

# London Times Publishes an Exposure Showing How They Are a Paraphrase of a French Book Attacking Governmental Abuses Under Napoleon III., Published in 1865

## Collapse of the Charges, Originating in Russia and Spread Broadcast, That Jews Plotted to Seize World Power

By the Constantinople Correspondent of The London Times.

Copyright, 1921, in the United States, by The New York Times Company.

HERE is one thing about Constantinople that is worth your while to remember," said a diplomatist to the writer in 1908. "If you only stay here long enough, you will meet many men who matter, and you may find the key to many strange secrets." Yet I must confess that when the discovery which is the theme of these articles was communicated to me I was at first incredulous. Mr. X., who brought me the evidence, was convinced. "Read this book through," he said, "and you will find irrefutable proof that the 'Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion' is a plagiarism."

Mr. X., who does not wish his real name to be known, is a Russian landowner with English connections. Orthodox by religion, he is in political opinion a Constitutional Monarchist. He came here as a refugee after the final failure of the White cause in South Russia. He had long been interested in the Jewish question as far as it concerned Russia, had studied the "Protocols," and during the period of Denikin's ascendancy had made investigations with the object of discovering whether any occult "Masonic" organization, such as the "Protocols" speak of, existed in Southern Russia. The only such organization was a Monarchist one. The discovery of the key to the problem of the "Protocols" came to him by chance.

### The Swiss Original.

A few months ago he bought a number of old books from a former officer of the "Okhrana" (Political Police) who had fled to Constantinople. Among these books was a small volume in French, lacking the title-page, with dimensions of 5½ by 3½ inches. It had been cheaply rebound. On the leather back is printed in Latin capitals the word Joli. The preface, entitled "Simple avertissement," is dated Geneva, Oct. 15, 1864. The book contains 324 pages, of which numbers 315-322 inclusive follow p. 24 in the only copy known to Mr. X., perhaps owing to a mistake when the book was rebound. Both the paper and the type are characteristic of the "sixties and seventies" of the last century. These details are given in the hope that they may lead to the discovery of the title of the book. Mr. X. believes it must be rare, since, had it not been so, the "Protocols" would have speedily been recognized as a plagiarism by any one who had read the original.

That the latter is a "fake" could not be maintained for an instant by any one who had seen it. Its original possessor, the old Okhrana officer, did not remember where he obtained it, and attached no importance to it. Mr. X., glancing at it one day, was struck by a resemblance between a passage which had caught his eye and a phrase in the French edition of the "Protocols" (Edition de la Vieille France, 1920, 5, Rue du Préaux-Cleres, 5, Paris 7th Arrondissement). He followed up the clue, and soon realized that the "Protocols" were to a very large extent as much a paraphrase of the Geneva original as the published version of a War Office or Foreign Office telegram is a paraphrase of the ciphered original.

Before receiving the book from Mr. X. I was, as I have said, incredulous. I did not believe that Sergei Nilus's "Protocols" were authentic; they explained too much by the theory of a vast Jewish conspiracy. Professor Nilus's account of how they were obtained was too melodramatic to be credible, and it was hard to believe that real "Learned Elders of Zion" would not have produced a more intelligent political scheme than the crude and theatrical subtleties of the "Protocols." But I could not have believed, had I not seen, that the writer who supplied Nilus with his originals was a careless and sameless plagiarist.

### Montesquieu and Machiavelli.

The Geneva book is a very thinly veiled attack on the despotism of Napoleon III. in the form of a series of twenty-five dialogues divided into four parts. The speakers are Montesquieu and Machiavelli. In the brief preface to his book the anonymous author points out that it contains passages which are applicable to all Governments, "but it particularly personifies a political system which has not varied in its application for a single day since the fatal and alas! too distant date when it was enthroned." Its references to the "Hausmanniza-

tion" of Paris, to the repressive measures and policy of the French Emperor, to his wasteful financial system, to his foreign wars, to his use of secret societies in his foreign policy (cf., his notorious relations with the Carbonari) and his suppression of them in France, to his relations with the Vatican, and to his control of the Press are unmistakable.

The Geneva Book, or as it will henceforth be called, the "Geneva Dialogues," opens with the meeting of the spirits of Montesquieu and Machiavelli on a desolate beach in the world of shades. After a lengthy exchange of civilities, Montesquieu asks Machiavelli to explain why from an ardent Republican he had become the author of "The Prince" and "the founder of that sombre school of thought which has made all crowned heads your disciples, but which is well fitted to justify the worst crimes of tyranny." Machiavelli replies that he is a realist and proceeds to justify the teaching of "The Prince," and to explain its applicability to the Western European States of 1864.

In the first six "Geneva Dialogues" Montesquieu is given a chance of argument, of which he avails himself. In the seventh dialogue, which corresponds to the fifth, sixth, seventh, and part of the eighth "Protocols," he gives Machiavelli permission to describe at length how he would solve the problem of stabilizing political societies "incessantly disturbed by the spirit of anarchy and revolution." Henceforth Machiavelli, or in reality Napoleon III., speaking through Machiavelli, has the lion's share of the dialogue. Montesquieu's contributions thereto become more and more exclamatory; he is profoundly shocked by Machiavelli-Napoleon's defense of an able and ruthless dictator, but his counter-arguments grow briefer and weaker. At times, indeed, the author of "L'Esprit des Lois" is made to cut as poor a figure as parvum componere magno—does Dr. Watson when he attempts to talk criminology to Sherlock Holmes.

### "Dialogue" and "Protocol."

The "Protocols" follow almost the same order as the "Dialogues." Dialogues 1-17 generally correspond with "Protocols" 1-19. There are a few exceptions to this. One is in the 18th "Protocol," where, together with paraphrases of passages from the 17th Dialogue ("Geneva Dialogues," pp. 216, 217), there is an echo of a passage in the 25th "Geneva Dialogue," viz.: "Quand le malheureux est opprimé il dit 'Si le Roi le savait'." Quand on veut se venger, qu'on espère un secours, on dit 'le Roi le saura.'" This appears on p. 68 of the English edition of the "Protocols" (4th Edition, published by "The Britons," 62, Oxford Street, London, W.) as "In order to exist, the prestige of power must occupy such a position that the people can say among themselves, 'If only the King knew about it,' or 'When the King knows about it.'"

The last five "Protocols" (Nos. 20-24 inclusive) do not contain so many paraphrases of the "Geneva Dialogues" as the first 19. Some of their resemblances and paraphrases are, however, very striking, e. g., the following:

A loan is an issue of Government paper which entails an obligation to pay interest amounting to a percentage of the total sum of the borrowed money. If a loan is at 5 per cent., then in twenty years the Government will have unnecessarily paid out a sum equal to that of the loan in order to cover the percentage. In forty years it will have paid twice, and in sixty thrice that amount, but the loan will still remain as an unpaid debt. ("Protocols," p. 7.)

Montesquieu.—How are loans made? By the issue of bonds entailing on the Government the obligation to pay interest proportionate to the capital it has been paid. Thus, if a loan is at 5 per cent., the State, after twenty years, has paid out a sum equal to the borrowed capital. When forty years have expired it has paid double, after sixty years triple, yet remains debtor for the entire capital sum. ("Geneva Dialogues," p. 250.)

But generally speaking "Protocols" 20 and 21, which deal (some- what unconconvincingly) with the financial program of the Learned Elders, owe less to the "Geneva Dialogues," Nos. 18-21, than to the imagination of the plagiarist author who had for once in a way to show a little originality. This is natural enough since the "Dialogues" in question describe the actual financial policy of the French Imperial Government, while the "Protocols" deal with the future. Again in the last four "Geneva Dialogues" Machiavelli's apotheosis of the Second Empire, being based upon historical facts which took place between 1852 and 1864, obviously furnished scanty material for the plagiarist who wished to prove, or, very possibly, had been ordered to prove in the "Protocols," that the ultimate aim of the leaders of Jewry was to give the world a ruler sprung from the House of David.

The scores of parallels between the two books and a theory concerning the methods of the plagiarist and the reasons for the publication of the "Protocols" in 1905 will be the subject of further articles. Meanwhile it is amusing to find that the only subject with which the "Protocols" deal on lines quite contrary to those followed

by Machiavelli in the "Dialogues," is the private life of the Sovereign. It is soon ruined by internal convulsions or by foreign intervention following on the heels of civil war. Then follows a singular parallel between the two books which deserves quotation:

Geneva Dialogues, p. 8. "What arms will they employ? Will the State which has two opposing enemies, one external and one internal, to use different means of defense against the one and thus be mutually in a position to defend themselves? Will they mutually ban night secret plans of de- attacks, traps, ambushes, battles by night or with inequality of force? Of course not; such combatants would court derision. Are you against the employment of these traps and tricks, of all the strategy in- dispensable to war against the enemy within, the revolutionary?"

### Instances of Paraphrasing.

While the Geneva Dialogues open with an exchange of compliments between Montesquieu and Machiavelli, which covers seven pages, the author of the Protocols plunges at once in medias res.

One can imagine him hastily turning over those first seven pages of the book which he has been ordered to paraphrase against time, and angrily ejaculating, "Nothing here." But on page 8 of the Dialogues he finds what he wants: the greater part of this page and the next are promptly paraphrased, thus:—

Geneva Dialogues, p. 8. "Among mankind the evil instinct is mightier than the good. Man is more drawn to fear and force than to good. Fear and force have more of noble empire over him than good. Every man aims at domination; not one is ready to sacrifice the rights of others to his own interests."

What restrains those beasts of prey which they call men from attacking one another? Brute nature, in the first stages of social life, they submitted to, then the Law, brute and blind force, then to law, which is regulated by forms, reality is the same. Every man aims at domination; not one is ready to sacrifice the rights of others to his own interests. Political freedom is not a fact but an idea.

The gift of liberty according to the Machiavelli of the Geneva Dialogues, of self-government according to the

Protocols (page 2), leads speedily to civil and social strife, and the State is soon ruined by internal convulsions or by foreign intervention following on the heels of civil war. Then follows a singular parallel between the two books which deserves quotation:

Geneva Dialogues, p. 8. "What arms will they employ? Will the State which has two opposing enemies, one external and one internal, to use different means of defense against the one and thus be mutually in a position to defend themselves? Will they mutually ban night secret plans of de- attacks, traps, ambushes, battles by night or with inequality of force? Of course not; such combatants would court derision. Are you against the employment of these traps and tricks, of all the strategy in- dispensable to war against the enemy within, the revolutionary?"

### Right and Wrong.

Both "Machiavelli" and the author of the Protocols agree (Prot. p. 3, Geneva Dialogues, p. 11) almost in the same words that politics has nothing in common with morality. Right is described in the Protocols as "an abstract idea established by nothing," in the Dialogues as an "indefinitely vague" expression. The end, say both, justifies the means. "I pay less attention," says Machiavelli, "to what is good and moral than to what is useful and necessary." The Protocols (p. 4) use the same formula, substituting "profitable" for "useful." According to the Protocols, he who would rule "must have recourse to cunningness (sic) and hypocrisy." In the second Dialogue (p. 15) Montesquieu reproaches Machiavelli for having "only two words to repeat—'Force' and 'guile.'" Both Machiavelli and the "Elders" of the Protocols preach despotism as the sole safeguard against anarchy. In the Protocols this despotism has to be Jewish and hereditarily. Machiavelli's despotism is obviously Napoleonic.

There are scores of other parallels between the books. Fully 50 paragraphs in the Protocols are simply paraphrases of passages in the Dialogues. The quotation per me reges

France edition of the Protocols (p. 29), while regent is substituted for regnant in the English version (p. 20), appears on p. 63 of the Geneva Dialogues. Sulla, whom the English version of the Protocols insists on calling "Silla," appears in both books.

After covering Italy with blood, Sulla reappeared as a simple citizen in Rome; no one durst touch a hair of his head. Geneva Dialogues, p. 159.

Remember at the time when Italy was streaming with blood, she did not touch a hair of Silla's head, and he was the man who made her blood pour out. Protocols, p. 31.

Sulla, who after the proscriptions stalked "in his savage grandeur home," is one of the tyrants whom every schoolboy knows and those who believe that Elders of the 33d Degree are responsible for the Protocols may say that this is a mere coincidence. But what about the exotic Vishnu, the hundred-armed Hindu deity who appears twice in each book? The following passages never were examples of "unconscious plagiarism."

### Geneva Dialogues, p. 141.—

Machiavelli.—"Like the god Vishnu, my press will have a hundred arms; and these arms will give their hands to all the different shades of opinion throughout the country."

### Protocols, p. 43.—

"These newspapers, like the Indian god Vishnu, will be possessed of hundreds of hands, each of which will be feeling the pulse of varying public opinion."

### Geneva Dialogues, p. 207.—

Montesquieu.—"Now I understand the figure of the god Vishnu; you have a hundred arms like the Indian idol, and each of your fingers touches a spring."

### Protocols, p. 65.—

"Our Government will resemble the Hindu god Vishnu. Each of our hundred hands will hold one spring of the social machinery of State."

### Taxation of the Press.

The Dialogues and the Protocols alike devote special attention to the Press, and their schemes for the muzzling and control thereof are almost identical, absolutely identical, indeed, in many details. Thus Machiavelli on pp. 135 and 136 of the Dialogues expounds the following ingenious scheme:—

"I shall extend the tax on newspapers to books, or rather I shall introduce a stamp duty on books having less than a certain number of pages. A book, for example, with less than 200 or 300 pages will not rank as a book, but as a brochure. I am sure you see the advantage of this scheme. On the one hand I think (je risais) by taxation that cloud of short books which are the mere ap-

pendages of Journalism; on the other I force those who wish to escape stamp duty to throw themselves into long and costly compositions, which will hardly ever be sold and scarcely read in such a form."

The Protocols, p. 41, has:—

"We will tax it (the book press) in the same manner as the newspaper press: that is to say, by means of excise stamps and deposits. But on books of less than 300 pages we will place a tax twice as heavy. These short books we will classify as pamphlets, which constitute the most virulent form of printed poison. These measures will also compel writers to publish such long works that they will be little read by the public and chiefly so on account of their high price."

Both have the same profound contempt for Journalists.

### Geneva Dialogues, pp. 145, 146:—

Machiavelli.—"You must know that Journalism is a sort of Freemasonry; those who live by it are bound to one another by the ties of professional discretion; like the augurs of old, they do not lightly divulge the secret of their oracles. They would gain nothing by betraying themselves, for they have mostly won more or less discreditably."

### Protocols, p. 44:—

"Already there exists in French Journalism a system of Masonic understanding for giving countersigns. All organs of the press are tied by mutual professional secrets in the manner of the ancient oracles. Not one of its members will betray the secret of the secret, if the secret has not been ordered to be made public. No single publisher will have the courage to betray the secret entrusted to him, the reason being that not one of them is admitted into the literary world without bearing the marks of some shady act in his past life."

### Contempt for the People.

But this contempt is nothing compared to that which both Machiavelli and the Elders evince toward the masses whom tyranny is to reduce to a more than Oriental servitude.

### Geneva Dialogues, p. 43:—

Machiavelli.—"You do not know the unbounded meanness of the peoples... groveling before force, pitiless towards the weak; implacable to faults, indulgent to crimes, incapable of supporting the contradictions of a free régime, and patient to the point of martyrdom under the violence of an audacious despotism... giving themselves masters whom they pardon for deeds for the least of which they would have beheaded twenty constitutional kings."

### Protocols, p. 15:—

"In their intense meanness, the Christian peoples help our independence when sneering they crouch before power; when they are pitiless towards the weak; merciless in dealing with faults, and lenient to crimes; when they refuse to recognize the contradictions of freedom; when they are patient to the degree of martyrdom in bearing with the violence of an audacious despotism. At the hands of their present dictators, Premiers, and Ministers, they endure

abuses for the smallest of which they would have murdered twenty kings."

Both the Elders and Machiavelli propose to make political crime thoroughly unpopular by assimilating the treatment of the political criminal to that of the felon. Both devote not a little attention to police organization and espionage; the creator of Machiavelli had evidently studied Napoleon III.'s police methods, and suffered at the hands of his agents. Each proposes to exercise a severe control over the Bar and the Bench. As regards the Vatican, Machiavelli-Napoleon, with recent Italian history in mind, aims at the complete control of the Papacy. After inflaming popular hatred against the Church of Rome and its clergy, he will intervene to protect the Holy See, as Napoleon III. did intervene, when "the chassés worked wonders." The learned Elders propose to follow a similar plan: "When the people in their rage throw themselves on to the Vatican we shall appear as its protectors in order to stop bloodshed." Ultimately, of course, they mean to destroy the Church. The terrible chiefs of a Pan-Judaic conspiracy could hardly have any other plan of campaign. Machiavelli, naturally, does not go so far. Enough for him if the Pope is safely lodged in the Napoleonic pocket.

Is it necessary to produce further proofs that the majority of the Protocols are simply paraphrases of the Geneva Dialogues, with wicked Hebrew Elders, and finally an Israelite world ruler in the place of Machiavelli-Napoleon III., and the brutish *goyim* (Gentiles) substituted for the fickle masses, "gripped in a vice by poverty, ridden by sensuality, devoured by ambition," whom Machiavelli intends to win?

The questions now arise, how did the originals become known in Russia, and why were the Protocols invented?

There is no evidence as to how the Geneva Dialogues reached Russia. The following theory may be suggested.

The Third Napoleon's secret police, many of whom were Corsicans, must have known the existence of the Dialogues and almost certainly obtained them from some of the many persons arrested on the charge of political conspiracy during the reign of Napoleon III.

In the last two decades of the nineteenth century and in the early years of the twentieth, there were always a few Corsicans in the Palace Police of the Czar and in the Russian Secret Service. Combining courage with secretiveness, a high average of intelligence with fidelity to his chief, the Corsican makes a first-class secret agent or bodyguard. It is not improbable that Corsicans who had been in the service of Napoleon III., or who had had kinsmen in his secret service, brought the Geneva Dialogues to Russia, where some member of the Okhrana or some Court official obtained possession of them. But this is only a theory.

### Professor Sergei Nilus.

As to the Protocols, they were first published in 1905 at Tsarskoe Selo in the second edition of a book entitled "The Great Within the Small," the author of which was Professor Sergei Nilus. Professor Nilus has been described to the writer as a learned, pious, credulous Conservative, who combined much theological and some historical erudition with a singular lack of knowledge of the world. In January, 1917, Nilus, according to the introduction to the French version of the Protocols, published a book entitled "It Is Here, at Our Doors!" in which he republished the Protocols. In this latter work, according to the French version, Professor Nilus stated that the manuscript of the Protocols was given him by Alexis Nicolavitch Sukhotin, a noble who afterward became Vice Governor of Stavropol.

According to the 1905 edition of the Protocols, they were obtained by a woman who stole them from "one of the most influential and most highly initiated leaders of Freemasonry. The theft was accomplished at the close of the secret meeting of the 'initiated' in France, that nest of Jewish conspiracy." But in the epilogue to the English version of the Protocols Professor Nilus says, "My friend found them in the safes at the headquarters of the Society of Zion, which are at present situated in France." According to the French version of the Protocols, Nilus in his book of 1917 states that the Protocols were notes of a plan submitted to the "Council of Elders" by Theodor Hertzl at the first Zionist Congress, which was held at Basle, in August, 1897, and that Hertzl afterward complained to the Zionist Committee of Action of the indiscreet publication of confidential information. The Protocols were signed by "Zionist representatives of the 33d Degree" in Orient Freemasonry and were secretly removed from the complete file of the proceedings of the aforesaid Zionist Congress, which was hidden in the "Chief Zionist office, which is situated in French territory."

Such are Professor Nilus's rather contradictory accounts of the origin of the Protocols. Not a very convincing story! Theodor Hertzl is dead; Sukhotin is dead, and where are the signatures of the Zionist representatives of the 33d Degree? Turning to the text of the Protocols, and comparing it with that of the Geneva Dialogues, one is struck by the absence of any effort on the part of the plagiarist to conceal his plagiarisms. The paraphrasing has been very careless; parts of sentences, whole phrases at times, are identical; the development of the thought is the same; there has been no attempt worth mentioning to alter the order of the Geneva Dialogues. The plagiarist has introduced Darwin, Marx and Nietzsche in one passage in order to be "up to date"; he has given a Jewish color to "Machiavelli's" schemes for dictatorship, but he has utterly failed to conceal his indebtedness to the Geneva Dialogues. This gives the impression that the real writer of the Protocols, who does not seem to have had anything to do with Nilus and may have been some quite unimportant précis writer employed by the Court or by the Okhrana, was obliged to paraphrase the original at short notice. A proof of Jewish conspiracy was required at once as a weapon for the Conservatives against the Liberal elements in Russia.

Mr. X., the discoverer of the plagiarist, informs me that the Protocols, shortly after their discovery in 1901, four years before their publication by Professor Nilus, served a subsidiary purpose, namely, the first defeat of M. Philippe, a French hypnotist and thought reader, who acquired considerable influence over the Czar and Czarina at the beginning of the present century. The Court favorite was disliked by certain great personages, and incurred the natural jealousy of the monks, thaumaturgists and similar adventurers who hoped to capture the Czar through the Empress in their own interest, or in that of various cliques. Philippe was not a Jew, but it was easy to represent a Frenchman from "that nest of Jewish conspiracy" as a Zionist agent. Philippe fell from favor, to return to Russia and find himself once more in the Court's good graces at a later date.

### The First Revolution.

But the principal importance of the Protocols was their use during the first Russian revolution. This revolution was supported by the Jewish element in Russia, notably by the Jewish Bund. The Okhrana organization knew this perfectly well; it had its Jewish and crypto-Jewish agents, one of whom afterward assassinated M. Stolypin; it was in league with the powerful Conservative faction, with its allies it sought to gain the Czar's ear. For many years before the Russian revolution of 1905-1906 there had been a tale of a secret council of Rabbis who plotted ceaselessly against the Orthodox. The publication of the Protocols in 1905 certainly came at an opportune moment for the Conservatives. It is said by some Russians that the manuscript of the Protocols was communicated to the Czar early in 1905, and that its communication contributed to the fall of the Liberal Prince Sviatopolk-Mirski in that year and the subsequent strong reactionary movement. However that may be, the date and place of publication of Nilus's first edition of the Protocols are most significant now that we know that the originals which were given him were simply paraphrases.

The following conclusions are, therefore, forced upon any reader of the two books who has studied Nilus's account of the origin of the Protocols and has some acquaintance with Russian history in the years preceding the revolution of 1905-1906:

1. The Protocols are largely a paraphrase of the book here provisionally called the "Geneva Dialogues."
2. They were designed to foster the belief among Russian Conservatives, and especially in Court circles, that the prime cause of discontent among the politically minded elements in Russia was not the repressive policy of the bureaucracy, but a worldwide Jewish conspiracy. They thus served as a weapon against the Russian Liberals, who urged the Czar to make certain concessions to the intelligentsia.
3. The Protocols were paraphrased very hastily and carelessly.
4. Such portions of the Protocols as were not derived from the Geneva Dialogues were probably supplied by the Okhrana, which organization very possibly obtained them from the many Jews it employed to spy on their co-religionists.

So much for the Protocols. They have done harm not so much, in the writer's opinion, by arousing anti-Jewish feeling, which is older than the Protocols and will persist in all countries where there is a Jewish problem until that problem is solved; rather, they have done harm by persuading all sorts of mostly well-to-do people that every recent manifestation of discontent on the part of the poor is an unnatural phenomenon, a factitious agitation caused by a secret society of Jews.