

The Fascist Menace

Whatever its ethnic make-up, Britain, indeed, any modern society, is noted for its diversity of opinion on a wide range of social and political issues. Much of this opinion is ill-informed, and is so for a number of reasons. Politicians aren't always honest, neither is the media, some people don't know how to assess evidence or weigh arguments, many simply do not have the time to explore every political debate from the restoration of capital punishment to British membership of the EEC to the role of the United Nations. But however diverse may be peoples' opinions, one thing every ordinary person surely agrees on is the undesirability of fascism and all its associated evils. These include persecution of minorities - ethnic and other - concentration camps, brutality, street violence, and much else.

Fascism, it is said, is such a terrible, inhuman philosophy, that it must not just be stamped out wherever it rears its ugly head, but it must be given not the slightest opportunity to take root. This includes the denial of free speech to fascists *by whatever means necessary*. It is not clear, exactly, if this means that in the final analysis, fascists and their fellow travellers can be murdered in order to shut them up, but the possibility should never be ruled out.

As well as denial of free speech, no one must give fascists any sort of platform, ever, and least of all must anyone debate with them. These fascists are so dastardly, so fiendish, so devilishly cunning, that they might use trickery to win the debate, and before long they'll have taken over the country and have thrown all the Jews, blacks, Asians and homosexuals into concentration camps in preparation for the Final Solution. Fascists cannot, must not, be debated. As George Orwell put it in his satirical novel *Animal Farm*:

"One false step, and our enemies would be upon us. Surely, comrades, you do not want Jones back?"
Once again this argument was unanswerable...if the holding of debates...was liable to bring him back, then the debates must stop." (1)

Needless to say, all debate ceased, and the animals who had been liberated from the dictatorship of the wicked Jones soon found themselves living under a despotism that was so corrupt, brutal and tyrannical that it made the heartless farmer seem positively benign by comparison. The laws which the animals had written on the wall on the expulsion of the farmer were slowly rewritten until they meant whatever the pigs - the ruling class - wanted them to mean. The new dictatorship was unrestricted by law, animals were executed on the slightest pretext, on trumped-up charges, some even denounced themselves.

We can probably rule out summary executions under the dictatorship of our new unhappy anti-fascist lords, but short of stringing up fascists and fellow travellers, militant anti-fascists will do anything to stop them spreading their message or even gaining access to the common people.

What Is Fascism?

One might think that a prerequisite for opposing fascism in all its myriad forms would be first and foremost to define it. One could ask the fascists themselves to do this, but since most of the people who are branded fascists deny being any such thing, this does raise problems. And of course, we can't debate with them so we can't ask them. Let us then take an excursion into history. The father of fascism (2) is generally regarded as Benito Mussolini (1883-1945). One of the major black marks against fascism is its alleged anti-Semitism, in other words, just as the capitalists supposedly set worker against worker in order to frustrate the coming of (inevitable) socialism, so the fascists are said to preach racial hatred, in particular, using the Jew as the scapegoat for all the world's problems.

Now it is certainly true that the German fascists (Nazis) (3) did this, but at this time, the belief in the world Jewish conspiracy and the Jewishness of Bolshevism was hardly a preserve of fascists and rabid anti-Semites. Lord Alfred Douglas, one time catamite of Oscar Wilde, was a raving anti-Semite who published virulent attacks on Jews in his literary journal *Plain English* between 1920 and 1922. He was hardly a fascist. Indeed, even many Jews believed this nonsense. The 1920 American edition of the notorious *Protocols of Zion* contains a quote from the prominent rabbi Stephen Wise who said that the conspiracy (ie Bolshevism) if it existed, did so only among apostates. (4)

THE MENACE OF "ANTI-FASCISM"

Which brings us to Mussolini, who was in fact no kind of anti-Semite, because several Jews served in his government. (5) Mussolini was also no fan of Hitler. Even more interestingly, the November 5, 1926 issue of the influential newspaper the *American Hebrew*, contains an interview with Signora Amalia Besso, an Italian Jewess who claimed to have been a leader of women's fascism before Mussolini!

Finally, it should be pointed out that the churches have been accused of preaching or at best nurturing anti-Semitism for centuries with the nonsense about the Jews killing the Son of God. None of the mainstream Christian churches espouses anti-Semitism today. On the other hand, certain Islamic fundamentalists do. This leads, correctly, to condemnation of the particular sects involved and not to a blanket condemnation of the Islamic faith. So, fascism, as an ideology, should not be condemned simply some fascists are anti-Semites, although realistically, today most fascist parties contain at least elements of organised or ad hoc anti-Semitism.

Which still brings us no closer to defining fascism. In the AFA documentary, one of those interviewed, an elderly man who had taken part in the Battle of Cable Street, defined fascism as "the strong arm of the capitalist system." This belief, and definition, is one which finds much support amongst militant anti-fascists. One of the claims levelled against fascists in this film was that they had helped break the 1926 General Strike. As they may well have done. But this hardly proves their ideology to be an integral part of the capitalist conspiracy. In the first place, fascists weren't the only ones who sided with the "ruling class" to break the strike. Anti-Semites use the same logic to "prove" that the Bolshevik Revolution was a Jewish revolution. In the second place, this was before the advent of Oswald Mosley's British Union of Fascists. The fascist parties of the 1920s were more radical conservatives than fascists. (6)

Fascism has elements of the corporate state, ie it is a form of big government. American researcher George Thayer defined fascists as "those who believe in...the Corporate State, the Leadership Principle, and Authoritarianism..." which is probably the most accurate definition, and the one we will use. (7) The National Front has of course been branded fascist for years, but in 1991, Gerry Gable, editor of the (supposedly) leading anti-fascist journal, *Searchlight*, contributed an essay to a book on contemporary fascism. In *The Far Right in Contemporary Britain*, Gable refers to the National Front's ideology as that of "a decentralised economy and state..." (8) So, according to this "expert", the National Front is an anti-fascist party, as indeed it is, whatever its policy on race.

Incidentally, Gable is a staunch advocate of the no platform for fascists at any place any time. He also refuses to debate with them, although he has had no qualms in the past about recruiting fascist *agents provocateurs* to incite violence and hatred against Britain's ethnic minorities, including his own. This alone demonstrates how dangerous is this policy. Okay, we've defined fascism, at last, let's now move on to the principal subject of this analysis, Anti-Fascist Action.

Introducing AFA

Anti-Fascist Action is probably the most militant anti-fascist group in Britain. (9) Usually known as AFA (pronounced as in gaffer), they are a bunch of real heroes: defenders of the Jews, the blacks, the Asians, and of course the working class, from the hordes of the British National Party, the National Front and all the fascists and fellow travellers who will take over the country as soon as they brainwash the population sufficiently to vote them in. The fact that the fascist vote in this country seldom reaches 3% is neither here nor there, the *menace* must be nipped in the bud.

In May 1992, AFA were given space on Channel 4's *Open Space* programme to air their views. In a no holds barred documentary called *Fighting Talk*, (10) made under their own direction, they told the people exactly what they thought fascists are about, exactly what they are about, and exactly what they do, and will do, in order to save British democracy from the fascist hordes.

The rhetoric was powerful, but what did AFA really say? And what do they really stand for?

A Textual Analysis Of The AFA Documentary And Militant Anti-Fascist Dogma

The documentary opened with scenes of everyone's favourite fascist, Adolf Hitler himself. There was also a shot of dead bodies from one of the Nazi concentration camps at the end of the war, probably Belsen, but the shot was brief and uncaptioned. Then the presenter, AFA member, Mensi, (11) read the famous Pastor Niemoller "They came for me" quote. He stressed AFA's policy of physically confronting fascists and said the group also confronts them ideologically. Just how ideological is AFA's confrontation of fascists we shall soon see. Mensi stressed also that AFA protests against racial hatred, and alleged that there are 70,000 racial attacks a year in Britain. He claimed further that the fascists came for him, ie, a group of skinhead thugs started a riot at one of his concerts. Without wishing to insult our finely shorn friends, I would suggest that most of them are rather more interested in boozing, brawling and "Paki-bashing" than in spreading the gospel of Adolf Hitler. Hitler himself was a non-drinker, and, whatever lying propaganda the controlled media and morons like Mensi spew out, it is a documented fact that Adolf Hitler bore no ill will towards the non-white peoples of the world. His racial hatred was directed solely towards the Jews. (12)

Something else Mensi seems to have forgotten (or ignored) is that it is, and always has been, the "anti-fascists" who have attacked the fascists first and foremost. This is a fact which is so well documented that it would be hardly worth mentioning except that Marxist (and other) propaganda by consistent repetition, has obscured the true facts. Let us then document the true facts here, from a number of sources, so as to put them forever beyond dispute. We start with the testimony of *Searchlight* editor and arch-liar Gerry Gable. In the July 1993 issue of Gable's error-prone, lie-ridden, mischief-making magazine, it is stated that:

"Since the earliest days of fighting fascism in the twenties and thirties, it has been a fundamental principle that nobody ever sits on a platform or joins in debate with nazis and fascists." (13)

Gable's claim is confirmed by no less an authority than the Führer himself, so let us quote him here at length from his best known work, *Mein Kampf*. (14) Adolf Hitler did not form the Nazi Party from scratch, rather he joined the German Labour Party (or German Workers Party) as member number seven. He had been ordered to investigate the party by his superiors. (15) At the time, 1919, Hitler was still in the army, and Germany, having suffered a humiliating defeat in the bloodiest war in human history, was in a state of turmoil. Hitler, being both a gifted orator and a dedicated patriot, soon rose to prominence in the party, assuming its leadership, a leadership which he was never to relinquish.

Not every German was intensely patriotic however, and his minuscule organisation soon came under attack from the far better organised and unreservedly violent, Marxist left. It should be born in mind that this was at a time well before the Nazi "gas chambers", the Nuremberg Laws, or even before Hitler began his railing at the Jews. He had, by his own admission, become an anti-Semite in Vienna, when as a young man, living in abject poverty, he first encountered the "Jewish problem". (16) One should not however make too much of this, as, unpleasant though it may be, anti-Semitism was far less subject to social taboo in those days than it is today. Indeed, some openly anti-Semitic publications, even in Britain, were patronised by respectable advertisers (17) and as stated, a great many people from all walks of life took seriously such blatant anti-Semitic propaganda (and nonsense) as the *Protocols of Zion*.

On page 269, after commenting on a peaceful political meeting, Hitler recounts how in general "the National Socialist meetings were by no means 'peaceable' affairs...It was imperative from the start to introduce rigid discipline into our meetings and establish the authority of the chairman absolutely." Communist agitators attempted to break up the National Socialists' peaceful meetings with such ruthlessness that "More often than not everything hung on a mere thread, and only the chairman's ruthless determination and the rough handling by our ushers baffled our adversaries' intentions."

The organised Marxist movement then tried other tactics to prevent the common people from hearing what Herr Hitler and company had to say. "Appeals were then made to the 'class-conscious proletariat' to attend our meetings in masses and strike with the clenched hand of the proletarian at the representatives of a 'monarchist and reactionary agitation'." (18) In other words, to do what *Searchlight* editor and arch-liar Gerry Gable does, incite the gullible *goyim* to violence: "Stop the Nazis before they turn me into a lampshade!"

Herr Hitler's lectures must have been extremely interesting because they droned on for three hours! His enemies then ordered workers not to attend the National Socialist Party's meetings. This is the Marxist concept of freedom.

THE MENACE OF "ANTI-FASCISM"

Don't go to this meeting, by order. Who did these people think they were? And AFA, who do they think they are?

Not satisfied with this, the far left resorted to violence once again. And, while they were being attacked, the nascent National Socialists were "treated as veritable criminals against mankind. One article followed the other, in which our criminal intentions were explained and new proofs brought forward to support what was said. Scandalous tales, all of them fabricated from start to finish, were published in order to help to poison the public mind." (19)

This has been the tactic of *Searchlight* magazine and its controllers, one of the main promoters of AFA. Many, many fabricated stories about the National Front and the British National Party and their members have filled the media: the 1981 Leicester gun-running conspiracy and the Notting Hill Carnival bomb plot, for example. Currently, the quasi-mythical group Combat 18 is being held responsible for violent outrages. (20) As far as acts of fascist motivated violence do occur, they are largely the work of individuals and frustrated activists. Occasionally, a group of fascists or fellow travellers will come together to fight fire with fire, but there has never been any evidence worthy of the name that either the British National Party or the National Front (as parties) have ever condoned or advocated much less organised political or racial violence. The proof of this is the fact that such parties, although constantly monitored by the Secret State, have never been the subject of criminal prosecution, save under Britain's Draconian and outrageous "race relations" laws.

The press bias against the BNP et al needs no mention. Within the past three months at the time of writing, one BNP activist has been the victim of a letter bomb, a second has lost the sight of an eye in a street attack, and the party's press officer has been viciously attacked in his own home and his computer stolen. These are the bad guys, remember, the fascist thugs!

Returning to the 1920s, the National Socialist Party organised a squad of troops (the SA) to defend their meetings, and they defended them with vigour so that on entering the meeting halls with cries of "To-day we shall finish them off" the organised left would not treat Hitler and company the way they treated other speakers who were "thrown down the stairs with cracked skulls..." Those leftists who tried to disrupt Nazi meetings were thrown out with lightning speed". (21)

Finally, with regard to the no platform, no debate and no right to communicate their views to the public, it should hardly be necessary to point out that in recent years - and not so recent years - attacks on fascists and their fellow travellers have far outnumbered attacks by fascists. Most of the latter, incidentally, have been by way of reprisal or out of frustration.

In 1992, former 43 Group thug Morris Beckman published a candid (if not entirely accurate) history of this organisation. At one point he describes a fascist meeting soon after the war in which the speaker, Jeffrey Hamm, was brutally attacked while making a speech standing on top of a van: "Hamm stared down contemptuously at the struggling mob below and gave the fascist salute, a ploy always calculated to goad opponents. He succeeded only too well - a piece of brick hit him on the side of the head and he fell on top of the van, unconscious." (22) Beckman was Jewish, as was the 43 Group. (23) They are both conclusive proof that anti-Semites are made rather than born.

In July 1962, a riot ensued when Colin Jordan's National Socialist Movement held a meeting in London's Trafalgar Square; in August 1977 there was serious public disorder when the National Front marched in Lewisham, South London. In October 1993, serious public disorder ensued at an anti-BNP march in Welling, Kent. Fascists played no part in any of these disgraceful scenes, and could not in any reasonable sense be said to have provoked them. Unless their very existence constitutes a provocation.

All the above proves that if they (the fascists) came for Mensi, they were hardly setting a precedent. Fascists are far more often victims than perpetrators; far more often sinned against than sinning. In view of the well orchestrated hate campaign against them and the partisan - and often dishonest - stance of the media, it is hardly surprising that they resort to violence. Give a dog a bad name and it'll bite you; treat people like scum, and it won't be too long before they act like it. None of this of course justifies or even excuses racially motivated violence, but one must always look at the whole picture.

On the subject of racial violence, while only an imbecile would deny the reality of racial attacks, the subject of what constitutes a racial attack and how many there actually are in Britain annually is a subject of considerable debate. Naturally, the BNP et al attempt to minimise such attacks and their own (if any) involvement in them while ethnic, immigrant and anti-fascist pressure groups take precisely the opposite stand. (24) The latter also blame attacks on *racism* while the former blame them on the failure of multi-racialism and the resentment of the indigenous population. Both are right to some extent. On the one hand, it is true that if there were no non-whites in Britain there would be no attacks on them; on the other hand, racial attacks are not perpetrated out of love for one's fellow man.

Nevertheless, the claim of 70,000 racial attacks annually is unreasonably high. What constitutes a racial attack? An attack on a non-white by a white without a clear motive? Is a drunken brawl, a mugging etc? Does verbal abuse constitute an attack? More interestingly, in June 1994, (page 7), *Searchlight* reported an attack on an Asian man by a gang. The victim was cut by a black member of an otherwise all white gang. Is this a racial attack, another example of multi-racial partnership, or simply a case of thugs coming in all colours? Neither AFA's figures nor any of the highly imaginative statistics churned out by such partisan organisations as the Board of Deputies of "British" Jews can be taken seriously. Their propaganda is too often self-serving. (25) [One subject we have not discussed here is the role of *agents provocateurs*, "fascists" and "moles" recruited by ostensibly anti-fascist organisations to infiltrate far right groups for the specific purpose of inciting their less intelligent elements to commit violent or even terrorist acts against ethnic minorities. The current writer has recently published a documented study of this, *LIARS OUGHT TO HAVE GOOD MEMORIES: The True, Unsanitised Story Of "Searchlight" Mole Ray Hill*].

Serious racially motivated attacks are the ones which are most easily established as such, but only if the perpetrators are caught or can be identified with reasonable certainty. The most serious of these are of course murders. In recent years there have been what appear to be a number of well publicised racially motivated murders, but even they are not all what they appear to be. In January 1981, a fire in a crowded partying black household in Deptford, South London, was blamed on the far right. No one was ever charged in connection with the fire which resulted in thirteen deaths, but the best evidence indicated that the fire was started by someone who was attending the party. (26)

Over the past few years there have been literally a handful of purely racially motivated murders of blacks and other non-whites. These cause a great deal of righteous indignation in the media and in the left wing press, as indeed they rightly should, but in the period 1969-87, a staggering 2,618 people were killed and more than 33,000 injured in Northern Ireland. (27) The population of Northern Ireland in 1991 was 1,649,000. (28) This carnage has been exclusively white on white, which means that whatever racial hatred exists on mainland Britain can't hold a candle to the terrible hatred and bitterness of Catholic on Protestant and vice versa in that sad province. It is also notable that the outrageous campaigns of the IRA - the world's premier terrorist murder machine - receive little if any genuine condemnation from the "anti-fascist" left in Britain.

In October 1993, the IRA planted a bomb in the Shankill Road which killed ten people, including one of the bombers. The following week the story was reported in *Socialist Worker* under the heading: *After ten killed in bomb blast...How do we end this horror?* An inset into the story, *What's behind 'the troubles'*, began thus: "THE PRESS claim the killings are about Protestant versus Catholic extremists. They never look at the real causes of the troubles in Northern Ireland - politicians who have whipped up divisions between Catholics and Protestants for centuries." (29)

It wasn't the politicians who planted the bomb; responsible politicians, Protestant and Catholic, have been unanimous in condemning such outrages, whether they are committed by "Republicans" or by "Loyalists". Indeed, this is about the *only* issue in the past thirty years that all mainstream politicians in the United Kingdom and Northern Ireland have agreed on unanimously. They can argue about the merits of boycotting South Africa - before the "democratic" election of Nelson Mandela; about the causes of inflation; the power of the unions; whether or not the police should be armed; whether or not to bomb Iraq and murder its leader; but the one thing *all* politicians agree on is that the continuing horrors and senseless murders in Northern Ireland must be condemned unconditionally. But what did *Socialist Worker* say about this horror? "The IRA's bomb was aimed at the UDA's headquarters in an office above the fish shop where people died. The IRA later apologised for killing innocent people. This will not do." (30) No condemnation whatsoever, simply, you shouldn't have done it boys, be more careful next time.

Likewise, Red Action, the group which was expelled from the Socialist Workers Party in 1982, (31) and which has an overlapping membership with AFA, has been putting up stickers around London - and doubtless elsewhere - imploring people to side *with* the IRA *against* the common enemy, (see page 16). This common enemy is of course British soldiers, Irish policemen, prison officers, MPs. And you, if by their broad definition you are a fascist, fellow traveller or class enemy.

Returning to the AFA video, the claim is made that the white working class is being betrayed by all the mainstream parties. Which is true. In Germany in the 1930s the people correctly blamed the politicians until Hitler came along and blamed the Jews. Again, this is not quite correct, and it was less than fair to blame German politicians. We have already made the point that Hitler's anti-Semitism was far from unique, that drawing room anti-Semitism was widespread at this time, even in British society. In fact, one of the things Hitler was undoubtedly correct

THE MENACE OF "ANTI-FASCISM"

about was the unfair settlement of World War One. It was unquestionably the unjust settlement of the Treaty of Versailles which helped bring Hitler to power. (32)

In Britain today, the far right are said to blame immigrants as Hitler blamed the Jews. This is not quite true. The hard core (and in some respects lunatic) right still blame the Jews. But as most of the Draconian "race relations" legislation and suppression of free speech in this country has been connived at with assistance or even at the behest of Organised Jewry, that is hardly surprising. The organisation which has been more responsible than most is the Board of Deputies of "British" Jews "defence committee". This quasi-fascistic organisation is an almost unqualified supporter of the State of Israel. It claims to represent all Britain's Jews, in fact it does not. It certainly does not represent the Orthodox, who walked out in the early seventies. (33) And it most certainly does not represent the ultra-Orthodox Neturei Karta and other anti-Zionist sects who regard the State of Israel as an abomination.

The race "problem" is of course not an economic problem but a social and in some senses biological problem. The orthodox line, indeed the only line permitted by "respectable" people, is that the problem of *racism* is simply prejudice against people with dark skins by people with white skins. Exactly how foolish, and dangerous, is this belief, can be attested by the current genocide in the Central African state of Rwanda. Some reports put the numbers of dead as high as half a million. This violence is black on black. We have already mentioned similar white on white violence in Northern Ireland where the parties involved are also culturally very similarly, and, unlike the Rwandans, highly civilised. Obviously, race is more than skin deep; we ignore it at our peril.

As to the white working class being betrayed, part of this betrayal was from the organised left. There was no significant influx of unassimilable immigrants into Britain until after the Second World War. When the immigrants came, initially from the Caribbean, they were met with hostility and at times violent resistance. (34) The stock explanation is that immigrants were brought to Britain because of an acute labour shortage. Some people on the far left have even suggested that the country couldn't have survived without them, an absurd suggestion as it implies that Britons couldn't have run their own transport system, hospitals et al before. The admission has been made that immigrants were brought here as cheap labour. Socialist ignorance of basic economics is such that the far left totally rejects the free market solution. In a truly free market there can be no shortage of labour or of goods and services, because as the demand increases, prices - in this case, wages - follow, until the deficit is made good. It follows from this that those people who supported immigration into Britain for their own nefarious purposes were in fact acting *against* rather than in favour of the best interests of the white working class.

The extreme left went a step further and called for the abolition of all immigration controls as well as for "Any racial discrimination to be made a penal offence." (35) Penal, take note, not simply criminal. Love thy neighbour or else! One Communist Party pamphlet argued that "British public opinion in general is firmly against a colour bar, as anyone who reads the newspapers will see." (36) The idea that the newspapers - the "Tory press", remember - reflect public opinion, is a novel idea even for a dyed in the wool communist. Of course, public opinion was not totally opposed to a colour bar, as the author of this pamphlet himself proved. On page 10 he spoke of "a prejudiced minority", yet on the previous page he related the difficulty most non-whites (37) experienced in finding accommodation, having the door slammed in their faces by horrified landladies etc.

The Communist Party campaigned against immigration controls and for forced race-mixing not out of love of blacks and other non-whites, but out of hatred for their own white skins and in order to import their own revolution. They are no true friends of any of the world's oppressed peoples and never have been. This being said, the current generation has been presented with a *fait accompli*, but AFA and their ilk are not and never have been in this business to improve race relations.

Next, narrator Mensi quotes Hitler: "Only one thing could have stopped our movement. If our enemies had understood its principles and from the first day had smashed with utmost brutality the nucleus of our new movement." (38)

In a letter to the *Independent*, published April 15, 1994, John Rees, a member of the Socialist Workers Party cited this; and, while condemning far right violence he attempted to justify far left violence:

"When Nelson Mandela or Gerry Adams advocate the use of force, they do so as part of a wider struggle for greater freedom and democracy. When the Nazis use force, it is part of a wider attempt to deny elementary rights to trade unionists, socialists, black people and many other sections of the population."

In other words, if they murder your children in a *good* cause, Mr Rees approves. Anyone who has ever read *Socialist Worker* will realise just what *good* causes Mr Rees and his fellow travellers support, but it's the same old story: the end justifies the means.

This quote is often used by the anti-fascist left nowadays, but every time they quote it they miss the point. If an ideology can be smashed only by the utmost brutality, it must have a great deal of popular appeal, and indeed, this is what Hitler meant. The early Christians were subjected to the utmost brutality, other religious faiths have also been persecuted, including of course the Jews. The hard core never wavered, and the flame continues to burn, throughout two millennia in the case of Christianity, and under oppressive régimes as varied as the Romans and the Soviets.

Of course, Nazism is based on more than faith, as are all political ideologies. Nazism can be opposed, and should be opposed, but not by force, and certainly not by terror. No ideology should be opposed by terror unless the common people are living under virtual terror, as they were in the early days of Soviet Russia. Jews never lived under terror in Nazi Germany. True, there was persecution, but this persecution was done within the framework of increasingly repressive anti-Jewish legislation which culminated in the Nuremberg Laws. (39) During World War Two, many, but by no means all, German Jews were rounded up and herded into concentration camps. They were so treated because they were considered enemy aliens; at the start of hostilities, Chaim Weizmann, the recognised leader of international Zionism, declared that the Jews would stand by the democracies. (40) After the entry of the United States into the war, citizens of Japanese ancestry were likewise rounded up and herded into concentration camps, even though there had been no similar declaration by any Japanese leader.

We will not discuss here the Final Solution - whether or how many Jews were allegedly exterminated as the result of a deliberate policy of genocide - we will simply point out that whatever happened to the Jews during the war happened in the context of war time atrocities, a war which cost nearly fifty million Gentile lives on both sides, and a war which neither Hitler, nor the Nazis, nor the German people, had wanted in the first place. (41)

The point I am making is that if the so-called anti-fascists of AFA ad nauseum can oppose Nazism/fascism only by smashing it with the utmost brutality, they can't oppose it at all in any meaningful sense. Any ideology can be opposed and destroyed by force, including democracy. If an ideology can *only* be opposed by force, it does not deserve to be opposed, and indeed should be supported enthusiastically by the common people. The plain fact is that the vast majority of so-called anti-fascists, and all violent anti-fascists, are totally incapable of opposing fascism in any meaningful sense because a) like Gerry Gable, they have no idea what fascism really is, and/or b) they are not opponents of fascism but rivals who seek to impose their own brand of "fascism" on society.

The principal argument against fascism/Nazism since the end of the Second World War has been and remains, in a nutshell, *gas chambers*. As if nobody else committed atrocities. As if nobody else practised genocide. As we shall see shortly, the greatest irony here is that the people in the anti-fascist movement who make the most noise about the Nazis' alleged genocide of the Jews are themselves the followers of a political philosophy (Marxism) against which the atrocities and horrors of Nazism - real and imagined - pale into insignificance.

Also participating in this film were two older people, both of whom had been in Cable Street in 1936 at the time of Mosley's attempted march through the heavily Jewish populated East End of London. Mosley was said to have been a disciple of Hitler. This is misleading; if Mosley could be said to be a disciple of anyone, then it was of Mussolini. The reality is that although the British Union of Fascists was founded in October 1932, Mosley did not adopt a "Jewish policy" until the spring of 1934. (42) In May 1933, Mosley told the *Jewish Chronicle*: "As I have already said in public, I think that the anti-Semitic policy of the German Nazis was a great mistake. It certainly is not our policy." (43) He distanced himself from anti-Semitic fascist groups in Britain, and accused the British press of misrepresenting the BUF.

Four months later, in the same paper, the President of the Oxford University Jewish Society had nothing but praise for Mosley. A. Herman wrote: "At the present time, our greatest supporters in our fight against the Imperial Fascists are the Mosley Fascists themselves." (44)

The AFA film showed original footage of the Battle of Cable Street, and the witnesses pointed out, correctly, that they had never seen a fascist all day and that all the fighting was against the police. As indeed it was. The popular mythology of Cable Street is that this was the ordinary people of the East End rising up against fascism in order to protect its Jewish population and thereby to demonstrate the unity of the common people (ie the working class) in the struggle against the fascists themselves, the "fascist" police and the wicked capitalist system. The reality was, of course, very different.

An article in the April/May 1991 issue of *Comrade* gives the lie to this colossal fiction. Quoting contemporary Special Branch reports, the author demonstrates clearly that the "anti-fascist" uprising against Mosley was staged

THE MENACE OF "ANTI-FASCISM"

by the organised communist movement and its Labour allies. (45) The slogan of the "anti-fascists" was "They shall not pass"; an earlier issue of *Comrade* makes the point that this was in fact "PROSTITUTING that great phrase of the French armies before Verdun in 1916..." (46)

One of the Cable Street witnesses pointed out that not only had the "anti-fascists" fought the police, but that they had beaten them. The forces of law and order surrendered. This is not anti-fascism but anarchy. It was this same witness who defined fascism as "the strong arm of the capitalist system". And, of course, as they hadn't seen a fascist all day, not a single fascist was arrested. This is a state of affairs which was mirrored throughout anti-fascists' demonstrations in the post-war period, through the 1950s and early 60s, and through the anti-National Front and latterly the anti-BNP demonstrations of the late 60s down to the present day.

Narrator Mensi also believes fascism to be the strong arm of the capitalist system. As well as physically opposing fascism, he and his gang: "have marches, we have carnivals, music events..." Yes, come to the anti-fascist carnival, folks. They even have a travelling exhibition, where, no doubt, people dressed as *Holocaust* victims, regalled in Belsen pyjamas, explain patiently to schoolchildren why the concentration camps of Nazi Germany were so much more terrible than the concentration camps of Soviet Russia and how the Soviets, our glorious allies, remember, fought the twin evils of fascism and anti-Semitism so that Poland could be liberated from the German jackboot and placed under the Soviet one. Wasn't it Churchill himself who said after the war, my God, we have killed the wrong pig? But I digress. The salient point is: who foots the bill?

If, as Mensi and company would have us believe, fascism is the strong arm of the capitalist system, why doesn't the Benneton company employ blond-haired, blue-eyed supermen in its advertisements instead of kids in three colours? Why don't "capitalist" foundations such as the Runnymede Trust sponsor new editions of *Mein Kampf* instead of "anti-racist" polemics such as the Searchlight publication *New Right, New Racism*? (47) Why did the Gulbenkian Foundation publish a series of grotesque, historically, biologically and generally factually inaccurate pamphlets on the theme of the evils *racism*? Pamphlets which denigrate the concept of race, Britain's heritage and the capitalist system. Come to think of it, why don't tobacco companies sponsor Nazi style rallies instead of snooker tournaments? And so on.

The truth is that it is Mensi and company who are the lackeys of the capitalist system, not the (thoroughly democratic) National Front or even the unquestionably fascist British National Party. No fascists control foundations; no fascists occupy positions of power and influence in Westminster or Whitehall, or Fleet Street for that matter; no fascists control banks or multi-national companies. Ironically, some of the wealthiest men in Britain if not the world are professed socialists, including the late Robert Maxwell. Exactly how sincere are their professed beliefs in socialism remains to be seen, but certainly they own socialist and pro-socialist publications, including national newspapers. Robert Maxwell owned the *Daily Mirror*.

Still on the subject of champagne socialists, Paul Foot, former editor of *Socialist Worker*, is a spawn of the wealthy "Left Feet" family. Many other names could be added to his. (48) But who foots the bill? Often, the very capitalists Mensi and company so obviously despise. And the taxpayer and ratepayer as well, though not nearly so much with the demise of both the Labour government and the GLC.

Mensi and co's yapping on about fascism being the strong arm of the capitalist system is naïve, but his condemnation of a peaceful, non-confrontational anti-fascist demonstration was disgraceful. On October 16, 1993, two "anti-fascist" demonstrations were organised to protest against racially motivated murders in South London. An orderly march organised by the mainly black Anti-Racist Alliance was held in Central London. While in Welling, a much larger turn out under the Anti Nazi League's banner ended in a full scale riot when the marchers tried to storm the headquarters of the British National Party. No prizes for guessing which of these Mensi would have been on. The Anti Nazi League is little more than a front for the violent Socialist Workers Party. We have already seen what this organisation really thinks about violence, as long as it's in a "good" cause.

Also appearing on the AFA documentary was Terry Marsh, who said he had agreed to appear because he felt that a lot of people would find it easier to identify with him than with an intellectual. He does himself a disservice. For the benefit of non-fight fans, former marine and fireman Marsh was not only one of the greatest boxers this country has ever produced, but is one of the very few world champions ever to have retired without losing a single professional fight. He is still young, but although highly intelligent and charismatic, he has never had the appeal of Barry McGuigan, say, or the much vaunted but limited Frank Bruno. Marsh pointed out correctly that unemployment is an economic rather than a racial problem, but said also that a lot of the youth can't see they're being used. Only the youth, Terry?

The well-spoken, articulate Marsh is the last man one would imagine resorting to violence outside of the square ring. He is being exploited for the obvious reason that he is a white man in a sport which is by and large dominated by blacks. But although one should welcome his obviously sincere condemnation of racial hatred - and indeed of

fascism - surely he must realise there are better ways to combat both than by allowing himself to be exploited by a group of thugs and bully boys like AFA?

All the other stock claims are made about fascists: if they're allowed to spread their ideology, then violence and hatred will result. One could retort that if homosexuals are allowed to spread their poison, AIDS will result. Ironically, not only is the organised homosexual movement in the vanguard of the anti-fascist movement, but the advent of AIDS has been exploited by these human dung beetles to raise awareness of their "problems", to demand more and more special privileges and to attract more public funding - your money - to promote their poison. (49) It is a safe bet that the average black or Moslem would rather his son be attacked by a skinhead thug than embrace this perverted "culture".

Another group who are given a platform on the grounds that not talking to them encourages them to commit violent acts - including murder - is the IRA. Strange isn't it that there is one rule for the BNP and another for the world's most lethal killing machine? Fascism is based on force and fear; to ignore fascists only encourages them, we are told. No one said they had to be ignored, except by the media, of course. As well as traduced in a thousand different ways.

At the end of the programme, Mensi's mask slips completely as he espouses his philosophy in its entirety: "At times of economic chaos, strife, trouble, the fascists rear their ugly heads pretending to be the new radical opposition when in fact they are the mercenaries of the rich, hired by the rich, to maintain *their* social order. If only we as a class could realise that it's pointless fighting between black and white, Protestant, Catholic, Jew, Arab, and that our interests lie in standing together. It's no good fighting for the crumbs that fall off the rich man's table. The smaller the crumb, the more violent the fight."

We have already disposed of the nonsense of fascists being mercenaries of the rich: the fact that Paul Foot works in Fleet Street while John Tyndall would never even be granted a press card should dispose of that fantasy. (50) Mensi is of course espousing the rhetoric of the class struggle, in particular the Trotskyite version. Trotsky is often denounced by the far right on account of his ethnic origins, but there is a perfectly valid reason to denounce this enemy of humanity. It was Trotsky who said: "In a country where the sole employer is the State, opposition means death by slow starvation. The old principle: who does not work shall not eat, has been replaced by a new one: who does not obey shall not eat." (51)

Trotsky wrote these words in 1937, towards the end of his life. This was after he had seen the results of the dreadful, inhuman philosophy of which he was a major architect. The usual ploy of Trotskyites is to promote the myth of Stalinism, to claim that the revolution was betrayed, and things would have turned out very different if Trotsky rather than Stalin had succeeded Lenin. Like Mensi, they are living in a dream world. And like Mensi, Trotskyites will tolerate no opposition, their simulated anger and very real violence can be, and often is, turned just as easily against the Tories, the police, and those mythical "bosses" whom they so love to hate. Fascism may be a brutal philosophy, but it is positively benign in comparison to what the communist international have planned for us.

The Myth Of "Racism"

Before we deal with fascism proper, let's clear up a few things about this supposed evil, *racism*. Probably more claptrap and outright dishonesty has been written about this subject than any other in the field of human relations. *Racism*, we are told, is evil. Fine. Only we are never told what *racism* is, except in the broadest of terms. This is a well-known fallacy, that of equivocation. This consists of using a word in a number of different contexts or to mean a number of different things. For example, when we use the word *love*, it can have any number of different meanings depending on who or what we are referring to. The love one feels for one's mother is a very different type of love one feels for one's spouse, which in turn is very different from the love one may feel for one's dog, for one's country, and so on. Similarly, the word *racism* is used to lump together racial bigotry, intolerance, anti-Semitism, Sectarianism, hostility to immigration, hostility to forced integration, a belief in racial superiority (its original meaning), outright racial hatred, and so on.

Ask any politician if he condemns or condones *racism*, and unless he's a right wing headbanger - like the BNP's Richard Edmonds - he'll condemn it, often in the most forthright terms. But ask him what it is he is condemning, and there's the rub. (52) People everywhere are *racist*, and then again they are not. Generally, people prefer the company of their own kind. This applies not only to race but to many other things. Most of us are prefer to spend

THE MENACE OF "ANTI-FASCISM"

our time with our families, people with whom we share an ideology or a hobby, people of our own age group, people who speak the same language or who share the same interests. And people from the same ethnic group.

Of course, this is an extremely broad generalisation. Our grandparents belong to our family but not to our age group, similarly, a fellow chess player or opera buff might come from a different age group or racial background, and so on. Just as you would resent a stranger walking into your house and demanding the "right" to sit at your table, to work in the family business, or to a piece of your pie in many other ways, so too do very many people resent what they consider to be - rightly or wrongly - the invasion of their country by unassimilable aliens. Often they put forward many rationalisations including the argument about unemployment, and foreigners taking their - ie white people's - jobs, (an argument which is not totally without merit, as it happens). Other rationalisations include references to culinary habits, language problems and so on. But at the end of the day, people of all races resent having other races shoved down their throats.

The resentment white people feel is so strong because of the hate campaign that has been waged against all resistance. This includes emotional blackmail, a plethora of specious arguments, and, of course, violence in addition to violation of their right to discriminate against whoever they damn well please on the basis of race or anything else. (53) A pamphlet published by the Socialist Workers Party in 1978 is a classic example of exploiting race in order to further a political agenda. *THE CASE AGAINST IMMIGRATION CONTROLS: SOCIALIST WORKER POCKET PAMPHLET NO. 6* argues exactly that: no immigration controls at all.

Leaving aside any considerations of race, it should be abundantly clear that Britain, an already overcrowded island, cannot take any number of immigrants. How many should we allow in? One million? Ten million? A hundred million? The reality is that the Western (white) nations, and to some extent the Oriental nations (in particular Japan) have far higher standards of living than the non-white world, in particular the black world. Leftist propaganda - which in many cases consists of outright lying - would have us believe that this is because these nations have been exploited by the white nations in the past under "Imperialism", and that their wealth has been "sucked out" of them, somehow. In reality, if it were not for Imperialism - and capitalism - most of these countries would still be living in the Stone Age - as indeed they are wherever Imperialism has not yet reared its ugly head. But even if these absurd arguments were true, there is no earthly reason why white people - or anyone else - should be expected to pay reparations in perpetuity for the sins of their ancestors.

The Socialist Workers Party pamphlet argues that all immigration controls are *racist* - *racialist* was the preferred word at the time. Furthermore, in 1976-77 the population of England and Wales *fell* by 23,000. This was the third fall in a row, and is due not to emigration but to the decline in the indigenous birth rate. In other words, white people are not breeding fast enough. We are told also that more people *left* the UK in the same years than entered it, obviously overwhelmingly of native stock.

This simple, indeed irrefutable, fact, that white people are not breeding fast enough to replace those dying, is itself a plain refutation of the nonsense of universal white *racism* espoused by the far left. In short, the policies which are being pursued relentlessly throughout the Western world are leading to the extermination of the white race. In 1947, a US Senator said that in only nine generations the white race in America would be extinct. (54) A contemporary prediction for Scandinavia was even more pessimistic. Scandinavia is, of course, the home of the Nordic race, (and the blond-haired, blue-eyed brutes of the mythical Nazi race hate myth). In 1987, one anti-abortion campaigner wrote that "It has been estimated that unless the women in Sweden have a higher birth rate soon, there will be no more Swedes after four generations." (55)

Of course, the hatemongers of AFA, and certainly the Jewish hatemongers of the Searchlight Organisation (and their fellow travellers, Jew and Gentile), couldn't give a monkey's about the extinction of the white race. Indeed, their principal concern is that this (inevitable?) extinction is not happening fast enough. Hence the obsession with promoting miscegenation, uncontrolled immigration etc. But one group which certainly does take exception to its being phased out is the noisy, vociferous, organised homosexual movement. In 1993, the Chief Rabbi Emeritus, Lord Immanuel Jakobowits, said that he favoured genetic engineering to phase out the poison of homosexuality from society. (56) This resulted in hysterical attacks on Britain's most distinguished Talmudic scholar. (57) A London synagogue was picketed, and there were calls for him to be hounded throughout academia. (58) It is ironic that a world in which men don't importune for immoral purposes in public toilets, engage in anonymous sex in bathhouses or eat excrement, is considered an abomination while a world without white people is considered a good thing.

An important footnote here is that there are some people on the far left who believe that it is not (only) the white race but all mankind that is being systematically wiped out. The American-based Lyndon Larouche Organisation believes that the United Nations is planning to reduce the world's population by a programme of genocide - enforced birth control and less humane methods. The main targets for this programme are of course the world's

non-white people, in particular the black and brown. One need not subscribe to the Schiller Institute's esoteric theories of the Anti-Defamation League being agents of British Imperialism, or the British planning to reconquer the United States by flooding it with hard drugs! But their arguments concerning the perfidy of the UN require careful consideration. One need not subscribe to any manner of conspiracy theory to appreciate the fact that socialism, whether it be of the Mensi type or of the UN type (global collectivist) or indeed of the big business type (corporate) is primarily about people control. Controlling (or destroying) the race of the people or simply controlling their fecundity, amounts to the same thing in broad terms, systematic genocide.

Returning to the SWP pamphlet, on page 7, the claim is made that without black workers the National Health Service would collapse. We have already dealt with this specious argument. If these bods really cared about blacks they would argue precisely for such workers to be repatriated to the West Indies or wherever because these countries don't have a national health service, and such obviously skilled people of native stock would be more than welcome there. The pamphlet goes on to liken Margaret Thatcher to the Nazis simply because she once said something less than unflattering about the National Front. This is rather ironic because Thatcher was often referred to as "the Finchley Jew" during her tenure as Prime Minister. (59)

The SWP pamphlet then argues that immigration controls are *THE ROAD TO DACHAU*. Not repatriation, simply immigration controls. "Immigration control is fundamentally undemocratic" it argues. The idea that the Socialist Workers Party is any sort of defender of democracy is too ludicrous for words.

This is the sort of nonsense, claptrap and emotional blackmail which really gets up white people's noses. They don't like to be called Nazis simply because they oppose forced race-mixing, or even simply immigration controls. Especially when the British people fought the alleged tyranny of the Nazis in order to retain their national sovereignty, and, one supposes, some vestige of national (and racial) identity.

Opposition to forced race-mixing, then, has little or nothing to do with fascism, or even with opposition to racial hatred. And that regardless of how racial issues are used - or exploited - by the BNP and its fellow travellers. The hysteria over *racism* must be ended, and the subjects of race-mixing, immigration, and even that of repatriation, must be discussed openly and honestly. (60)

Why Fascism Is Really Hated

The main subject of this short study is fascism/anti-fascism rather than the nonsense of *racism*, so we will not dwell any further on the issue of race. Let us though explain why fascism is really hated. Notwithstanding that some of its allegedly avowed enemies do not understand what fascism really is - Gerry Gable for instance, as demonstrated - and bearing in mind that this is a subject that is as broad as it is long, I would suggest that there are three reasons why this is so.

- 1) Fascism is not the antithesis of communism/socialism/violent anti-fascism, but a rival movement.
- 2) Communism/socialism/violent anti-fascism is not opposed to the ends of monopoly capitalism, only to the means.
- 3) Fascists may have the wrong answers, but, unlike the communists/socialists/violent anti-fascists, they at least ask some of the right questions.

Fascism/Socialism: Siamese Twins

"The great ideological conflict of our age must not be confused with the mutual rivalries among the various totalitarian movements." - Ludwig von Mises (61)

Socialists today are apt to dismiss with laughter the claim that they have anything at all in common with the hated fascists. Fascists are, after all, the epitome of evil, while they are for the workers. Obviously they need a history lesson. We have already seen that in the first instance, fascism was in no way anti-Semitic, and that a number of

THE MENACE OF "ANTI-FASCISM"

Jews were prominent in the fascist government of Benito Mussolini. What is even less well known is that in the early days, socialism was every bit as *racist* as is fascism today. It was also intensely *homophobic*, and not a little anti-Semitic.

The anti-Semitism of Jewish-born Karl Marx is well-documented. (62) Less well known is the fact that it was the South African Communist Party rather than the Nazi Party which coined the slogan: "Workers of the World Unite, and fight for a White South Africa." (63) Another well-documented fact is that not only did the fiercest opposition to Nazism in Germany come from the communists, but after the Nazis took power, many of these very "anti-Nazis" switched their allegiance and became ardent Nazis. (Those who didn't end up in concentration camps). And after the war, when the game was up, they slipped quietly away and became communists again.

Finally, let us return to the *gay* issue. In Weimar Germany, homosexuality was regarded as a "fascist perversion". (64) While: "As early as the 1920s leaders of Western Communist parties began to float the idea that...homosexual activity...resulted from the *decadence* of capitalism in its death throes. Homosexuality was to disappear in the healthy new society of the future." (65) Whether or not the about face of the extreme left was the result of pragmatism, some perverted application of the dialectic or whatever, is beside the point. The point is that no dissidence at all is permitted. If the party line is that homosexuality is a perversion, then off go the queers to the concentration camps. While if it is flavour of the month, then it's compulsory *gay* lessons for the under twelves and rigorous persecution of *homophobes*.

Similarly with race, under socialism, whatever the ruling clique decides, goes. The classic proof of this is the schism in the misnamed "anti-racist" movement where such dedicated supporters of Adolf Hitler as "Red" Ken Livingstone and Trotskyite Vanessa Redgrave have been denounced as "anti-Semitic" for denouncing Zionist atrocities and the Zionist-inspired hate campaign against the PLO. In return, anti-Zionist "anti-racists" have denounced Zionists and their lap-dogs as fascists and *racists*, which culminated in the November 1975 declaration of the United Nations that Zionism = *racism*. If either of these two lunatic factions had total control of a socialist Britain, or (Heaven forbid!) the entire world, they would each ruthlessly suppress and purge the other.

Anyone who can see a ha'porth of difference between this sort of repression and the type the comrades of the extreme left denounce so vehemently when it emanates from the BNP et al has missed the point. If a jackboot is stamping on your face it matters not one whit if the foot inside it belongs to an *Aryan*, a Jew, a black, a "fascist" or a "red".

The second point I made is that collectivism (in all its myriad forms) is not opposed to the ends of monopoly capitalism, only the means. We have demonstrated adequately I think that, whatever claptrap they may espouse about *racism*, the policies of the far left on race are those of international capital: the end of nation states and races. It is not necessary to accept any version of the conspiracy theory of history to realise that everywhere power is being progressively centralised, and that the driving force behind this is capital.

Socialism, particularly the Trotskyite brand, wants "world revolution". Under socialism, the "workers" will control everything. for workers, read state. Many multi-national corporations now have gross national product which exceeds those of some nation states. They too want centralised planning, most of all do the bankers, who have managed to operate on a business as usual basis whatever conflicts their host nations may be embroiled in. (66)

The third point is, I would submit, the real reason why "fascism" is hated most of all. Fascists may have the wrong answers but at least they ask the right questions. One of those questions is where does money come from? The answer is, of course, that it is created *ex nihilo*. Fascists make much of this. Some of them, misguidedly, blame the Jews for controlling capitalism. This isn't an outright lie but a truth that has been torn out of context. Jews were certainly heavily involved in the development of capitalism a fact testified to by a plethora of Jewish names in the wholesale and retail trades, and banking. (67) But they were far from the only ones, and they had no monopoly on usury. (68)

Money (credit) is the lifeblood of the nation. Any nation. If the flow of credit ceases, the economy grinds to a halt. Bankers have long realised this, so too have rulers. The leaders of the United States fought a running battle with the bankers from the earliest times. The creation of money, not only out of nothing but as an interest-bearing debt, is surely the greatest con trick of all time. One person who realised this was Hitler. It was at a meeting of the German Labour Party that Hitler was first introduced to the Social Credit (69) theories of Gottfried Feder. (70) It was Feder who wrote the programme of the Nazi Party. (71)

The Nazi financial policy included "Relief of the State, and hence of the nation, from its indebtedness to the great financial houses which lend on interest." and "Provision of money for all great public objects (waterpower, railroads, etc.), not by means of loans, but by granting non-interest bearing State bonds or without using ready money." (72) The Nazis paid great attention to breaking "the thralldom of interest".

THE MENACE OF "ANTI-FASCISM"

When the Nazis took power, Organised Jewry under the leadership of the American lawyer Samuel Untermyer, mounted a massive International Jewish Boycott, which sought to overthrow Nazism. It should be noted that this boycott was instituted before the Nazis had time to put their anti-Jewish policies into practice, or before they were even properly formulated. In 1938, after the Nazis had been in power for five years, an article published in the *London Jewish Chronicle* was scornful of Nazi financial policy. (73) The *Jewish Chronicle* is well known not just for its whining and wailing but for its self-serving propaganda, (74) but the same message comes from a far less untrustworthy source. German historian Joachim Fest wrote in his biography of the Führer that he dismissed the great idea of Feder's life "breaking the bondage of interest" as one of a group of "officially approved fantasies." (75)

Whether or not Hitler did introduce a form of Social Credit, or financed the German state by a modified form of orthodox finance, the German economic miracle was real enough while it lasted.

To get round the boycott which International Jewry boasted was crippling Germany, (76) Hitler bartered goods with other nations. (77) So much for the Jews not controlling the banks! A.K. Chesterton commented in his conspiracy classic that "When Hitler rebelled against the Money Power there arose an urgent necessity to smash him and his barter system." (78) Conspiracy or not, Jewish or otherwise, they certainly did try to smash both Hitler and his system of government. And finance. Chesterton claims further that "Had Hitler continued to develop Germany on an autarchical basis, bartering surplus production for needed imports, he might conceivably have conferred on mankind the greatest gift since Prometheus stole the fire from Heaven." (79)

We all know what happened next of course. Even after the Nuremberg Laws, Organised Jewry, which had been trying desperately to smash Hitler by fair means or foul, was unable to mobilise sufficient force to crush him. The bloodiest fratricidal war in history was still well within living memory, a war in which 12,000 Jews had died for Germany, (80) incidentally, as even Hitler recognised. (81) But when Hitler made the fatal mistake of invading Poland, other forces, more powerful even than Organised Jewry, used the pretext to put an end, not to Hitler's tyranny, but to his tampering with the sacred cow of finance.

Some fascists, and of course hard core anti-Semites, continue to put the blame for World War Two on "the Jews". As I hope I have demonstrated, this is not so much a lie as a crass oversimplification, and we can look to an anti-fascist for the real solution to this problem. Writing in *The Menace Of Fascism*, Ted Grant says: "It makes little difference to the system whether the capitalists are Jews or Gentiles. Both are subject to the laws of capitalist economy and act accordingly." (82)

This is indeed true. Even if all the banks were owned by Jews, the problem would not be a Jewish problem. Probably most if not all the banks in Israel are owned by Jews, yet those poor bastards suffer even more than we do, as anyone who has made the slightest study of that strife torn country will realise. (83) And Jews, however Machiavellian they may be, don't control every bank throughout the entire world. (84)

Returning to anti-fascist Ted Grant, he has hit the problem bang on the head, but what does he advocate? What do all socialists advocate? The answer is of course the class war, ganging up on "the bosses". When it comes to the evils of usury, the only thing they suggest is nationalising the banks. In other words, transferring the private monopoly on the creation of credit to the state. No thanks!

Pick up a copy of *Socialist Worker*, *Militant* or any other "radical" publication, and they have nothing at all to say about usury. Except that sometimes the more "educated" among the socialists will attempt to trace the movement for financial reform to the *Protocols of Zion*. Their line of argument is that anyone who argues against usury believes this is a Jewish practice, that the Jews control the banks, and that the subject is not worth discussing. Of course it isn't, because in a world which was liberated from the shackles of debt-created credit, no one but no one would have any time at all for the class struggle. (85) Or for the fanatical class hatred that goes with it.

This then is the reason, the real reason, fascists are hated so much. This hatred, which at times borders on the hysterical, is totally irrational. Were it to come simply from Jews and others who have suffered under fascism, yes, it would be understandable. But when communists (including Stalinists!) rail at its evils, this really is too much. It has been suggested in certain "nationalist" quarters that the reason certain elements of the far left are subjected to occasional purges is because they have got too near the truth; the Militant Tendency in particular was said to have once looked at the subject of meaningful financial reform. And look what happened to them. (86)

How To Oppose Fascism

"Twelve voices were shouting in anger, and they were all alike. No question, now, what had happened to the faces of the pigs. The creatures outside looked from pig to man, and from man to pig, and from pig to man again; but already it was impossible to say which was which." George Orwell, *Animal Farm*. (87)

We have, I think, demonstrated that, however bad, sick, evil, or disastrous for civilisation is fascism, the cure, "anti-fascism", is far, far worse than the disease. Any philosophy which advocates and perpetuates no platform, no debate and smashing its enemies with the utmost brutality must be opposed totally, at both an ideological level and with the full force of the law.

In case the reader is still not convinced that Mensi and company's brand of anti-fascism is a menace, if, dear reader, you think that perhaps they were posing for the camera, putting on a show for the public, here is a sample from their journal, *Fighting Talk*. Issue 7 (undated but published cMarch 1994), restates their policy in no uncertain terms: "Militant anti-fascism has a single goal - to forcefully disrupt the fascists from going about their business. Our aim is to prevent them from selling their papers, distributing their leaflets, putting up their stickers and posters. Our intention is to make it impossible for them to stand candidates in elections, and where they do manage to stand, to disrupt their campaigns at every stage. Ultimately, our aim is to crush them completely, to wipe them off the face of the earth...We have never made any bones about it: to fight the fascists ideologically, you have to fight them physically....A purely legal anti-fascism is no anti-fascism at all."

The previous year, a glowing review of Jewish thug Morris Beckman's *The 43 Group* (already alluded to), condoned the extreme violence of this virtual terrorist organisation: "...the 43 Group, dedicated to physically opposing and disrupting the fascists wherever they showed their face." [sic] They "had a simple philosophy: they sought to violently disrupt the fascists by any means necessary. They saw that the fascists were hiding behind the veil of legality, and so the 43 Group did not hesitate to break the law whenever they needed to." (88)

Note those last two phrases: "hiding behind the veil of legality" and "did not hesitate to break the law whenever they needed to." Try using them in this context. I desperately needed a few drinks, so when this old lady walked by minding her own business, hiding behind the veil of legality, I snatched her handbag. She cried out, so I did not hesitate to do what needed to be done; I hit her over the head and ran off to the nearest pub.

It is truly amazing that even a group as fascistic as AFA could fail to see the poison they are both preaching and practising. Virtually any one of us can justify breaking the law every day. Of course, while the likes of AFA grass roots members - including the otherwise well-meaning Terry Marsh - don't realise this, their Machiavellian, (and often powerful manipulators) do. Simulated "public outrage" and threats of serious public disorder are then used to "justify" the suppression of "fascism" - both the ideology and the groups who preach it. Just who is kidding whom?

We have seen then that this is no way to oppose fascism. If fascism is the servant of finance capital, and we have demonstrated clearly that it isn't, but if it is, if fascism is the instrument of, or the result of, big government, then the way to oppose fascism, indeed, the only way, is to oppose big government itself. The idea that the state can ban fascism is an absurdity. *Only a fascist state can ban fascism*. And of course, once it started banning political opponents, it wouldn't stop. (89)

It was George Washington who said that government, like fire, is a dangerous servant and a fearful master. (90) The history of the struggle for freedom has been the restraint of government by law. Our forefathers suffered mightily to restrain the power of monarchs, of despots, of tyrants. Many paid with their lives. Now we are told that we should destroy all these precious freedoms simply because a bunch of pillocks in a backwater of Sussex think the Jews are plotting to take over the world and churn out endless updates of the *Protocols of Zion*. Or because some glue-sniffing skinhead called Mr Patel in his corner shop a "Paki bastard" and maybe kicked his shutters in. Or because another skinhead, or a group of them, attacked a black youth in South London and knifed him to death.

If I may be permitted to draw a parallel, in November 1993, two young boys were convicted of the murder of a two year old boy in Liverpool. The previous February, young James Bulger was butchered in a most brutal and shocking fashion. In another, recent murder case, a girl was tortured to death. Part of the blame for these murders was placed, unbelievably, on *video nasties*, and a campaign to ban them was launched. This was hardly the first such campaign and will certainly not be the last. On another occasion, the MP Clare Short, herself a professed "anti-fascist", (91) launched a campaign to purge topless models from tabloid newspapers. This is another hardy

perennial of the far left, more particularly of the "feminist" movement. Well, Miss Short, and Mrs Mary Whitehouse, here is a message from all Libertarians, and doubtless from all male readers of the *Sun*: (92) Fuck you!

Yes, some deranged male might look at a photograph of a topless woman over his breakfast and be incited to go out and rape a schoolgirl. Similarly, someone might read the *Protocols of Zion* and go out and start a pogrom. It has happened. Someone else might read a novel which implores all good white "patriots" to free their country from the niggers and the Jews, and, taking that literally, go out and kill a few blacks. (93) There are some people who claim that reading hate propaganda never leads anyone to commit criminal acts. Of course it does. Sometimes. Just as an advertisement for a car or a brand of soap powder sometimes leads people to make purchases. If people ignored all propaganda there would be no point in advertising; there would in fact be no point in civilisation, or no civilisation at all, because it is only by the interchange of ideas - including propaganda - that we communicate. But once you start banning "hate propaganda", where do you stop?

If fascism stands for repression, then anti-fascism must stand for freedom. The only way to fight fascism is by the propagation of freedom. This means, among other things, free markets. In a word, capitalism, the institution Mensi and his friends at AFA profess to hate the most. It also means an end to repressive "anti-hate" legislation. Of course, such legislation is directed only at racial hatred - real and imagined - not quite what the *racist* state would be expected to do. But what if the state were to outlaw class hatred, making it a criminal offence to use words "in a manner that would be likely to incite class hatred"? The precedent has long been set.

If Mensi and his friends really want to oppose fascism, *racism* - whatever is meant by that nebulous word - and that most heinous of evils, anti-Semitism, they might like to consider doing a little genuine educational work. With regard to *racism* for example they might like to explain to the gullible *goyim* how it follows that because the Germans ill-treated the Jews in the Second World War, that the root of all evil is *Aryan*, and wouldn't it be a splendid idea if the *Aryan goyim* were bred out by a combination of birth control and miscegenation.

With regard to anti-Semitism, they might like to explain the history of the *Protocols of Zion* and the bizarre theology that goes with it. How King Solomon sat down with the sages of Zion in 929BC and how they plotted together to carve up the world. How the symbolic snake of Judaism entered Greece in 429BC, the Rome of Augustus in 69BC, Madrid in 1552, Berlin in 1871 and St. Petersburg 10 years later. They might explain how the original of the *Protocols* (which was presumably written in Hebrew) has never been found, how its purveyors told several contradictory stories about how it fell into their hands, and how it contains fatal internal inconsistencies. (94)

On the much beloved subject of the Jewish control and manipulation of the economy, they might like to explain how the Jewish conspiracy compels 12 million people a week to shop at the Jewish-owned store Marks & Spencer. (95) Anti-Semites and their fellow travellers (96) never cease to whisper (and whine) about this, yet the full extent of Jewish ownership - real and imagined - is extremely well documented. In 1948, Ted Grant, whom we have already met, published a brief survey of Jews in the British economy. One of his conclusions was that Vickers and the great armaments concerns contained no Jewish capital. (97) But aren't wars the Jews' harvest? (98)

Anti-fascists never but never do this, (99) because they are not interested either in fighting fascism or dispelling anti-Semitic myths. What they are interested in is perpetuating their own brand of fascism, their own brand of racial hatred, making a living - or even a vocation - out of Jewish paranoia, xenophobia and the genuine fears of both white people and the immigrants and ethnic minorities they claim to support. But, most of all, they are interested in the promotion of socialism, the abolition of the private ownership of the means of production, and placing it under state control. (100) In such a world, we would all exist, not as free - or as now, relatively free - men and women, but for the state. And, as Ayn Rand said: "Whoever tells you that you should exist for the collective, for the State - is, or wants to be, the State." (101) Et tu, Mensi!



Above: This sticker is published by the "anti-fascist" thugs Red Action. In December 1993, Liam Heffernan was gaoled for 23 years for his part in an IRA bombing campaign; he was both a member of Red Action and an active "anti-racist", a state of affairs nobody on the anti-fascist left finds the slightest bit paradoxical. The perverted logic of such "anti-fascism" is that it's an unforgivable crime to call Mr Patel a Paki bastard and tell him to go back to his own country, but okay to blow him to smithereens if he works in the City of London. And, while it's simply unmentionable to paint a swastika on his synagogue wall, if you shoot Mr Cohen's soldier son on the streets of Northern Ireland, that's another nail in the coffin of British Imperialism.

Notes And References

- (1) From *THE PENGUIN COMPLETE NOVELS OF GEORGE ORWELL*, pages 33-4, published 1983.
- (2) For the record, the current writer always spells fascism with a small 'f', and communism with a small 'c'.
- (3) Nazism is not the same as fascism, but for the purpose of argument we will assume that it is. It is near enough, and the anti-fascist epithet is inevitably applied to Nazis, so it is pointless to nit pick.
- (4) *THE PROTOCOLS AND WORLD REVOLUTION INCLUDING A TRANSLATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE "PROTOCOLS OF THE MEETINGS OF THE ZIONIST MEN OF WISDOM"*, published by Small, Maynard, (1920). This version was edited by the former Tsarist and later Nazi agent, Boris Brasol. On page 144 the following quote is attributed to Rabbi Wise: "The conspiracy, if there is one, is among those of Jewish birth who are or seem ashamed of their origin. They follow false gods or none at all, and among them will be those who may seize power for their own ends." [Citing an article from the *New York Tribune*, March 2, 1920. *JEWISH PLOT ONLY AMONG APOSTATES, SAYS DR. WISE*. This address was made March 1, 1920 at Carnegie Hall.]
- (5) *Universal Jewish Encyclopedia*, Vol 8, pages 68-9, (1942).
- (6) The British Fascisti was founded in May 1923 by Miss Rotha L. Lintorn-Orman, the 26 year old daughter of a major and grand-daughter of a field marshal. The name was later Anglicised. [*POLITICAL VIOLENCE & PUBLIC ORDER: A Study of British Fascism*, by Robert Benewick, published by Allen Lane The Penguin Press, London, (1969), page 27.]
- (7) On page 14 of *THE BRITISH POLITICAL FRINGE: A Profile*, by George Thayer, published by Anthony Blond, London, (1965).
- (8) On page 256 of the book *Neo-Fascism in Europe*, Edited by Luciano Cheles, Ronnie Ferguson and Michalina Vaughan, published by Longman, London and New York, (1991).
- (9) There is also Red Action, a group of pro-IRA thugs who have an overlapping membership with AFA. This group is not so much militant as criminal; it specialises in hammer and iron bar attacks on fascists and fellow travellers.
- (10) According to the *Radio Times*, *Fighting Talk* was broadcast on May 18, 1992.
- (11) According to an album review in *Melody Maker*, (October 9, 1993, page 40), Thomas "Mensi" Mensforth, the leader of Oi!/punk band *Angelic Upstarts*, is a "bright and articulate hard-left Scargillite". The band were said to have played benefits for the Anti Nazi League, which, presumably, they dumped as being too soft when AFA came along. According to the blurb on one of their album covers, the band was formed in 1977. They played songs with titles like *Who Killed Liddle Towers?*
- (12) It seems to be largely forgotten today that the Nazis fought with the non-Aryan Japanese against the Aryan British and the largely Aryan Americans. It was the Allies, not the Nazis, who at were at this time churning out hate propaganda portraying the Japanese as slant-eyed, sub-human anthropoids. An enlightening little book the interested reader might consider in this connection is *THE TESTAMENT OF ADOLF HITLER The Hitler-Bormann Documents February-April 1945*, Edited by François Genoud, Translated from the German by Colonel R.H. Stevens, Introduction by H.R. Trevor-Roper, published by Icon Books, London, (1962). This includes a number of Hitler's less well-known pronouncements on race, including his praising of the Chinese for building a great civilisation, and his condemnation of colonialism.
- (13) Page 24. Gable was taking a swipe here at black journalist and Anti-Racist Alliance member Marc Wadsworth. Wadsworth's "crime" was to join in a discussion with Patrick Harrington of the Third Way. Harrington hardly qualifies as a nationalist, much less a Nazi.
- (14) All quotations from *Mein Kampf* are taken from the James Murphy translation, which is the only one approved by the author. This is a modern, (uncredited) printing of the April 1942 edition, (*UNEXPURGATED...TWO VOLUMES IN ONE...90TH THOUSAND*), Translated and annotated by James Murphy.
- (15) Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, pages 130 and 126 respectively, (ibid).
- (16) Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, page 39, (ibid).
- (17) We have already alluded briefly to one such journal, *Plain English*. This was a weekly literary journal with a circulation of about 3,000, edited by, and indeed, a vehicle for, Lord Alfred Douglas, whose main claim to fame up until then had been to write a love poem to Oscar Wilde. Initially, the journal was patronised by respectable advertisers, but as His Lordship's anti-Semitism became more and more pronounced, the hidden hand went to work and the advertising revenue dried up. Douglas persistently accused Winston Churchill of being in the pay

of a Jewish syndicate, for whose benefit he had issued a false communique on the Battle of Jutland. Eventually he was jailed for criminal libel.

(18) Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, page 270, (ibid).

(19) Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, page 271, (ibid).

(20) The police think otherwise, as, however much *Searchlight* rails at Combat 18 and the British National Party, they continue to take no action.

(21) Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, page 273, (ibid).

(22) From page 151 of *The 43 Group: the untold story of their fight against fascism*, by Morris Beckman, published by Centerprise Publications, London, (1992), Foreword by Vidal Sassoon.

(23) By the end of April 1946, the 43 Group had over 300 members, including "a sprinkling of gentile ex-servicemen", Beckman, *The 43 Group*, page 26, (ibid).

(24) The usual approach is to take official figures and multiply by a factor of twenty or more. As there are fairly few racially motivated assaults, the tactic most often used is to list "racial incidents". A "racial incident" can be almost anything, including glaring at a Pakistani shopkeeper when one has been overcharged.

(25) A good example is a magazine produced by the so-called Commission for Racial Equality, *RACE THROUGH THE 90s*, (revised 1993). On page 21 it is claimed that in 1990, 6,459 "racial attacks" were reported to the police in England and Wales, but, that 96% of incidents went unreported. Note the sleight of hand, the report begins by talking about racial attacks and ends with racial incidents. This would leave one to believe that the total of 6,459 should really have been 161,475! Take the official figures and multiply by twenty-five. These figures are pure propaganda, and pure garbage.

(26) The inquest recorded an open verdict. *The Times*, November 21, 1983, page 2, reported that a new report was sent to the Director of Public Prosecutions. The same article claimed that several people had not told the truth about the fire; the prime suspect was a black man who had been at the party.

(27) Page 15, *PUPPETMASTERS: The political use of terrorism in Italy*, by Philip Willan, published by Constable, London, (1991).

(28) 1991 census, figures taken from *Whitaker's Almanack, 1994*, (Standard Edition), page 118.

(29) *Socialist Worker*, October 30, 1993, page 5.

(30) Ibid.

(31) According to page 28 of *AT WAR WITH THE TRUTH: THE TRUE STORY OF SEARCHLIGHT AGENT TIM HEPPLE*, by Larry O'Hara, Produced by Mina Enterprises, Camberley, Surrey, (1993).

(32) This is generally agreed upon by mainstream historians.

(33) *THE CLUB: The Jews of modern Britain*, by Stephen Brook, published by Constable, London, (1989), page 213.

(34) This actually led to race riots in the 1950s, only in this instance the violence was largely white on black. The far left put this down to racism of course. Thus, when whites riot, it's racism and when blacks (and other non-whites) riot, it's racism. Whitey is always the villain.

(35) See for example, *No Colour Bar for Britain*, by Philip Bolsover, published by the Communist Party of Great Britain, (1955), page 11. (This was a twelve page pamphlet).

(36) Bolsover, *No Colour Bar for Britain*, page 10, (ibid).

(37) At this time, mostly blacks.

(38) This quote is both well known and widely quoted, though poorly understood by militant anti-fascists. According to playwright, (and upper class communist and Searchlight shareholder) David Edgar in his anti-National Front play *Destiny*, Hitler spoke these words at Nuremberg in September 1933.

(39) This is an important point. A reading of the *Jewish Chronicle* for the Nazi era explodes the myth that the Nazi government could do and did do exactly what it wanted and that the Jews could be mistreated, persecuted or even murdered as though they were veritable outlaws. For example: August 18, 1933, page 18, reported that a Labour Court in Berlin had upheld a complaint by an employee of a Pharmaceutical Institute who was dismissed simply for being of Jewish origin. February 9, 1934, page 14, reported that a National Socialist in Bavaria was fined 25 Marks for sending a Jewish lawyer an official communication addressed "To the Jew lawyer..." February 23, 1934, page 12, reported that two nineteen year old artisans were jailed, each for a month, for demanding money with menaces from a Jewish merchant. August 10, 1934, page 12, reported that a Hamburg court had ruled that a Jewish pauper was entitled to free legal defence, (which begs the question why he was a pauper). November 16, 1934, page 19, reported that a Nazi stormtrooper who attacked two Jews for no reason was jailed for six months, and also that a Jewish firm had sued an Aryan firm and was awarded damages. And so on. In other words, Jews

THE MENACE OF "ANTI-FASCISM"

in Nazi Germany enjoyed the protection of the law, though of course, one would rather have been an *Aryan* in Nazi Germany than a Jew.

(40) See for example the *Jewish Chronicle*, September 8, 1939, page 7. Here, Weizmann is said to have declared that the Jews stood by Great Britain and would fight on the side of the democracies.

(41) Hitler actually wanted peace: a piece of Poland, a piece of Czechoslovakia, a piece of Rumania... There can be no doubt that he wanted a local war, and Polish territory, but the last thing he wanted was war with Britain, and it is a documented fact that he made repeated appeals to the British to stop this fratricidal madness.

(42) According to Robert Skidelsky's excellent biography, *Oswald Mosley* [Third edition published by Papermac, London, (1990)], the British Union of Fascists was formally launched October 1, 1932, (page 293); Jews were excluded from the London membership in February 1934, and in April this was extended in to the provinces, (page 385).

(43) *Jewish Chronicle*, May 12, 1933, page 35.

(44) *Jewish Chronicle*, September 29, 1933, page 16. The Imperial Fascist League was a rival movement run by the fanatically anti-Semitic Arnold Leese. Leese subsequently quoted Herman's letter in a leaflet as proof that Mosley was an agent of the Jews.

(45) *Comrade* is the newsletter of the Friends of Oswald Mosley. One of the Special Branch reports cited: Public Record Office file MEPOL 2/3043 reads in part as follows: "Organised for 'attacking Fascism in its strongholds and sweeping it off the streets of London', it was 'doubtful whether' the Jewish-Communist Ex-Serviceman's Movement had 'more than one-half' who 'were ex-servicemen.'"

"Other bodies set up to oppose the Blackshirts in East London were run by those who were 'only concerned with monetary gain, to be obtained by exploiting more or less wealthy Jews...' All the groups included 'many foreign Jews' who 'are far more anti-police than anti-Fascist.'"

The current writer has himself researched at the Public Record Office and can confirm that other official reports bear this claim out.

(46) *Comrade*, October-November 1986, issue 4, page 2. It is widely and erroneously believed today that this slogan was coined at the Battle of Cable Street.

(47) This particular publication may not have been funded by the Runnymede Trust, but it was certainly written by two of that august body's researchers. Published in 1986, it has a preface by Searchlight shareholder (and upper class communist!) David Edgar.

(48) To be fair, Robert Maxwell was of humble origins; the same cannot be said for Paul Foot.

(49) The Terrence Higgins Trust is ostensibly an AIDS charity but is in reality a thinly disguised homosexual pressure group.

(50) The late David McCalden once applied to join the NUJ but had his membership application rejected. Later he turned up working for the Institute for Historical Review in California.

(51) Page 89, *THE ROAD TO SERFDOM*, by F.A. Hayek, published by Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, (1944).

(52) The point I'm trying to make is that the word *racism* is used so freely that it can mean practically anything from unprovoked attacks on or even murders of non-whites to the slightest manifestation of race-consciousness amongst the *Aryan goyim*, like remarking "I've got nothing against them, but there's no way I'd let my daughter marry one".

(53) A good example is a publican who may refuse to serve any customer without giving a reason. Because of the nature of public houses, the fact that people sometimes often become drunk and sometimes very abusive, etc., this is something that often happens. If the customer happens to be black, should the publican now be compelled to give a reason for refusing to serve him? Perhaps he suspects him to have been selling drugs on the premises. What then?

(54) Senator Theodore G. Bilbo in the PREFACE to his book *TAKE YOUR CHOICE - SEPARATION OR MONGRELIZATION*. This book is actually still in print; the second impression (photo reproduced from the original), was published by Historical Review Press U.S.A., Decatur, Georgia, (1980). Predictably, the same, tiresome minority who forever denounce all race-conscious *Aryans* as bigots and haters also attacked the Senator. The *Jewish Chronicle* for September 7, 1945, page 11, refers to him as an American Streicher!

(55) *TWO MILLION SILENT KILLINGS: THE TRUTH ABOUT ABORTION*, by Dr Margaret White, published by Marshall Pickering, Basingstoke, Hants, (1987), page 108. Dr White by the way is no racist; this excellent anti-abortion polemic was written from a Christian perspective.

THE MENACE OF "ANTI-FASCISM"

- (56) It is customary in Orthodox Judaism for distinguished rabbis to pronounce on everything from modern inventions and innovations, (the television for example is considered *treifeh* - unfit for Jews to watch or even to own), to political events. For example, following the Hebron massacre of February 1994, a group of Ultra-Orthodox, anti-Zionist Jews held a demonstration in Central London against both the massacre and Zionist indoctrination. The current writer was privileged to attend.
- (57) Lord Jakobowits is the author of *Jewish Medical Ethics*.
- (58) See for example *The Pink Paper*, November 12, 1993.
- (59) By the anti-Semitic far right. Margaret Thatcher was Conservative MP for Finchley 1959-92. Finchley has a large Jewish population. Thatcher is also a fervent Zionist, which is hardly likely to have done her career any harm.
- (60) On November 25, 1968, the *Leicester Mercury*, reported that a black man, Mr Joseph Jeffers of Melbourne Road, had put up a poster outside his house reading "THREE CHEERS TO ENOCH POWELL..." The front page story was "Send Us Home - £5,000 Each" - *West Indian*. The article said that most West Indians agreed with him. This and other research that has been conducted into the issue of voluntary repatriation, particularly amongst younger blacks, gives the lie to the claims of the SWP ad nauseum that repatriation is "Nazi".
- (61) From page 13 of *Socialism*, published by Jonathan Cape, (1951).
- (62) See in particular the 1979 study *Karl Marx: Racist*, by the American Jewish academic Nathaniel Weyl.
- (63) The current writer once attended a meeting of (if my memory serves me correctly) the Socialist Workers Party, at which this claim was made. In his 1990 study, *A History of South Africa*, [published by Yale University Press, London, (1990)], Leonard Thompson refers to white miners who, in the 1920s, formed armed commandos under the slogan "Workers of the World Unite, and Fight for a White South Africa." The South African Labour Party certainly preached "White Socialism Only" at this time, indeed, the greatest opposition to forced race-mixing - in the workplace as in society as a whole - has always come from the working classes.
- (64) See the *Encyclopedia of Homosexuality*, Edited by Wayne R. Dynes, published by St James Press, London, (1990), volume 2, page 773.
- (65) Dynes, *Encyclopedia of Homosexuality*, volume 2, page 773, (ibid).
- (66) Charles Higham's *Trading With The Enemy* is one of many books which prove this. The Allies traded with the Nazis throughout World War Two. Nowadays, the ownership of corporations is even more internationally interlocked than was I.G. Farben; millions of dollars can be transferred from one side of the globe to the other at the press of a button.
- (67) The development of international banking in particular owes much to the influence of Jewish families. The Rothschilds are at the centre of most conspiracy theories about modern capitalism, although whatever their ancestry the Rothschild family has long ceased to be Jewish in all but name.
- (68) In his 1990 study, *Literature and Money: Financial Myth and Literary Truth*, Cedric Watts writes: "In Elizabethan England, usury burgeoned; and it was clearly not a matter that could be attributed to Jews, since virtually all of them had been banished from England in 1290." (Page 51).
- (69) This theory was actually developed by Major C.H. Douglas (1879-1952), but there were many people who espoused similar ideas including the entrepreneur and inventor Arthur Kitson. Douglas wrote two books and many pamphlets on Social Credit,
- (70) Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, page 122, (ibid). which he developed to far greater lengths than merely abolishing usury.
- (71) *The Programme of the NSDAP: The National Socialist German Workers' Party and its General Conceptions*, by Gottfried Feder, was first published by Fritz Eher Verlag, Munich, (1932). [English edition published by B.P. Publications, Shotton, Clwyd, Wales, (1980)].
- (72) Feder, *Programme of the NSDAP*, page 30, (ibid).
- (73) *FIVE YEARS OF HITLER...*, by Bernhard Reichenbach, published in the *Jewish Chronicle*, January 14, 1938, page 21.
- (74) One of its constant complaints was that by the dismissal of Jews from positions of influence and the Aryanisation of Jewish business interests, the Nazis were wrecking the economy. Certainly the Nazis appeared to realise that most Jews who held such positions did so on merit. The *Jewish Chronicle* for April 20, 1934 reported that at the start of the year, all the German-Jewish owners of the big steelworks who had been ejected by Hitler were reinstated, as were Jews who had been dismissed from their positions with German banks.
- (75) From page 430 of *Hitler*, by Joachim C. Fest, Translated by Richard and Clara Winston, published by Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London, (1977). By this time, Feder was Secretary of State in the Ministry of Economics.

THE MENACE OF "ANTI-FASCISM"

(76) In the *Jewish Chronicle* for October 27, 1933, a long article entitled *GERMANY THROUGH BARBARISM TO BANKRUPTCY. Heavy Cost of Jewish Persecution...* saw these poor, persecuted, powerless people boast how they were bringing Germany to its knees.

(77) The *Jewish Chronicle* for January 4, 1935, page 9, reported that Germany was bartering goods with South Africa and the United States, two of the countries in which the boycott movement was most successful.

(78) *THE NEW UNHAPPY LORDS: AN EXPOSURE OF POWER POLITICS*, by A.K. Chesterton, published by Candour Publishing, London, (July 1965), pages 208-9.

(79) Chesterton, *Unhappy Lords*, page 23, (ibid).

(80) See in particular pages 130-1 of *THE YELLOW SPOT: the outlawing of half a million human beings...*, uncredited but with an introduction by Herbert Dunelm, Bishop of Durham, published by Victor Gollancz, London (1936).

(81) According to the *Jewish Chronicle*, March 31, 1933, page 20: the Union of Jewish ex-soldiers at the Front issued the following statement: At Wesel, people in Storm Troop uniform tried to prevent customers entering the business house of the firm Leyens and Levenbach. One of the proprietors...put on his uniform and his Iron Cross, and took up his stand at the entrance, among the Storm Troopers and distributed the following leaflet: "Our Chancellor Hitler, and Ministers Frick and Goering, have repeatedly declared that 'anyone who insults a soldier who fought at the Front will be punished by imprisonment.'" The pickets were withdrawn, and the boycott action was called off.

(82) *THE MENACE OF FASCISM: what it is and how to fight it*, by Ted Grant, published by Militant, (1978). This quote is taken from page 75. In his 1980 book *NEVER AGAIN: The hows and whys of stopping fascism*, Socialist Workers Party fellow traveller Colin Sparks, who subscribes to many of Grant's fantasies, claims that Imperialism wants war, (pages 81-2). While on page 90 he comments: "It is only too easy to make the struggle between socialists and fascists appear a simple gang war between two groups of thugs..." Which is exactly what it is.

(83) Israeli Barry Chamish has written a devastating critique of the Promised Land; his book, *The Fall Of Israel* was published by Canongate in 1992.

(84) There are people - not all of them nutters - who believe that all the world's major banks, in particular the Federal Reserve, the Bank of England and the Bank of France, are interlocked and controlled through London by the Rothschild family. I have read such literature myself, including Colonel Archibald Roberts' excellent *The Most Secret Science*, but while his and others' researches present overwhelming evidence both of mendacity and the crying need for financial reform, the evidence they present for total control by the financial oligarchy is far from convincing. Anyone who studies world affairs will realise that the big boys often get it wrong.

(85) Most people don't anyway, which is the main reason that so many socialists concentrate on the equally phony struggle against racism, which they see as a form of class struggle.

(86) This is only anecdotal, but certainly there are people on the broad left who have some inkling about what is really going on. I know that from personal experience.

(87) From pages 92-3 of the Everyman's Library Edition, published by David Campbell, London, (1993).

(88) From page 15 of *Fighting Talk: The magazine of Anti-Fascist Action*, issue 4, undated but cApril 1993.

(89) Nor does it. Racists, "sexists" and even homophobes have been added to the list of fascist fellow travellers. Ironically, the greatest schism is within the violent extremist left itself: the anti-Zionist faction has often voted to deny the pro-Zionist faction a platform on the grounds that Zionism equals racism, while the pro-Zionist ("Jewish") faction has ruthlessly smeared anti-Zionist anti-fascist/"anti-racists" as anti-Semitic.

(90) "Government is not reason;

it is not eloquence;

it is force! Like fire,

it is a dangerous servant

and a fearful master!" From the inside cover of *THE FEARFUL MASTER: A SECOND LOOK AT THE UNITED NATION*, by G. Edward Griffin, published by Western Islands, Belmont, Massachusetts, (1964).

(91) Her entry in the 1994 edition of *Who's Who* lists Clare Short as director of something called All Faiths For One Race from 1976-8. She has been a Labour MP since 1983.

(92) Which does not include me, I hasten to add.

(93) As in William Pierce's sick hate novels *The Turner Diaries* and *Hunter*.

(94) A full appraisal of the nonsense of the *Protocols* would take us far afield, but the 1942 study by the American (Gentile) historian John Shelton Curtiss [*An Appraisal of the PROTOCOLS OF ZION*, published by Columbia University Press, New York] is particularly strong on the nonsense of the *Protocols* and points out for example that in one breath the Jews are said to be deliberately fermenting chaos so as to overthrow the old order while in

the next it is claimed that they already own most of the world's gold and real estate. The latter claim is in any case self-evident nonsense.

(95) This figure was cited by the (Gentile) journalist Stephen Aris in his 1973 study *The Jews in Business*, page 144, [Penguin, Harmondsworth, Middlesex]. If anything it will have grown substantially since then.

It is probably not quite correct to call Marks & Spencer a Jewish store, even though for most of its existence it has been controlled by Jewish families. M&S grew out of the penny bazaar of Jewish immigrant Michael Marks. Although Marks died in his forties, his partnership with Spencer (a *goy*), laid the foundation for one of the most successful of Britain's retailing chains. The company was founded in 1884; a hundred years later, nearly a third of British women were buying their underwear at Marks & Spencer.

(96) I saw fellow travellers because, contrary to Zionist - and Jewish - propaganda, many people who believe the Jews control the banks, the media, the economy or all three couldn't possibly be described as anti-Semitic, but simply people haven't done their homework, (or more likely have been reading the wrong sort of books, like the *Protocols of Zion*!). In most cases they also have an extremely poor understanding of economics, (like most economists!)

(97) Grant, *The Menace Of Fascism*, page 77, (op cit). This pamphlet was actually first published in 1948 and republished thirty years later with a long introduction by Roger Silverman. One can of course argue that Grant is biased - as he certainly is - and even that he is a Jew - as he may well be - but the true extent of Jewish (and other) ownership of wealth in Britain, the United States and doubtless many other countries) has long been documented fairly extensively, and the truth is easily obtained by those who seek it. In Autumn 1993, the British magazine *BusinessAge* [sic] carried a lengthy article on the 500 richest people in Britain. Jews were well-represented, but so were rock musicians.

(98) Another slogan associated with the mystical anti-Semitism of an earlier age.

(99) Having said that, Grant did it. At one time, Organised Jewry also published refutations of anti-Semitic canards; that august body the Board of Deputies of "British" Jews even set up a special committee to undertake this sort of work; one of the first things it published was an excellent analysis of the mystical origins of the *Protocols* by the distinguished anti-Zionist journalist Lucien Wolf, [*The Jewish Bogey*, published in the United States as *The Myth Of The Jewish Menace In World Affairs...*]. However, both the anti-fascist movement and the servants of Imperial Zion have long since abandoned any pretence of quiet reason and have decided to shut up the opposition by, in the case of the latter, whispering, whining, wailing and wire pulling, and in the case of the former, by naked terror.

(100) In the April 30, 1983 issue of *Melody Maker*, Mensi told interviewer Carol Clerk: "So many people now think I'm a Commie because some of my views are slightly Left Wing." And that "We need a true Socialist system; a system that will do things like return free school dinners." Does anyone really believe that socialism is about free school dinners? The previous year (May 8, 1982), "anti-fascist" Mensi reportedly told the same paper that "The Russians are as big a threat as Adolf Hitler was in the Thirties. They're not even proper Communists...some of them are driving about in big limos..." He described *racists* and fascists as "filth...who attempt to corrupt the good name of England."

(101) Quoted from page 395 of *THE PASSION OF AYN RAND*, by Barbara Branden, published by W.H. Allen, London, (1987).

Distributed by InfoText Manuscripts

**Published by Anglo-Hebrew Publishing,
BCM Box 2293,
London WC1N 3XX.**

ISBN 1 898318 86 7