The Idea of a Mass Jewish Conspiracy in anti-Semitism

By Karl Radl

October 22, 2013

http://semiticcontroversies.blogspot.com/2013/10/the-idea-of-mass-jewish-conspiracy-in.html

One thing that has been lacking from anti-Semitism from many years has been a method to the madness; you'll have to forgive the pun on the philo-Semitic interpretation, is a coherent method to both understanding why the jews are a problem and a threat as well as to understand their past activities and predict; with some degree of accuracy, their future actions.

It is perhaps axiomatic of me to mention that in my experience of them: most anti-Semites have very little idea of much to do with jews other than that they know at some level; and in varying degrees, that the jews are their enemy and in some respects an enemy like no other. This holds particularly true when it comes to understanding the jews, because anti-Semites have had a tendency to try and use simple explanations that make sense to them.

In essence then anti-Semites have; since time immemorial, been trying to understanding the jews in terms of what the anti-Semites would have to do in order to get the same result. So when a European anti-Semite sits down and thinks about the jewish question he quite naturally places himself in the jew's shoes and thinks out what he would have to do achieve the same disproportionate dominance, the same apparent tribalism and the same ability to silence opponents by jewish-specific buzzwords and character-assassination.

This leads to an understanding based on a lack of understanding the jews that we can see as an intellectual cop-out of sorts, but one with huge emotional appeal and a not inconsiderable amount of intellectual appeal as well. This is the idea of the jewish conspiracy with the jew thought to be a sort of secular or theological diabolical agent where the jew's activities and final goal are shrouded in mystery, secrecy and can only be conjectured at. The jew is held to be a sinister figure conspiring through the generations against the gentile world writ large and seemingly randomly picking targets, which are then later rationalised by anti-Semites of varying stripes often as being a deliberate attack on their nation for *'doing the right thing'* or *'being a bulwark against their power'* and so forth.

This is why I described it as a *'cop-out'* intellectually, because this way of understanding the jewish question bases itself on the idea that the jewish question is beyond our comprehension in anything other than a general sense. We can't nail down the jewish intentions because they are completely alien to us and therefore we should only look for where they are directing their activities next so as to discern the latest target.

This theory conveniently; as philo-Semites have been quick to pounce on throughout history, exonerates those who are the targets of the jews from any real share in the event and therefore the jew takes all the blame. A similar criticism of theories of this kind; and more particularly the fact that they often claim (implicitly or explicitly) to come from *'beyond recorded history'* in

terms of their historical explanation, was first pointed out by Revilo Oliver in his speech *'Conspiracy or Degeneracy?'* where he challenged the anti-Communists of his day to come up with a well-rounded theory of history with well-anchored intellectual foundations to improve their understanding and arguments as to why Communism was such a threat to both North America and Europe. This challenge wasn't taken up, but Oliver did go some way towards building one himself in an unfinished series of articles in *'American Opinion'*, which began to craft the basis of what I have come to term: *'racial materialism'*.

If we assume that the jew has been randomly targeting civilisations for whatever reason; and no author to my knowledge has convincingly explained why; or even agreed which, civilisations the jews have targeted and why then it lands us in all sorts of trouble. Christian anti-Semites frame the conspiracy in terms of Satanism and/or atheism, while atheist anti-Semites see it more as an attempt to delude the world to believing in the doctrines of Judaism via deistic or secular religion. Russian anti-Semites often assert that the Bolshevik revolution in 1917 was a jewish conspiracy to bring down a government that was hurting the jews, while others see a counter-conspiracy from gentiles turning up under the aegis of Stalin in 1949-1953.

In essence then we can see that the idea of a mass jewish conspiracy gets us into all kinds of intellectual trouble as we certainly can't prove one exists in any meaningful way and certainly if we are applying how we would have to behave in order to create that theoretical understanding of the jewish question then we put ourselves in yet more trouble, because we are asserting two contradictory positions at the same time.

To wit:

1) That the jew is a shadowy conspiratorial being whose actions are not readily understandable by the normal methods employed by intellectuals and thinkers down the ages.

2) That the jew thinks like us as in order to understand the jew we have had to place ourselves in his shoes and juxtaposition the jew with a non-jewish mentality.

These are obviously problematic assumptions to make and no writer on this topic I have read; and I've probably read a good percentage of the numerous contributions on this subject, has managed to solve this contradiction. Most are unfortunately blissfully unaware of it, which has lead; as I have said, to philo-Semites jumping on their soap boxes to denounce anti-Semites for believing *'contradictory positions'* and then proceeding to spill large amounts of ink about why people can believe said positions.

Now it should be understood that I am not here suggesting that the jews are incapable of conspiratorial behaviour and/or organising solely jewish conspiracies for the benefit of jews. That would be silly as they have given ample accepted proof that they are capable of; and have done, both: the most obvious (and usually ignored) examples of this are the three major jewish revolts against the Roman Empire, which were organised conspiratorially; often over great distance and also in non-jewish lands, and were solely jewish for the benefit of jews.

So clearly jews are capable of such behaviour, but the evidence as far as I can see it does not indicate anything nearly as massive as the *'Protocols of Zion'* type world plot envisioned by many anti-Semites and if anything the jews are likely to be engaging in conspiracies against each other as well as everyone else. In fact if you study jewish communal and Israeli politics you will

find that this is consistently alleged by every side of the jewish political spectrum against their opponents. To settler and ultra-nationalist jews it is all a leftist-Islamist plot to perform a *'new holocaust'*, to liberal jews it is an ultra-nationalist plot to force jews into behaving *'like Nazis'* and to the Hasidim everything that doesn't conform with their beliefs is part of a plot to corrupt purity of the jewish emunah (*'spirit'*).

Clearly it is very hard to convincingly argue such a monolithic conspiracy exists and the proponents of this idea usually try to do so by counting on the gullibility of the readership and hope desperately that nobody asks awkward questions or requires a detailed breakdown of the evidence and why it converges on that conclusion.

Of course proponents of such arguments in the modern era are not nearly as sophisticated or as educated as they used to be as there has been a tightening up; and rising of, evidential standards in the latter twentieth century in particular. While I am highly sympathetic to older proponents of the conspiracy argument: the modern descendants of these great men and women are but a pale shadow of their forebears.

Instead of logic and detailed research they usually resort to cheap two-a-penny claims and assertions that anyone who opposes them is either a jew or a deluded fool, which is both absurd and counterproductive. Indeed it smacks; as philo-Semites have again been quick to notice, of paranoia and an inability to back up arguments.

You could almost say that those who argue for a *'Protocols of Zion'* type conspiracy are the intellectual equivalent of holocaustians in their extremely selective use of evidence, internal contradictions and habit of defaming their opponents while claiming the moral high ground. Both positions in some respect share a similar psychology, which bases itself on the presumption that they know it is happening/ has happened, the evidence must be made to fit that assumption and that therefore anybody who challenges this must be either be delusional or part of the problem.

Funny how two groups who spend so much time attacking other could be quite so a-like: isn't it?