

challenged

Zionism in U.S. elections

in the British Watergate coup which ousted President Nixon — notably in the case against Agnew, but also through the “antiwar” activities of the Berrigans and the calls by Representative Mitchell, long before Watergate occurred, for Nixon’s impeachment.

THE ‘COLORED KENNEDYS’

The Mitchell family — a politically prominent black family economically based in the undertaking business — stands in the same relation to the “families” as the Hofjuden Rothschilds to the “WASP” British nobility. Parren’s nephew, Clarence Mitchell III, was speaking more aptly than he was perhaps aware when he compared the Mitchells to another prominent parvenue clan, the Irish Kennedys, upon election to the Maryland House of Delegates in 1972: “We Mitchells have been called the colored Kennedys,” Clarence declared proudly. “What we decide to do, we do.”

What the “colored Kennedys” did for the black population of Baltimore neatly parallels the sort of contributions Zionism has made to the welfare of the majority of Jews. Until the 1950s, Baltimore was known as one of the major “gateways” for blacks to enter the skilled working class. Bethlehem Steel’s mammoth Sparrows Point works was one of the leading industrial installations which hired and trained unskilled black workers coming from a rural southern background. Following the 1958 recession, opportunities for such unskilled workers began to dry up in Baltimore, as they did nationwide. As elsewhere, Baltimore’s “liberals” began to plan for the disastrous transition to “service-oriented” economics — replete with drugs, high unemployment, a poverty apparatus, and social welfare programs to replace lost productive jobs. The Mitchells were among the first to obtain “a piece of the action.” (As Parren Mitchell’s career is thus based on the drying up of blacks’ opportunities for skilled employment, there is no little irony in his emergence today as an advocate of “affirmative action” programs for the blacks among the dwindling Sparrows Point workforce.)

By his own account, Parren Mitchell was “apolitical” during the relatively prosperous fifties, and only began to emerge as a “black militant” spokesman in the period which paved the way for the 1968 riots in Baltimore. In 1965, Mitchell was named head of the Community Action Program, one of the first institutions set up in Baltimore’s

Baltimore’s Zionists trace their roots to the Confederacy

The clique of “families” that make up Baltimore’s Zionist establishment traces their roots to the proslavery Zionists associated with the Rothschilds and Great Britain in the antebellum period. Among the most vociferous of these anti-Union families were the Cohens, Ettings, Friedenwalds, Szolds, and others who today figure prominently as leading figures in the Zionist lobby.

The descendants of those families, and the later Russian emigre families like the Blausteins, Meyerhoffs, Hofbergers, and Sonneborns, built empires in oil, manufacturing, and real estate. The proceeds of their enterprises underwrote Baltimore’s organized crime, drug pushing, and gambling, financed by the John Hopkins University departmental programs that founded the “right to die” and hospice death cult movement, and created a political machine experienced in the vote fraud that brought Parren Mitchell into office.

Beyond Baltimore’s borders, their efforts extended to manipulation of the U.S. Jewish population to accept the British plan for the creation of the Israeli state and a world Zionist movement.

To the present, Baltimore’s Zionist establishment has remained true to their traitorous forebears — the Cohens, Ettings, Friedenwalds, and Szolds.

Their outlook in the antebellum period was typified by Rabbi Bernard Illoway of the powerful Baltimore Hebrew Congregation who declared that “Who can blame our brethren of the South for their being inclined to secede from a society under whose government their ends cannot be attained and whose union is kept together by heavy iron ties and violence and arbitrary force? Who can blame our brethren of the South for their being inclined to secede from a society whose government cannot or will not protect the property, rights and privileges of a great portion of the union. . . . Why did not Moses prohibit the bringing or selling of slaves?”

As today, the Zionists used organizations such as B’nai B’rith to intimidate pro-Union Jews. One Jewish Union sympathizer, Hyman Spitz, described the terror: “The Union people had to keep still and had to pretend to be rebels. In order to be treated right I and our children were required and obliged to carry rebel emblems.” One group tried to “integrate” their B’nai B’rith chapter and it was forced to dissolve. And a pro-Union rabbi, David Einhorn, was hounded out of Baltimore.