

Semitic Controversies

2008 Issue

Edited by Karl Radl

<http://semiticcontroversies.blogspot.com>

Contents

**Dershowitz versus Scholarship: Some Brief Comments on Dershowitz's 'Critique' of Walt
and
Mearsheimer**

A Talmudic Debacle: Part I

**Book Review: 'Reckless Rites: Purim and the Legacy of Jewish Violence' by Elliot
Horowitz**

**Book Review: 'Did God Have a Wife?: Archaeology and Folk Religion in Ancient Israel' by
William Dever**

The Rabbi of Hate: My Encounter with Rabbi David Eidensohn

Of New York and Tel Aviv: Some Comments on the Understanding of Jews

Einstein: the poor student?

**That Bane of Rationality: A Response to Revilo Oliver's 'Those Awful Protocols' (Part
One)**

A Talmudic Debacle: Part II: Written or Oral Torah, what says Judaism?

**That Bane of Rationality: A Response to Revilo Oliver's 'Those Awful Protocols' (Part
Two)**

**That Bane of Rationality: A Response to Revilo Oliver's 'Those Awful Protocols' (Part
Three)**

Why Semitic Controversies Was Created

The Open Double Standard: Doctor Aribert Heim versus Doctor Yitzhak Arad

A Letter to the Ambassador: The Open Double Standard in Action

A Change to the Schedule for this Week

An Einstein-Poincaré Conundrum

Joe McCain's Jewish Mythos Making: Part I

Einstein's Alleged Plagiarism, The 9/11 Truth Movement and Other Curiosa

**Rabbinical Rule in the Middle Ages and Early Modern Central and Eastern Europe:
Terror and Despotism (Part I)**

A Lubavitch Debacle

The Design of a Conspiracy: The Anti-Jewish Thought of Arnold Leese (Part I)

**Rabbinical Rule in the Middle Ages and Early Modern Central and Eastern Europe:
Terror and Despotism (Part II)**

**Some Brief Notes on Eustace Mullin's Quotation from Israel Cohen's 'A Racial
Programme for the Twentieth Century'**

Dresden Burning's Xanga

On Jewish 'Traitors'

Some Brief Comments to Incogman

The Design of a Conspiracy: The Anti-Jewish Thought of Arnold Leese (Part II)

A Jewish 9/11 Debacle: The Odigo, Missing Jews and Related Claims

Response to Incogman (Part I)

In Brief: A Righteous Jew?

Film Review: 'Max'

In Brief: 'Jew Watch'

Response to Incogman (Part II)

A Judeo-Bolshevik Debacle

On Jewish 'Traitors': Marcus Eli Ravage

A Worthy Set of Principles: Theodor Fritsch's Decalogue

In Brief: The Selenkov Quotation

On Jewish 'Traitors': Benjamin Freedman

Lies are not Facts: Benjamin Freedman's 'Facts are Facts' Debacle (Introduction)

The Misleading Term 'ZOG'

A Note to Readers

Ashkenazim versus Sephardim: The Conflict Inside Jewry (Part I)

Lies are not Facts: Benjamin Freedman's 'Facts are Facts' Debacle (Section II, Part I)

A Response to the Wandering Jew

Book Review: Carleton Putnam, 1980, 'Race and Reality: A Search for Solutions', 2nd Edition, Howard Allen: Cape Canaveral.

On Jewish 'Traitors': Jack Bernstein (Part I)

On Jewish 'Traitors': Jack Bernstein (Part II)

Book Review: Alan E. Steinweis, 2008, 'Studying the Jew: Scholarly Anti-Semitism in Nazi Germany', 2nd Edition, Harvard University Press: Cambridge.

Weird Accusations: An IP Trap?

In Brief: The 'Nobody told me about it' Fallacy

Some Reflections on 2008 and Some Thoughts for 2009

Dershowitz versus Scholarship: Some Brief Comments on Dershowitz's 'Critique' of Walt and Mearsheimer

Sunday, 15 June 2008

Alan Dershowitz's recent blog article '*Double Standard Watch: Questions for Walt and Mearsheimer*' at the Jerusalem Post website is for any student of Dershowitz's screeds; I won't say writings because I personally don't consider his written work on Israel and Jews to be even educated polemics, an interesting one in terms of Dershowitz's usual hysterics. To paraphrase Finkelstein in '*Beyond Chutzpah*' Dershowitz desperately wants to prove something and will marshal any 'evidence' and make any tenuous connection to make his case.

In this case; he wants to prove that Walt and Mearsheimer (and presumably his other opponents; such as Neumann and Finkelstein) base their research on 'out-of-context quotes' that they '*lifted from anti-Semitic, neo-Nazi and radical Islamic hate sites.*' Now having read Walt and Mearsheimer's book '*The Israel Lobby and US Foreign Policy*' fairly recently I don't recall any conclusions from such supposed 'bad sources'; the question of what about a 'hateful' site makes it a bad source of information is of course a more lengthy and more detailed discussion that I won't enter into here, nor do I immediately recall any citation of such sources. Perhaps Dershowitz could be specific in what he means and where Walt and Mearsheimer are supposedly skimming their research from such sources. Walt and Mearsheimer do mention David Duke once and in passing as an example but they promptly condemn him. However as veteran Dershowitz readers will well know he makes these kind of charges on a regular basis in both his books and other published work; his enemies are always 'haters', 'anti-Semites', 'Nazis', 'Shoah/Holocaust Deniers' and Lord knows else.

It is also interesting that Dershowitz immediately does exactly what he did to Finkelstein in his '*The Case for Israel*' in declaring the following to create the suggestion of considerable specific scholarly criticism [and condemnation] (in both cases one easily imagines Dershowitz with an animalistic sneer plastered across his face); '*That is why so many of their own colleagues - Jewish and not Jewish - have trashed their work as "piss-poor" research (as one colleague put it).*' Have 'so many' of 'their own colleagues' 'trashed' their work; not according to what I've read although Dershowitz and associates have circled numerous petitions condemning them for invented offences (some of which I have been forwarded by gracious friends) and engaging in a covert; as well as overt, personal campaign against them; much as it was revealed he had considerable hand in Finkelstein being denied tenure at De Paul University. But perhaps it is better to ask; why; if some colleagues disagree so strongly, there has not been a devastating critique brought out against the book from the direction that Dershowitz argues from i.e. that the people of the United States love Israel so much and have so many 'shared values' they just want to give it \$3 billion per annum. Alright; I am massively simplifying the argument here but it makes the point that needs to be made regardless.

In fact; earlier in this same article Dershowitz manages to state what the 'critical case' made is; in so far that Dershowitz and his associates charge; often directly, that because Walt and Mearsheimer did not write a book about what they call 'the Saudi Lobby' and the suggested

influence of oil companies on the decision to go war with Iraq in 2003 they must therefore be 'anti-Semites' because they are 'blaming the jews'. The logic is simple; because they have written a book primarily about jews lobbying and influencing United States foreign policy on behalf of a foreign country; Israel and having disproportionate influence on this foreign policy. They are irrational and hence are 'anti-Semitic' because their work goes beyond the pale of what 'new anti-Semitism' authors; whom are associated with Dershowitz and his associates not least by their almost universal shared jewish ancestry and approving citation of each other's work [for example; Dershowitz's unrestrained admiration for Chesler's book *'The New Anti-Semitism: The current crisis and what we must do about it'*; despite the fact she is ostensibly opposed to him politically], call 'reasonable criticism'. This; of course, means you have to attach a metaphorical halo to Israel and believe pretty much the official Israeli story on all events to do with Palestine; specifically to do with ongoing conflict with Syria, Iran, the Palestinians and so forth.

Dershowitz doesn't point out; assuming that his readers have likely not read Walt and Mearsheimer, that they address the points he makes as counters in their book although perhaps not at the length some may think they deserve they have addressed them and have done so consistently throughout their responses to criticism of their thesis. Dershowitz also does not note that the 'Saudi Lobby' is irrelevant to their thesis which is a narrow rather than a broad one about the influence of Israel in Washington. However perhaps what Dershowitz would argue is that because the thesis is that they argue the 'Israel Lobby' has disproportionate power and has a huge hand in controlling foreign policy in the Middle that the 'failure to account for the 'Saudi Lobby'' displays lack of scholarly integrity. However something to consider is Dershowitz and associates own argument in this regard; they argue that because of the massive funding provided by Saudis for Islamic schools, anti-Zionist programs and so forth it invalidates Walt and Mearsheimer's thesis. However; the fact is it doesn't even impact on it because the real facts [i.e. the practical results] of the situation demonstrate that the 'Saudi lobby' is not effective and that the 'Israel lobby' is. It is also worth noting that Dershowitz's claim that Israel and AIPAC had nothing to do with the Iraq war is exactly what Walt and Mearsheimer noted had started to be argued by the pro-Israel 'intellectuals' when just months earlier; as they have detailed in their work, these same 'intellectuals' had been arguing that it was in Israel's interests to have 'regime change' in Iraq so therefore the policy of war with Iraq should go ahead. Walt and Mearsheimer make an excellent case and their opponents like Dershowitz have simply been relegated to inventing reasons to charge them with 'bias' and so forth [therefore in Dershowitz's eyes invalidating any argument, counter-argument or future argument they make unless they are willing to kiss Israel's [or more precisely; jewish] feet in unconditional supplication]. That is after all Dershowitz's standard operating procedure in his books and screeds in general; why should we expect him to change? After all a tiger does not change his stripes and Dershowitz will likely never change his.

Dershowitz doesn't really go into depth with his 'criticisms' which are told are going into his new book [god how many does the jew have to write?]; *'The Case Against Israel's Enemies'* but I think we can guess from Dershowitz's past performance; when he has produced many an unevidenced and dare I say libellous case against perceived and real opponents rather than producing a scholarly and objective case, that it will be more of the same from AIPAC's favourite attack dog. Instead Dershowitz's style can be simplified to finding a statement which he thinks he can or needs to (for example with the question of Palestine's pre-Zionist population

and their status) catch/answer an opponent on; produce a few bits of evidence conclude the opponent is thereby opposing Israel 'without scholarly context'/'scholarly objectivity' and is therefore 'biased' against jews. Therefore said opponent is an 'anti-Semite' and is therefore according to Dershowitz's thought process 'irrational' (because all opposition to jews is in his mind; irrational and based on 'unfounded prejudice'); this means that Dershowitz in his own mind is free to link any author with all sorts of people with whom they are supposedly corresponding, are like and/or steal ideas from. This is evidenced rather dramatically above by Dershowitz's assertion of Walt and Mearsheimer's supposed stealing of ideas and structures from 'anti-Semites' which considering that the two learned Professors have made it very clear in their book; *'The Israel Lobby and US Foreign Policy'* [as well in their other published work with which I am somewhat familiar], they don't support the ideas, theses and arguments an 'anti-Semite' [rather than antisemite; i.e. I am not just anti-jewish but anti-semitic people like the Arabs as well as the jews] like me puts forward and I don't recognise any of their arguments as being similar to my own apart from on the most superficial of levels. Dershowitz is simply in Freudian terms projecting his own bias onto his opponents in order to distract from his own sense of intellectual [perhaps sexual or dare I say racial] inferiority.

So in conclusion to this brief commentary; we can paraphrase Dershowitz in saying: *'Alan Dershowitz: Distinguished academic? Not as evidenced by his work. Unscholarly propagandist? The proof is in the reading.'*

The original article by Alan Dershowitz can be found here:

http://cgis.jpost.com/Blogs/dershowitz/entry/questions_for_walt_and_mearsheimer

A Talmudic Debacle: Part I

Sunday, 15 June 2008

There is little reason to, by any stretch of the imagination, deny that the Talmud of Judaism is a voluminous work with a maze-like frame of thought, legal debates and judaic values where one can find matters not above, below nor beyond criticism. Neither is this a reason to assume any criticism thereof is right on the money or even valid in its attempt to reflect the frames aforementioned. I will proceed with an example of such a criticism where it is found wanting in its portrayal concerning a few quotes of the Babylonian Talmud.

In Michael A. Hoffman's work, *"The Truth About The Talmud"*[1], he describes a passage from the talmudic tractate "Baba Kamma" as meaning *"Jews have superior legal status"*, namely from Baba Kamma 37b of the Soncino English translation of the Babylonian Talmud.

The passage he refers to thereof reads;

"If an ox of an Israelite gores an ox of a Canaanite there is no liability; but if an ox of a Canaanite gores an ox of an Israelite...the payment is to be in full."

It would appear, as is claimed by Hoffman, to show it is granted for Jews to be generally unfair

in trade with all other non-jews. While it isn't erroneous to propose legal values being more of benefit, within a Jewish community, for Jewish people than for non-Jewish people thereof, it needs further clarification. The footnote of the above reads;

"As Canaanites did not recognise the laws of social justice, they did not impose any liability for damage done by cattle. They could consequently not claim to be protected by a law they neither recognised nor respected, cf. J. T. a.l. and Maim. Yad, Niz. Mam. VIII, 5. [In ancient Israel as in the modern state the legislation regulating the protection of life and property of the stranger was, as Guttmann. M. (HUCA. III 1 ff.) has shown, on the basis of reciprocity. Where such reciprocity was not recognised, the stranger could not claim to enjoy the same protection of the law as the citizen.]"

The above gives a general idea concerning the law of reciprocity, which was not unique for Jewish communities, it also grants the criticism of there being potential for a plethora of applied interpretations of how this law should or would hypothetically mean for non-Jewish trade with Jewish people.

However, this discussion continues onto the next page[2], with a footnote of relevance saying;

"The exemption from the protection of the civil law of Israel thus referred only to the Canaanites and their like who had wilfully rejected the elementary and basic principles of civilised humanity."

What one can easily derive from the above quotes and footnotes is that the principles of law of reciprocity are detailed in a general fashion, explaining basically that if one does not obey the most basic laws of the country they live in, they thereby forfeit legal rights to make demands based on the relevant laws of society.

Simultaneously, the discussion appears to leave quite a bit of room for otherwise fair-trade becoming subjected to "reciprocity" when it might not be valid for it to be.

Let us examine more quotes given by Hoffman, referencing to the above.

"Jews May Steal from Non-Jews" he writes in the previously mentioned work of his, citing Sanhedrin 76 and Baba Mezia 24a. The Sanhedrin quote cited says;

"Rab Judah said in Rab's name: One who marries his daughter to an old man or takes a wife for his infant son, or returns a lost article to a Cuthean, — concerning him Scripture sayeth, [that he bless himself in his heart saying, I shall have peace, though I walk in the imagination of mine heart] to add drunkenness to thirst: The Lord will not spare him."[3]

This quote does certainly offer us an example of a notably unfair and anti-gentile sentiment on withholding an object from a non-Jew, yet let us take a look at the footnote on this passage;

"Deut. XXIX, 18ff. i.e., the associations involved in these practices are displeasing in the eyes of the Lord. [How bitter must have been the persecution of the Jews under Ardesir (v. Funk, op.

cit 1, pp 66 ff.) to have provoked gentle Rab to this harsh utterance.”

As we can see, the previously cited passage of the Sanhedrin tractate, is not imposing any legislative decision or creed, no halakah (jewish law) is given in support of the above, which also explains why this utterance is lamented upon by the footnote commentary.

Hoffman referenced another passage, from Baba Mezia, in his attempt to strengthen the validity of his criticism that jews may steal from non-jews which he have yet to see any proof of. Let us take a look at the next quote cited;

"If one finds therein a lost object, then if the majority are Israelites it has to be announced, but if the majority are heathens it has not to be announced."[4]

The confusing part here appears to be the latter segment, "has not to be announced". What does that mean? Well to give a basic rendering of what this means it will suffice to say that where a jewish citizen finds a lost object then it is up to him, upon his next trip to a place of announcement (generally in pre-second Diaspora it was Jerusalem), to make an announcement in a public place, that he has found something with no knowledge of who the owner is. For an eligible owner to claim the object as his, he must offer the announcer some proof of ownership, by describing the object or otherwise identifying it. Furthermore, if three holidays has passed without anyone stepping up to claim the article as his, then finder's keeper's so to speak.

A footnote to the above discussion in Baba Mezia 24 says;

"Heathens do not return lost articles (v. infra p. 152, n. 3), and consequently do not come within the provision of the law relating to the announcement of finds. Moreover, according to Tosaf., even if it were certain that the article belonged to an Israelite, there would be no need to return it because the owner, presuming that a heathen found it, would despair of recovering it. v. B.K. (Sonc. ed.) p. 666. Baba Mezia, p. 149, n. 6."

The above footnote refers as well to another footnote in Baba Mezia 24b, saying;

"and as the majority of the inhabitants of the place are heathens who do not return lost articles, the owner must be assumed to have abandoned the hope of recovering the lost goods."

As of yet it is clear that these discussions do not imply it being legal for jewish people to steal objects from non-jews, it simply explains that if an object is lost then it should be taken to a place of announcement and wait for the owner to show up, but also that if a lost object is found in the lands of a heathen, then the laws on announcement are rendered moot since such a place is assumed not to exist and the finder does not know who the object belongs to.

However, let us continue with more firm clarifications on whether or not a jewish person can take an object found and purposely circumvent the return of it to its rightful owner. In Baba Kamma 113 there is a reference to a quote by Rabbi Phineas saying;

"where there was a danger of causing a profanation of the Name, even the retaining of a lost

article of a heathen is a crime.”

The profanation of God's Name occurs when the retaining of a lost article, belonging to anyone, is kept by the finder when the finder knows who the owner is, while the Baba Mezia discussions are not talking about a situation where the owner is known. If the finder does not know who the owner is of the article/object and no ways to acquire his identity, he can keep it as it does not enter into the property laws. This quote is followed by;

”Samuel said: Their mistakes are permitted. Like when Samuel bought from a gentile a golden bowl (with the seller thinking it was bronze) for four zuz and accidentally paid him one zuz less.”.

A quick read might have this sentence appear to be an argument against Rabbi Phineas' general declaration. It is not. Furthermore it is not talking about it being ok to steal from a gentile, rather that in any business deal one is responsible for the price offered for an object. So, if a gentile offers a gold bowl, believing it is of bronze and setting the price thereof, the Jewish buyer is not required to correct him that it is gold and thus pay more. It also explains how, if the Jewish buyer accidentally paid too little and the gentile did not count his money, the Jewish buyer (when or if realising his mistake) is not demanded to correct the purchase. Thus Rabbi Samuel mentions elsewhere in the Talmud;

”It is forbidden to deceive anyone, even an idolatrous gentile”.[5]

We have therefore been hereby provided with an actual example of how it is legal, not to steal but, for a Jew to profit upon the careless purchase or sale of an object by a gentile if the sale is not met with contemporary objections by the gentile. A Jew is not allowed to, by the Talmud, to purposely trick the gentile, he is however allowed to benefit from a gentile's mistake in sales.

If the above has not made anyone the wiser on what Jewish laws actually say on this matter, it might be a good idea to cite a piece of halakah that encompasses the above legal debacle. The Mishneh Torah, composed by Rabbi Maimonides as a codification of Jewish law (halakah) says;

” And similarly, lies, tricks, subterfuges, cheatings, and circumventions of gentiles are forbidden. They said [as quoted above] 'It is forbidden to deceive anyone, even an idolatrous gentile' and even more so when it can lead to the desecration of G-d's name. For that is a great sin and imbues in a person bad traits. And all these wicked actions G-d explained that He will be disgusted with them and with those who perform them, as it says: (Deuteronomy 18:12) "For anyone who does these is an abomination of G-d.”[6]

Considering the examples and contexts of what we've gone through above, it stands to reason that the methodology and conclusions thereof given by Hoffman are found wanting. They do not succeed in providing his attached claims or his elaborations of them with convincing, encompassive nor correct interpretation of the quoted material. Therefore we are forced to conclude the argued quotes not to be sufficient in sustaining his argued case.

[1] <http://www.revisionisthistory.org/talmudtruth.html>

- [2] Baba Kamma, folio 38a, Soncino Babylonian Talmud
- [3] Sanhedrin, folio 76b, Soncino Babylonian Talmud
- [4] Baba Mezia, folio 24a, Soncino Babylonian Talmud
- [5] Chullin, folio 94a, Soncino Babylonian Talmud.
- [6] Misneh Torah, commentary by Maimonides on Keilim 12:7

Book Review: 'Reckless Rites: Purim and the Legacy of Jewish Violence' by Elliot Horowitz

Saturday, 21 June 2008

Elliot Horowitz, 2007, *'Reckless Rites: Purim and the Legacy of Jewish Violence'*, 1st Edition, Princeton University Press: Princeton

'Reckless Rites' by Elliot Horowitz at first sight would suggest itself to be another volume of back-patting jewish historical thought devoted to demolishing 'anti-Semitic' straw men and visualising jewish history as a story of a saintly race, which suffers from being too wonderful because all the peoples of the world are jealous of its creativity, intellectual ability and business acumen[1]. I am happy to report that this is certainly not the case with 'Reckless Rites' rather the book; although one encounters a flurry of liberal canards and clichés about 'racism' and 'discrimination' once or twice per chapter [2], is quite a break from the general trend above outlined in jewish historical thought[3]. In it; Horowitz specifically sets out his premises in that he believes that there has been a considerable amount of jew-on-gentile violence in history that has been overlooked. He argues particularly that this violence is focused around the holiday of Purim[4].

Professor Horowitz himself spends the first section of 'Reckless Rites' examining the theological background of Purim and how the events in the book of Esther have been interpreted by theologians and Rabbis down the centuries. He argues that Esther has created more divided opinion and argument than perhaps any other book in the Old Testament and perhaps even the Bible itself. Horowitz notes that it is quite likely that events described in the book of Esther may be factually inaccurate since although they like the rest of the biblical texts have been taken as revealed historical fact; they are hideously one sided in their telling of events.

This part of Horowitz's argument; the hideously one sided nature of standard jewish history, is revealed in the second half of 'Reckless Rites', which focuses on the historical discrepancy between the primary sources and how the events are described in the jewish historical literature (which is usually used as the basis for modern work and research on the subject). What Horowitz does not dwell on; perhaps because it is a little too much for his potential jewish readers to stomach, is that this discrepancy has corrupted not only the later jewish works but also many non-jewish ones unless the author has gone back to the original text in all cases to validate the description given by jewish historians.

In the view of his argument; Horowitz shows an unusual interest in one of the minor (potentially)

historical characters of the book of Esther when he devotes a chapter to Vashti; the wife of the Persian king and one of the opponents of Esther; the latter wishing to gain Vashti's husband's emotional and carnal affections in order to manipulate him. Horowitz spends his chapter on Vashti trying to uncover the real character underneath the abuse and slander thrown at her in the Old Testament and the subsequent literature drawing on it. This is part of the wider argument by Horowitz that is at the core of his purported reason for writing 'Reckless Rites' in that there is a very real association of non-jews; especially Christians historically and Arabs at the present time, with the embodiments of enemy in Judaism; one of these being Vashti and another being Haman[5].

In discussing Haman and the book of Esther; Horowitz discusses the concept of the enemy in Judaic theology and in doing so traces its roots back to the Book of Exodus; where the Amalekites[6] first make their appearance. According to Exodus the Amalek were supposedly relatives of the early jews who unlike their racial kin had stayed behind in what is now southern Israel and the Sinai peninsula. The Amalek supposedly assaulted the jews as they were exiting the deserts of Sinai. In the ensuing engagement the militarily inexperienced jews managed to slaughter the battle-hardened Amalek army[7]; which ended in the execution-cum-ritual-sacrifice of the Amalekite king; Agag. The jewish tribal deity then proceeded to order his 'chosen people' to exterminate all the Amalek. Here; Horowitz contends, we find the origin of the enemy of the jews in jewish literature.

This might seem to be purely academic as the Amalekites are ostensibly seen as successfully exterminated for the rest of the writings which make up the Old Testament; however here Horowitz points out that according to jewish tradition and their most revered rabbinical writers; such as Maimonides, the Amalek have not been successfully exterminated. Hence the jewish tribal deity's edict to exterminate them is still in effect and must be followed by the jews as a mitzvot[8].

This Horowitz contends has lead to the consistent association of enemies of the jews with Amalek; in order to evidence this Horowitz quotes a number of American and Israeli sources about the opinions prevalent within the Israeli settler community whom are known for extreme ethnocentric secular and religious tendencies as well as being among the more extreme Zionists. What is particularly enlightening is the attitude consistent among these quotations which indicate that when the enemy is identified as Amalek there is no ethical bar to extermination because it is the explicit commandment of the jewish tribal god.

Further to this Horowitz cites the identification of Adolf Hitler as an Agagite; or King of Amalek, and National Socialists as being Amalek during and after the Third Reich[9]. This may perhaps go some way to explaining the extreme jewish vengeance wreaked on Germany following the defeat of the Third Reich; in that because of the association of National Socialism with an old enemy as old perhaps as the Aryan race; the jews were driven to more extreme acts of sadism, cruelty, violence and rapine towards prostrate Germany[10]. Perhaps the identification of the Aryan folk of Germany with Amalek as well as how far it contributed to the actions of the jews post-World War Two may even provide sufficient breadth for a scholar to make it their hauptwerk.

The importance of the concept of the enemy or Amalek to the Book of Esther; Horowitz points out, is that Haman is labelled as an Agagite and his Persian followers as Amalek. Haman is central to the Jewish festival of Purim which Horowitz uses to suggest there is a theological and cultural tradition within Judaism of violence towards those who are considered Amalek by a given Jewish sect and/or community at the time of the festival.

Horowitz spends much of this first part of his book enlarging upon the general theological background of Purim and its basis in the book of Esther in the light of how theologians; both Jewish and Christian, have dealt with the book's contents. Of particular note to the reader may be the fact that Horowitz does not shy away from seriously considering the views; with very little hand-wringing, of National Socialist theologians and those German theologians who contributed scholarly material to the crusade to rid the various Christian denominations of Jewish influence[11].

He notes that scholars have in general had one of three reactions to the book of Esther; one of ignoring it, one of celebrating it (as the triumph of justice) and one of using it as evidence of the Jewish tendency for vengeance against their foes and their unjust nature. This section is well worth a read even for those who are not theologically inclined and have little interest in debates over the specifics of theology. Since it gives the reader an invaluable historical background to the different streams of thought in the European intellectual climate; that of denial of a problem, the former of celebrating the problem and the latter of confronting the problem. That problem itself is; of course, the Jews.

Once Horowitz has established his premise that indeed there is cause to suggest a history of Jewish violence in and around Purim on the basis of the festival itself and the concept of enemy; he moves onto the second half of 'Reckless Rites'; which deals specifically in conducting a brief review of some instances and types of events in Jewish history from the perspective of questioning whether or not the accusations of the apparent 'anti-Semites' might have had some form of factual basis[12]. Not surprisingly Horowitz chooses to base his research and comments on medieval and early modern Europe where there is a large quantity of well documented 'anti-Semitic' risings, accusations and subsequent trials. As well as a considerable volume of contemporary literature and later specific and general academic work on a plethora of specific events and issues within the period.

What is more surprising is Horowitz's willingness to take on one particular Jewish historical canard; that the host desecration accusations and trials made in Europe were likely not just the invention of what Jews oft state were alleged bigoted and superstitious Aryan minds and that these host desecration activities had nothing to do with anything the Jews did or ever have done but were rather just made up by the economically jealous and the religiously bigoted[13].

The host desecration accusation is essentially when an individual or a group of Jews takes, buys or steals the wafer used in the Eucharist used to signify the body of Christ and then proceeds to blaspheme it by subjecting it to humiliations and torments[14]. Christian stories tell of how the host bleed and scared the Jews and so forth; this probable exaggeration of the events is the route by which Jewish historical authors have claimed that these occurrences were nothing more than a case of religious bigotry and that the Jews were simply blamed for things they did not do.

Horowitz however suggests a contrary and far more probable view of the matter in that jews have long views Christianity as one of their chief enemies. In fact; Horowitz spends an entire chapter of 'Reckless Rites' discussing the feelings of the jews for the Christian cross. In so far as it pertains to the hatred and fear the jews feel of it. Horowitz cites numerous and varied instances where Marrano families were caught; or accused of, scourging the cross in their home or at some locale among other instances. This Horowitz suggests may well be part of the largely vanished religion of the Marrano's which was a cross between Christianity and Judaism. Horowitz suggests that the practice of scourging the cross was part of an intrinsic fear and hatred of Christian symbols which manifested itself in the abuse of symbol of their supposed oppressors.

I would take a slightly different view from Horowitz in that this behaviour on the part of the Marrano's was less to do with oppression but rather the behaviour of a race which suckles in with its mother's milk[15] the spirit of vengeance against all the enemies of their race. Their actions towards the cross are in the spirit of this vengeance which they are enacting in secret because they fear to make their actions public. Perhaps the heady mix of fear of the authorities and the contempt for the religion; Christianity, they felt was forced upon them added to the brew to create this unique expression of jewish contempt. It again would make a valuable potential area of investigation for a scholar into just how much the religion of Marranos was created by the fear of the authorities and how much was created by the jew's disdain for non-jews (potentially created; as per Horowitz's argument, by the association of the 'oppressor' with Amalek).

Horowitz also brings up the fact that jews have historically and still do refer to the Christian cross as the abomination; the same word in fact they use to describe homosexuality which Horowitz pointedly recalls. Offensive perhaps but no can I believe this is pure co-incidence with the jewish history of overtly and covertly attacking Christianity and particularly the figure of Jesus whom is oft referred to by present day jews as 'the j man' so as not to offend their fellow jews.

When we consider this anti-Christian feeling amongst the jews in the context of the theology of Purim it becomes eminently possible; and even probable, as Horowitz argues that these host desecration events have managed to fall generally in and around Purim. What Horowitz therefore suggests may have occurred is demonstrated by a rhetorical question he asks; would not jews if given the opportunity to take a host without the Christians knowing gleefully take the opportunity to vent their oppression against the highly symbolic wafer?

Jews and their associates might claim in an effort to counter Horowitz's question; and have made similar arguments in the literature on this subject, that jews would not have done this for the simple reason that they would be too afraid of the consequences[16]. However this assumes that jews always act rationally and think through their decisions first; but as Horowitz's question suggest what happens if they stole the wafer on the spur of the moment and did horrible things to it either individually or as a group? Surely no individual or group would be so perfect as to weigh all the potential consequences of a given action all the time; which is what the jewish argument assumes and what makes said argument utterly spurious.

In 'Reckless Rites' Horowitz clearly makes the case that there is no real substance to the arguments of jews and their associates in regards to these events being simply 'anti-Semitic myths' because as we discussed; why not? What evidence is there to really suggest that these were simple fabrications of people against the jews? The answer is simple; there is no significant evidence to suggest that these charges are contrary to the ascertained facts of the cases involved.

Horowitz has clearly shown that the necessary ideological and theological background via the festival of Purim does in fact exist. It is likely not the idea of every jew but that there are some today whom; as Horowitz cites, revile Christian symbology and express open contempt for gentiles as Amalek[17]. Hence; we must conclude that in the absence of evidence to the contrary host desecrations did in fact occur and whatever their origin in individual cases there was a potential ideological and/or theological motive that could be constructed by individual and/or groups of jews to legitimise their actions.

This argument is strengthened by the most interesting part of 'Reckless Rites' where Horowitz briefly surveys the jewish historical literature and picks out one of its most famous denizens; Cecil Roth[18], for closer analysis. Horowitz here enters upon even more controversial territory since Cecil Roth is an oft quoted jewish historian who wrote many research works dealing with specific parts of the jewish community which are essential reading to the student of jewish question today.

What Horowitz argues at first seems fantastic; that Roth has distorted history to favour the jews especially in regards to long past historical events. However; as Horowitz continues his analysis of Roth a disturbing pattern to his mind emerges in that Roth has continually understated the case against the jews in such incidents as two jews intentionally urinating on a cross in Trier[19] and more over has likened it to being an anti-Semitic myth. What is interesting here is that Horowitz recognises distinctly that Roth has not done this accidentally because as he himself notes the alterations are themselves too often and too methodical to be other than a deliberate glossing over of inconvenient jewish historiography.

This might seem as obvious to any readers who are seasoned students of the jewish question; but we should remember that people will and have genuinely believed what Roth wrote to be a fundamentally accurate of jewish history as the sources suggest it. People; apart from those who have critically studied in jewish methods and thought, will genuinely and quite naturally believe what a noted and often published academic historian who is writing about a subject of which he is regarded as something of an authority in his own time and in posterity. Roth here is abusing his readers trust and failing in his academic duty to the world; this is something that cannot be excused on grounds that he was 'writing in a time of intense anti-Semitism' as I suspect some might argue. Roth has distorted history and knowingly kept doing it after the fall of the Third Reich in order I would suggest to make the supposed 'holocaust' all the more abominable as part of a sustained epoch of 'unjust persecution'. What Roth's actual motivations were we cannot really say; but one suspects that jews who are very conscious of the fact that they are jews may well be inclined to alter facts to suit their purposes.

Whether Horowitz represents a future school of jewish thought; I do not know. We shall just have to wait, see and hope.

[1] Such assertions are indirect in most histories of the jews but can be found more readily in jewish books written to 'counter anti-Semitism' and books written by especially vitriolic jews. An example of the former is Sidney Osborne's *'Germany and Her Jews'* (1939) and an example of the later is Max I. Dimont's *'The Indestructible Jews'* (1972).

[2] Readers of Horowitz may note his overuse of the centre-left Israeli daily; *'Haaretz'* as a source without qualification from other news services of different political positions. However; I do not feel it detracts from his argument but it is something that kosher commentators would be likely to use to declare Horowitz a 'self-hating jew' or 'leftist bigot' (forgive the oxymoron).

[3] This trend has not been limited specifically to jewish authors but has long been adopted by uncritical gentile authors. A good example of this sort of literature can be found in Paul Johnson's *'History of the Jews'* (1988) and more recently Thomas Cahill's *'The Gift of the Jews'* (2006).

[4] Purim for readers unacquainted with Judaic theology is the religious festival to celebrate the events outlined in the Old Testament book of Esther. The book of Esther tells the story of how the jewess; Esther, and her relative Mordecai trick a (non-existent) Persian king into creating Mordecai his chief advisor and massacring those Persians who had seen the jews abroad in Persia for what they were. I would encourage readers to take the half-an-hour necessary to read or re-read the book of Esther; since I personally believe it provides an invaluable reminder of the nature of the jew in the story itself and the fact that it was so brazenly included as a primary religious text in Judaism.

[5] Haman is the anti-jewish; potentially Aryan, chief minister of the Persian king in the Book of Esther. He and all his sons are eventually hung for the crime of 'plotting against the jews'.

[6] The Amalek were ordered to be exterminated as were the tribes of Canaan on the writ of the jewish tribal deity.

[7] The jewish success is attributed to divine intervention but this seems a rather unlikely event; it is more likely to be an additional support to Horowitz's argument that the jews have falsified history for their own ethnocentric motives. It seems probable that the jews entered the Amalekite's territory in search of territory to conquer, plunder and/or subsistence.

[8] Possibly as part of mitzvot 45 i.e. *'Not to be afraid of killing the false prophet'*.

[9] This might reasonably go some way to explaining the obsession jews have with the Third Reich generally and Adolf Hitler in particular.

[10] Elie Wiesel in his first [Yiddish] edition of the infamous; work of fiction purported as history, *'Night'* details how he raped a young German girl because his 'religion told him to' (to paraphrase); this fits into Horowitz's general thesis of calculated but opportunistic jewish violence in regards to alleged or real instances of actions taken against the jewish community. Whatever Wiesel's sexual perversions his confession of apparent religious motivations for this criminal action are of interest because he is either using it as an excuse for his personal depravity (i.e. it has some kind of religious currency among Judaic theology and/or jews as a race) or he genuinely felt there was a religious boon or reason for violating this young Aryan girl. Either of these is no reason in the slightest for committing such a crime but we must also understand the motivation for the crime not simply act as the jews; and other Semites, do and declare a holy war as a form of general vengeance for a real or perceived slight.

[11] One example of such an individual being Paul de La garde who is cited by Alfred Rosenberg as one of National Socialism's intellectual forebears in his *'The Myth of the Twentieth Century'*.

[12] This might seem an obvious question to ask; but it is not one that is often asked since it is much easier and a much better move; in terms of one's career, to just simply take it as read that all 'anti-Semites' are 'fantasizing' about jews and Judaism. One book that I haven't had a chance to read yet, as of this writing, on this general subject is Albert Lindemann's '*Esau's Tears: Modern Anti-Semitism and the Rise of the Jews*' (1997) which I will publish a review of in due course.

[13] Such a hypothesis can be found in most works about the Medieval period and jews. For further reading see Leon Poliakov's '*The History of Anti-Semitism: From Mohammed to the Marranos*' (Volume II) (2003), Ronnie Po-chia Hsia's '*The Myth of Ritual Murder: Jews and Magic in Reformation Germany*' (1988) and Jacob R. Marcus' '*The Jew in the Medieval World: A Source Book 315-1791*' (1961).

[14] The best known and most written about being the trial of jews at Passau in 1478.

[15] A pun on the cry of a jewess of Spain when she pleaded for clemency from the Inquisition for practising Judaism which she apparently imbibed with her mother's milk; what we would today call race. For further details see; p. 78 of Frederic David Mocatta's '*The Jews of Spain and Portugal and the Inquisition*' (1977).

[16] For example; see Ronnie Po-Chia Hsia's '*Trent 1475: Stories of a Ritual Murder Trial*' (1992); in which he makes the case that the jews could not have done the crime and that the charge was baseless anyway because the jews would not have committed such a crime at a time of such 'anti-Semitic' discourse.

[17] Borderline modern contempt of this form can be found on the highly subscribed Israel National Radio; part of the Arutz Sheva network, and can be heard online at the following address: <http://www.israelnationalradio.com/>. Please note that Christian listeners to their programs may find them incredibly offensive in their attacks on Jesus and the conspiracy theories about Christian organisations conspiring against the jews (especially related to the Catholic Church (i.e. the Vatican)). You will also find a profound hatred of Europe and gentile Europeans amongst their various programs.

[18] Cecil Roth's large amount of work can usually be acquired relatively cheaply but needless to say it highly defensive of jews being criticised or blamed for anything in particular. The interested reader is invited to study Roth's works such as '*A Short History of the Jewish People*' (1936) and; the much reprinted, '*The Jewish Contribution to Civilisation*' (1943) to get a flavour of Roth's jewish mythos-making.

[19] Jews were; and to a lesser extent still are, violent towards crosses/crucifixes and Christians; often in earlier times exposing their penis to the cross; trying to urinate on it, in a rather Freudian expression of contempt. They were; of course, often killed for this unnecessary and unjustified act by the nearby Christians who quite obviously took serious offence to this extreme impudence.

Book Review: 'Did God Have a Wife?: Archaeology and Folk Religion in Ancient Israel' by William Dever

Monday, 23 June 2008

William Dever, 2005, '*Did God Have a Wife?: Archaeology and Folk Religion in Ancient Israel*', 1st Edition, Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, 344 pages

William G. Dever is a Fundamentalist Christian convert to judaism and is an archaeologist and author by profession.

In 1975-1976, prior to the Israeli withdrawal from Sinai, Dr. Ze'ev Meshel of Tel Aviv University, an experienced archaeologist, geographer and trekker, excavated a site not far from the border known as Quntilat Ajrud. This site, small but conspicuous, was located in Darb Ghazza, an important ancient route from Eilat to Rafah and Gaza.

In the 8th and 9th centuries B.C.E., a travelers inn was located in the village; part of which was a shrine. Meshel's excavations yielded Hebrew inscriptions, both on pottery sherds and on the wall plaster. Several inscriptions mention "*Yahweh and his Asherah*." One reads: "*Blessings of Yahweh of Shomron and his Asherah*." Another reads: "*To Yahweh of Teman and his Asherah*" .

A few years before the dig in Sinai, the author of the book, William G. Dever, unearthed inscriptions in a cave in Khirbet al-Qom (the biblical city of Maqeda), which also mentions Yahweh and his Asherah. Quntilat Ajrud was located on the Egyptian border, which was part of ancient Israel . Back then Shomron was the capital and Eilat was within its jurisdiction. So these inscriptions linking Asherah to Yahweh were found both in Israel and Judea.

Who was Asherah?

In the Canaanite pantheon, she was the wife of El and the mother of all other gods. Are these inscriptions talking about the same goddess, who is now Yahweh's consort? There is no question that the dig discovered jewish reference and symbols of Asherah.

Worship of her was quite widespread in ancient Israel; especially in the days of Queen Jezebel and her husband Ahab: 400 prophets of Asherah ate at Jezebel's table and participated, along with the prophets of Ba'al, in the great contest on Mt. Carmel against Elijah - a contest that ended in the slaughter of the prophets of Ba'al (and probably the prophets of Asherah, too, although the text does not say so explicitly). The jewish torah does everything it can to assume authority as the "premier" monotheistic faith; there is little to none mention of the popular jewish religion as practised. Judging from the unearthed dig, it is quite plausible that jews generally believe that the god of Israel had a wife named Asherah. In his introduction to the book, Dever writes: "*This is a book about ordinary people in ancient Israel and their everyday religious lives, not about the extraordinary few who wrote and edited the Hebrew Bible. It is also a book for ordinary people today who know instinctively that 'religion' is about experience, not about the doctrines of scholars, theologians and clerics, who study religion dispassionately and claim authority...*"

In the chapter entitled: "*The archaeological evidence for folk religion in ancient Israel*." Dever describes a dozen small household shrines with similar architectural features and artifacts: altars, ledges, incense bowls, food remnants, and remnants of sacrifices and tributes. These jewish family rituals are described in detail by the jewish prophet Jeremiah: "*The children gather wood, and the fathers kindle the fire, and the women knead the dough, to make cake for the queen of heaven, and to pour out drink-offerings unto [their] gods*" (Jeremiah 7:18). The jews' "*queen of heaven*" was none other than the goddess Astarte.

Sex with the 'Shekhina'

Dever has written two chapters on Asherah. In one he explores the cult of Asherah and the archaeological and especially iconographic evidence for it. The other is about women's cults and "official Yahwism." The discovered female figurines; of which over a thousand have been discovered, are, clearly, that of Asherah. They are of the fertility charm variety. One chapter of the book is called "*What does the goddess do to help?*"

Yehezkel Kaufmann, the renowned torah scholar, has claimed that the jews' religion in the biblical era was strictly monotheistic from its outset; with but a rare few "negligible" traces of paganism at the fringes. Dever's book offers a different and more up-to-date view.

A jew may state, '*O.k., almost 3,000 years ago my forefathers believed that god had a wife, but this silly idea disappeared from the world a long time ago.*' However this is not true. Not only has this approach not died out; but it is still warmly embraced by many pious Jews (not always consciously), through the influence of kabbala. The concept of the Shekhina has many meanings. In kabbala, the Shekhina represents the female element of the Sefirot, or divine emanations. In kabbala, the primary objective in worshipping the jewish god is to bring about the sexual union between the male principle - the sixth Sefira, known as Tiferet or Yesod, and the female principle - the tenth Sefira, usually called Shekhina (but also known as Malkhut, Knesset Yisrael and Atara).

In certain versions of the jewish prayerbook, the Siddur which is influenced near entirely by kabbalistic traditions - certain prayers and blessings are prefaced by the following verse, "*Leshem yihud kudsha berikh hu veshechintay.*" In English translation: "*For the sake of the union of the Holy One, Blessed be He, and his Shekhina.*"

That union, to remove any doubts, is a sexual coupling. jewish mystics allege that the purpose of this act is to restore harmony to the world, after it was knocked off kilter by the sins and evil machinations of the "*sitra achra*" (ie, Gentile) and the jews' experience of exile. Dever learned about this kabbalistic outlook from "*The Hebrew Goddess*" by Rafael Patai. However, it is also found in Yehuda Liebes' hebrew article entitled, "*Zohar and Eros*" [Alpayim, 1994] and Moshe Idel's "*Kabbala and Eros*", which has only recently been published in English.

If the notion of the jews' god indulging in sexual union with their goddess seems bizarre to the reader, then let us continue to toss caution to the winds and draw attention to another, even more bizarre phenomenon. When religious jews sway back and forth in prayer; the swaying has a profound pantomimic significance to them. To quote from the book, "*Tzava'at Ha-Ribash*" (it's about Israel Ba'al Shem Tov, also known as the Besht, the founder of Hasidism), we find this statement:

"prayer is intercourse with the Shekhina, and just as one rocks back and forth at the start of intercourse, thus one must initially rock oneself back and forth in prayer. Then one may stand still and cleave deeply to the Shekhina. And while rocking back and forth and bringing oneself to a state of tremendous arousal, think: Why am I rocking? Because the Shekhina may be standing

before me, and the very thought arouses great passion."

I ask any Christian, of whatever variety; but especially Catholics, is this what you would have The Faith infused by? Should juden be allowed to continue to explain as well as define our Faith to us, or even comment as to the Divinity of Christ when their own god has no relationship to God Himself ?

The Rabbi of Hate: My Encounter with Rabbi David Eidensohn

Sunday, 29 June 2008

Two weeks ago on the 11th of May I wrote a note to Rabbi Eidensohn; who prefers to be called David, inviting him to participate in a duologue whereby we would discuss jewish history and perhaps a little jewish theology. I promised him a rational discussion of questions, which perhaps he did not understand the 'anti-Semitic' perspective on and the opportunity to debate an informed 'anti-Semite'. I made no pretensions about who I was or what my weltanschauung was but I assured David that I would maintain my politeness with him as far as I could because I earnestly wished to have a rational and specific discussion over questions in jewish history which I wished to get a variety of jewish perspectives on outside those presented within the considerable literature on the jewish question of all three; 'anti-Semitic', 'philo-Semitic' and jewish, flavours.

Why did I contact David specifically?

Firstly; a friend of mine recommended him as a Rabbi with whom he had had some discussion of jewish theology and whom seemed to be somewhat open to at least discussing issues (although my friend warned me that David was severely dogmatic in his beliefs; he felt he would still be interested in discussing issues rationally). He also informed me that David was knowledgeable about Sephardi history; being of Sephardi sub-racial extraction himself this is hardly surprising, and since my historical knowledge about jewry is somewhat biased towards the Ashkenazi sub-racial extraction it seemed pertinent to see if I could get some Sephardi commentary on some of these issues and perhaps get a Sephardi overview of Sephardi history in the age of the Ashkenazi.

Secondly; David runs a site called; 'jew haters' (<http://www.jewhaters.com>) which contends that David is intellectually honest and willing to defend his views rationally. In fact; the graphic in the middle of the page states quite plainly: *'Defending Jews and G-d's Law from Hate'* and *'Everyone is welcome!'* This is followed by a subtext stating *'LET ALL WHO ARE INTELLECTUALLY HONEST ENTER HERE AND SAY WHAT YOU WANT'* [capitalization in original]. This is again followed by another assurance to 'critics of Jews' as David calls them that; *'Again, I thank them [critics of jews], and welcome others who are of good heart, sincere and intellectual, to ask and say what they want, and I will, within my limitations of time and mind, try to respond. So much goodness and peace can come only when we know Truth.'* [parentheses added by author]. As you might expect I felt reasonably assured that even if I myself and David never saw eye-to-eye he would at least answer my questions and provide

rational responses.

Thirdly; David is an oft-quoted [Sephardi] Torah scholar and Cabbalist who resides in New York City and often gives private lectures to Jewish audiences as well as radio appearances. He is also the author of many books on Jewish marriage, Jewish divorce, Jewish living and sexuality. David himself of course would prefer to seem quite modest about these achievements but as he himself told me he is very proud of having gone 'from something to nothing and defied all secular Jews' expectation and pronouncements' to paraphrase.

So all things considered; David seemed like an ideal candidate; literate, respected by his Jewish peers and open to conducting a dialogue with a convinced 'anti-Semite', to begin my inquiries with.

David's response to my note to him came nine hours after I had sent it to him and it was enthusiastic. He welcomed the opportunity for discussion and wanted to know a bit more about me and offered me the opportunity to call him which I politely declined. Naturally I gave David a brief summary of who I was, my interests and my background as was and is polite to do when opening a discussion. I also cited a few books; in my reply of May the 11th, I thought David might have read (to pique his interest) considering they are well known and have often been read (and are oft cited) by many learned religious Jews and/or Rabbis alike; Max I. Dimont's; '*The Indestructible Jews*' & '*Jews, God and History*', and John Loftus' & Mark Aaron's '*The Secret War Against The Jews*'. To which David replied to my surprise that he had not read them; although as Cornelius informed me when I queried him about this David stated to him that he was against reading secular literature for Torah observant Jews because they require nothing but the Torah, the Talmud and the Cabbala.

David Eidensohn and Secularism

It is worth pointing out that David has read some secular literature recently in the form of Bernard Lewis [himself a Jew] as per his email to me on the 20th of May where he states as follows: '*Europe according to Bernard Lewis and others will be Moslem, populated by "other races" in a few generations.*' Which although the actual work is not cited the context suggests that he has taken it from one or both of the prolific Lewis' more recent books; '*What went wrong? The Clash between Islam and Modernity in the Middle East*' and '*The Crisis of Islam: Holy War and Unholy Terror*'. Now unless David has been reading some secular literature (or perhaps a newspaper article by Lewis) he would not have been able to state that with confidence; since he did not state it is as hearsay but rather as something he himself was familiar with. Or perhaps my friend's explanation to me was incorrect but this later suggestion seems unlikely given that throughout our conversation David evinced a singular distaste; perhaps even borderline 'hatred', for what he calls secularism.

This borderline hatred is rather well demonstrated on David's website when under the tab; '*Religious Hatred*', which links to a short article in response to something written by Rev. Ted Pike; David does not specify which article or reproduce or link to, he has added in a column on the right hand side of the screen with some snippets of his thought. Within this column we find the following paragraph presumably written by David: '*The haters like Rev. Pike empower*

Hollywood and filth by making people realize that religion means hate and destruction. Better secular filth in Hollywood than the Hundred Years War. That is how people think. Now the use of 'secular filth' indicates that David has some kind of borderline hatred or severe distaste for secular work in general. That David also distinguishes between 'Hollywood' and 'filth' in the earlier part of the paragraph is also interesting because it indicates that David does not see Hollywood as the only source of 'filth' and that 'filth' is another entity; perhaps the non-judaized goyim, which David's above quoted comments seem to suggest he is also opposed to. What David's thoughts about the goyim are we shall come to later and they will perhaps upset and shock but I believe they are educational to the non-jewish reader at the most fundamental of levels.

David and History

David's conception of history as you might have noticed from the above quotation from his website; Jewhaters.com, which states '*Better secular filth in Hollywood than the Hundred Years War*' is a little fuzzy at best; likely due to David's avowed borderline hatred of secularism and therefore secular literature. David's meaning in the aforementioned statement is made clear by citing his comment directly above the above quotation. In this he states as follows: '*Western civilization was almost destroyed by the Christian idea of eradicating heretics, and those who remained in Europe after the Hundred Years War resolved never to let religion have power in government to promote religious beliefs. This created secularism, a tenet created by deeply religious people to save the world from constant religious hate and killing*'. What David is in fact likely thinking of here is the Thirty years war; some two hundred years later, which can if viewed superficially be taken as a wholly religious conflict but rather is best viewed as a struggle between Germanic and Latin influence with economic, palatial, social and Jewish influences thrown into the witch's brew.

The Hundred Years War that David cites was simply the name given to a series of wars between the Monarchs of England and France over the throne of France and whether the English King as Duke of Aquitaine would have to pay homage to the French King or not. There was no religious angle and the devastation caused by the war pales in comparison to that of the Thirty years war which followed the Reformation.

Perhaps it is not right to blame him too much for this as we have already covered in this essay he seems to have a certain something against secularism and in particular secular literature but if David is to '*debate haters*' in his words then we ought to expect something of an accurate grasp of general history. I was puzzled when I first noticed this as I had expected David to have at least such a grasp of such history; both as a learned Jew and a Rabbi expected to instruct his congregation since if he was to discuss Jewish history with me he should have a good idea as to the context in which it occurred. Since most of what can be accurately, rather than presumptuously, recorded as Jewish history places a significant, both in terms of numbers and the various types of influence, if not a majority portion of it within the boundaries of the continent of Europe.

But perhaps; I thought, I should give David the benefit of the doubt since he must be so dedicated to his study of the Torah, the Talmud and the Cabbala that he has little time for

anything else and in a separate note from our discussion that I sent on the 13th of May I sent him some general corrections to the comments on the column of comments thus referred to on the 'Religious Hatred' tab of jewhatters.com. Since I desperately wanted to give David the benefit of the doubt I suggested that he might not have written the above and perhaps had had time to read over what had been written under his name; perhaps by another less intellectually honest or just plain mistaken Jew. When I asked the following in the same note to him on the 13th of May: *'I don't know if you wrote the above; but if you did I must ask you to please explain yourself (since it is hypocritical and what you say is factually specious).'* It was as much a case of surprise as it was a deliberate attempt on my part to pique some form of specific factual discussion from David that motivated me to write those words in all innocence to him.

David's response is perhaps quite surprising for somebody who makes a point of advertising himself on his website as intellectually honest when he instead of either admitting it was a mistake, taking the opportunity for blaming a nameless other that I had offered him or stating that what he written was correct in his opinion and offering even a cursory rationale for such statements, he began making excuses for himself. David's reply to me on the 19th of May stated as follows:

'Essentially, I can answer your questions, and I can consider your consequent questions. But I can't put that much time and energy into it, and I can't match you with tennis playing when you want sources for this or for that.'

What David didn't do here is address anything I had said and began offering bad excuses for not being able to *'answer my questions'* when he had agreed to such a discussion in the first place. He offered no defence and no rationale for what he wrote only conceding *'you may be right'* slightly further down in his reply but then adding a *'but...'* with a few other excuses about *'not having time'* and *'being old'*. I offered that David should perhaps take some time off and rest; I also suggested that he take sometime in replying to me, as I told him in my reply I was not going anywhere and would be quite happy to wait sometime before receiving a reply from. As I explained to him I also had to make time in my busy schedule to answer him to which David responded that *'perhaps I [i.e. the present author] was right'* but *'he couldn't do'* what I suggested.

This is perhaps symptomatic of David's personal stubbornness which to his credit is an excellent characteristic when debating theology and the letter of the legal interpretation of the Torah as well as the most esoteric doctrines of the Cabala. However when debating a topic in terms of the 'secular' world such as history it is a rather annoying and self-defeating personal characteristic which allows an opponent to just sit on his bottom and state that because he believes you are wrong then you are indeed so.

Considering that David considers; or more correctly markets, himself as such I was very disappointed that he did not do something other than make such remarks because he had led me to believe that he was able and willing to enter such correspondence. If he was *'too old'* or *'had little time'* then why does David openly market himself on jewhatters.com as soliciting such correspondence? To do so while knowing he has *'little time'* and is *'feeling his age'* is a surely close to false advertising since David is advertising something he is not able to deliver.

It is worth noting David's phrase in the above quoted passage: *'I can't match you with tennis playing when you want sources for this and that'*, because it underlines what I have to come consider the extent and accuracy [or lack thereof] of David's historical knowledge. In this I can state with some confidence that David's knowledge in regards to history seems not to be based on 'secular learning'; which he refers to metaphorically as 'tennis playing', but rather 'everybody knows that' and hear say. It would seem to confirm my friend's statement that David does not engage the secular literature; although we have seen he may have read Bernard Lewis, but apart from that he seems blissfully unaware of any but vague historical facts.

David and the 'Holocaust'

This vague awareness of historical facts and the course of history in general; as well as David's apparent heavy reliance on hear say, is really brought to the fore when the subject of the 'holocaust' was broached by him. It is of note before we continue that when David brought up the subject that I had vaguely referred to it as an example of jewish perfidy in passing and stated that it was a piece of atrocity propaganda but nothing beyond a few lines in my often lengthy responses to David. David immediately on bringing up the subject of the 'holocaust'; or the supposed industrial murder of six million jews mainly by the use of gas, personalised it by informing me how his wife's mother as he himself put it; his mother-in-law in more correct parlance, had been 'murdered by Nazis' and how could I adhere to an ideology that did that to his mother-in-law.

My response was perhaps a little more emotional than I would have liked because of my own very personal connections to the 'holocaust' but I asked David in a somewhat lengthy answer to provide proof of what he was alleging. I stated to him that because the 'holocaust survivors' could not provide a coherent story and that no 'homicidally gassed jew' has ever been successfully evidenced or even traced without a substantial leap of assumption about the 'how did it happen' of their death and that there has never been evidenced intent of the 'Nazis' for even planning let alone carrying out such a program. I pointed out to David; with a little emotion, that if he did not have proof that his mother-in-law was indeed *'murdered by the Nazis'* then he should not go say so because to do so was a foul libel against the entire Germanic folk and Europe in general.

David seemed to have pulled out and immediately personalised the alleged 'holocaust' as a tool to make me as an individual Aryan; and a National Socialist to boot, feel some compassion for him as I had told him in an earlier reply as stated above that I did not mind if he took a few days to answer my replies and that I would rather he got down to hard factual discussion rather than muddling around in 'what I thought'.

Throughout our admittedly brief discussion on the 'holocaust'; David, consistently personalised everything I said. Stating in his reply of May the 21st that; *'When I suggest to you that your kind are murderers, and that my wife's mother was killed by them, you respond that this is a lie. That's it.'* This indicates that David is unwilling and potentially unable to engage in a civil and factual discussion of the 'holocaust' since because I am a National Socialist I am responsible for his mother-in-law's supposed death in a concentration camp. What he is in fact responding to

here I shall quote at length because it will serve to show the reader how unrelated to my own response to his bringing his 'wife's mother' into our discussion the above is.

I stated as follows to him in my note of May the 20th:

'What did 'thousands of people see'? No; I am serious, I've interrogated 'holocaust survivors' before and unless you can present something new it is a load of old cosh. I've even had some admit to me the 'holocaust' is a fable; because they have no argument to the truth of the matter; probably some of those you are quoting en mass btw. Why you ask? Alright; let's get down to basics here. How do you know they saw what they saw? I'll tell you very briefly and concisely how I know they didn't:

A) All the 'witness' testimony does not tally with each other. The only way to make it even remotely fit a coherent timeline is pick and choose according to a pre-determined thesis. That is not scholarly in the slightest. This is also usually hear-say since if you get down to the bone of it most 'survivors' will say 'they heard it from fellow camp mates' and so forth. Others will say they saw physically impossible things; like a jewess leaping several feet of barbed wire naked (cf. Yankel Wiernik for just one prominent example); which by the way has been endorsed as 'decisive testimony' by none-other than our resident letter bomb advocate and 'holocaust scholar' 'Dr.' Ephraim Zuroff of the SWC.

Know that for instance that the first of Revisionists was a French Communist deputy (and chemistry lecturer) who had been imprisoned in Buchenwald for his activities in the French (i.e. the Communist) resistance. He called the jews on their experiences there and pointed out what a load of codswallop it was and he devoted himself to fighting the atrocity propaganda lies (which the jews had been circulating since '33 although they have their modern origins in 1880's Russia).

B) The testimony extracted (usually via torture; as noted by several American judges at the time) from SS men (and women) does not tally with each other (although more so than the 'caust survivors). The only way to make it do so is to pick and choose according to a pre-determined idea.

C) The methods of killing (with the exception of mass shootings) are physically impossible; even in the 'scholarly' works like Arad, Hilberg, Gilbert, Davidowicz, Toland, Reitlinger and so forth the methods are wrong, the dimensions are wrong, the figures don't add up, sometimes unwarranted assumptions are made etc. What about the steam chambers of Treblinka? What about the mass electric shocks of Belzec? What about the gas chamber of Dachau? What about the 'soap' made from 'jewish fat'? What about jewesses 'used as kindling because they burn better'? They are all the International Military Tribunal Proceedings; if you would care to dig out the many volumes and peruse them yourself.

Do you believe we did the physically (and still now) impossible?

D) There is no coherent methodology; no structure to these supposed killings despite the fact that the Reich was supposed to have just that in place. There is not even a Fuhrer order/directive

(which would have been necessary for such a program even under the auspices of the SS); the current 'opinion' as per Dwork and van der Pelt (as well as Overy and so forth) is that there was 'a remarkable meeting of minds'. I mean come on; anybody who knows anything about the SS knows that they were intensely and rigidly organised; even with their loose organisations such as the Ahernerbe (Ancestral Research) division.

E) There has been no 'gassed body' found; ever. Certainly not one in any of the 'archaeological reports' and various small scale digs they've done over the years (of which there's only been 3-4 serious ones on even this scale). There's been lots of photos (largely taken by the SS btw; and why the hell would the SS photograph something so important to keep secret if they had something to hide; which is the standard story) of emasculated corpses; but then the prisoners coming into say Auschwitz look quite well fed by comparison. The reason for this discrepancy is a simple one; the photos are of typhus and starvation cases which happened late in the war (although typhus raged throughout the mid-late war years; and was the reason for the transit camps [Treblinka, Belzec and Sobibor] and the shower blocks they contained since one has to delouse typhus carriers with de-contamination showers [which is all a critical reading of the 'witnesses' should tell you]. Simply put its a lie; why was it kept on a lie because it provided a justification for the war which was deliberately started by France and Britain (manipulating the Poles) which suited the jews and to a lesser extent the Soviet union (which was more interested in the general rather than specific 'crimes' of 'fascism').'

In the above I have made a very general; and in some places woolly, case for why his 'wife's mother' was not 'murdered by the Nazis' as part of any 'holocaust' and that his further personalisation of 'people he knows' seeing it/having had family members die in such an event is highly unlikely. Unfortunately; as you can see from my writing it is an emotional subject for me and perhaps I did get a little polemical because of the implications of and the use that the alleged 'holocaust' has been put to. David however translated what I had written above into a neat few sentences [as cited above]; *'you respond that this is a lie. That's it.'*

With this David did not even attempt to respond to an intellectually honest series of statements to him; which rather disappointed me as somebody who had advertised himself as *'intellectually honest'* and willing to *'take on all-comers'*, and then he even proceeded to accuse me; which any reader can see is clearly not so, of just dismissing his wife's mother's martyrdom; and as I learnt in his reply of May the 22nd his wife's experiences, as so much old rubbish. In fact; what I had asked David to do in my response to him on May the 21st and my response to his accusation; quoted above, that I was just 'dismissing' his wife's mother's [and his wife's] experiences, was that he should prove to me [or offer me some kind of evidence that this was so] that his wife's mother had been 'murdered by the Nazis' as he put it. David declined to do this in his final response to me on the 22nd of May and declared before he broke off contact that; *'You just want to dump on me and my lying wife and her lying parents and all of the thousands of lying Jews who were there long before you were born and brilliantly invented a new reality.'*

I asked him nothing offensive other than he ought to prove his case or admit he was libelling the Germanic and European folk with the death of his 'wife's mother' and what we can only assume his wife believes she went through. He advertised himself for discussion with people who hold critical views of jews suggesting that one can *'say what you want'* to him and he will counter it

with intellectually honesty and rigour. Not only have we discovered that David is badly informed but that he bluntly refuses; in my case at least, to have a reasoned factual debate about an event to which he is emotionally involved; thus I can only suggest that David is engaging in false advertising so that when a individual comes along who challenges some of his key assumptions about life and history he resorts to dismissing them out of hand without even saying really why.

One of David's key assumptions here that the 'holocaust' issue appears to touch on is that 'Nazis are evil' and 'jews are good'; it is true that I could be said to hold a similar view in opposition to this but my views as anybody of my close acquaintance will testify are far more complex than that dichotomy with an application of shades of grey as well as defining what 'good' and 'evil' are in my racial view.

David and the Nazis

I think it is fair to say that David hates 'Nazis'; but perhaps more correctly David hates Nazis who defy the 'Nazi mould' so-to-speak that is the image of the Third Reich, the National Socialist German Workers Party and National Socialism in general. David declared several times in our encounter that he did not understand me and how he wished to 'understand me' before we go into the factual side of the debate. I perhaps naively obliged him as far as I felt it possible to go but then after taking a break for the weekend; which David took for the express purpose of beginning our factual discussion, he came back with the following on his note to me of the 19th of May:

- '1) Are you a Nazi?*
- 2) Would you kill a Jew if you could get away with it?*
- 3) Do you feel the world needs to physically eradicate Jews?*
- 4) Are you saddened at Hitler's failure?*
- 5) Would you have preferred Hitler to succeed?*
- 6) Would you have fought for Hitler against England?*
- 7) Would you have served Hitler by killing Jews?'*

I was rather shocked and saddened by such a response when David had informed me that he would be ready to begin work on a discussion that would be published on jewhatters.com and then by a close friend on her blog. To ask me a series of questions such as this and then after I had politely responded to them out of courtesy to state that he did not want to talk anymore because I wanted to '*crap all over him*' to paraphrase his expressions I found to be profoundly insulting and not in line with what his website had lead me to believe about him.

I am sad to report that David's foul statements did not end there and in his last note to me; after I had offered him the opportunity to re-begin our discussion ignoring our previous discussion about his views and mine. In his last note to me on the 22nd of May David declared as follows: '*Next time your kind start up, and you will, we will castrate the lucky ones. There is no other solution.*' This is not a statement that one would expect from a Rabbi who is has website to in his words '*reply to hate*' since he is threatening that when 'my kind'; which should be read as gentiles who question whether the jews are really such wonderful creatures, with physical violence which would seem to stem from his own personal feelings; perhaps hatred, for those

who don't particularly like jews as a racio-ethnic group. This comment from David seems to have been intended to end our discussion; which he remember solicited but that I began, to have, with the jist of the mail being what could be classed as a polite piece of 'hate mail'. Please remember that David solicits mail 'from haters' and 'open intellectual discussion' but he himself has quite an open hatred of those who he seeks to reply to. I think on this basis we can conclude that David is the worst form of hypocrite and should be exposed as such.

To Conclude

Having discussed just some of the issues that occurred in my encounter with David I think it is appropriate to sum up by stating I don't have any particular interest in raking David through the mud but I could not let his commentary exist solely in the private domain because of its value in illuminating the personal attitude and bias of an oft-quoted Torah scholar towards those gentiles whom he consider to be his enemies. David's comments and his encounter with me now stand in the public domain for all to see.

Of New York and Tel Aviv: Some Comments on the Understanding of Jews

Sunday, 29 June 2008

International jewry; so called, is often imagined as a conspiracy originating from Israel sending out its tendrils to the United States and Europe in the form of jewish organisations; such as AIPAC in the United States[1] and CIOI/LFOI in the United Kingdom[2]. Included in these tendrils are jews themselves; which are often thought to be essentially inline with Israeli policy and because they are jews and Israel is the jewish state to be part of an organised attempt at jewry to exercise influence over the gentile world. In effect Tel Aviv; or if you put special emphasis on the religious aspect of post-Israel Zionism Jerusalem, is the capital of international jewry and this where one finds the nerve centre of jewish power. New York in this conception is merely the centre of these tendrils where the jews of the world exercise a considerable portion of their influence in the economic, intellectual, social and entertainment arenas. This takes Israel and suggests that it in fact is the centre of the jewish world; so that therefore jewry becomes indelibly linked with Zionism because what is Zionist is assumed to be what is good for Israel.

However this is a serious mistake for anyone to make; jewry does not operate for Zionist purposes alone but rather operates for what is best for jews[3]. If we are to assume that jews are Zionists in the main; we would be currently correct, but what is forgotten here-in is that jews are not equal in their abilities or their influence over each other[4]. Very few jews within jewry have significant influence but that influence is directed towards acting in what the individual jew, informal group or formal organisation believes to be the best interest of the jews as a whole group. This can rather callously mean; as it did in World War two era Zionist circles, that if one sacrifices a few million jews for the betterment of jewry as a whole as well as that jews should be integrated into the body of the host nation so as to disappear. This influence is exercised in various ways but the most common form is jewish propaganda in various forms towards the groups goal; the current fashion being Zionism but there are other non-Zionist groups who behave a similar fashion. This propaganda is often mistakenly thought to be targeted at gentiles

in the main; however in actuality, it is largely targeted at jews[5] and those who consider themselves especially friendly to the jewish and/or the Zionist cause.

This begs the obvious question why would jewish individuals, informal groups and formal organisations target their own people for their propaganda more so than the gentiles whom are far more numerous. The simple truism herein is that jews are well aware of their the scale and potency of their own people's considerable influence, capital and opinion-forming capabilities. The reason these groups target their own people is because jews are not natural Zionists but rather within the jewish community as with any economic situation there is infinite wants and finite resources to fulfil those wants. Jews have to compete with other jews to gain the finite resources on offer to jewry and in order to do that they must sell their philosophy for the betterment of jewry to as many jews as possible. They; of course, especially target authority figures within the jewish community as well as any non-jewish figures who have shown a special interest and proclivity to assisting and working with the jews to the general benefit of the jewish community.

The Zionist jews; you will note, had considerably more problems gaining resources prior to the formation of the State of Israel and until the six day war of 1967 the jewish state had considerable difficulties in pooling the clout of international jewry behind it[6]. This was partly due to the considerable divide within jewry between the three major warring strategies for doing what was best for the jews. Those three ideologies were Communism[7], Zionism and the continued Religious Diaspora[8]; Zionism as we are retrospectively aware won the day but it took the considerable and streamlined weight of the Zionist movement's individuals, informal groups and formal organisations to achieve this combined with historical events to give it the opportunity for victory.

It is commonly assumed as I have stated above that Israel uses these jews of the Diaspora as her agents and that they are serving Israel's interests primarily. While this as I've argued is true to an extent; it is only applicable to die hard jewish supporters of Israel who do currently dominate the major jewish organisations and the chief Rabbinate across the globe, but the majority of jews are far less enthralled with Israel and only support Israel because of their endemic ethnocentrism and the considerable Israeli effort to convince Diaspora jewry of the moral rectitude of their cause[9]. The average jew or jewess in say Brooklyn, New York does not know very much about Israel beyond the history purported by Israeli and jewish [i.e. what jews consider to be authoritative] sources and if their local and/or national authority figure[10] such as say their local Rabbi talks of the necessity of helping Israel as part of the process of tikkun olam[11] as well as performing a mitzvah[12].

Thus the problem we deal with when we speak of international jewry is not one of an organised conspiracy generally on behalf of Israel but rather a situation where jewish individuals, informal groups and formal organisations are trying to sell their fellow jews their vision for the future of jewry. The underlying truism there-in is that jews think about what is best for jews and that does not necessarily equate that best solution being Israel.

This leads us onto to consider the relationship between Israel and the jewish; particularly the North American, Diaspora. When Israeli Prime Minister Olmert said this year; 2008, that

‘situation in which Diaspora Jews are the philanthropists and Israel is the recipient cannot continue.’[13] He was expressing a concern that many of predecessors in the position of Israeli Prime Minister and President have openly stated. That concern is that Israel is extremely reliant on its Diaspora to protect and support it and that there are strategic concerns within the Israeli establishment that they will not be able to garner this support forever regardless of how effective their pro-Israel organisations are[14]. To this end Israel and some of its die hard supporters in the United States have sought to utilize any and all means at their disposal to break Israel’s dependence on its Diaspora and to make it a viable state in its own right.

This further supports the thesis I have suggested above which asserts that Zionism is not the be and end all of jewish power. More than that there is the very real possibility that jews; in the Diaspora, will abandon Israel at some point as liability to the future interests of jewry. This has become more poignant as traditional allies of the jews; the Socialist Left, began to turn on the jews of Israel under considerable influence from the then existent USSR[15] which accused the jews not unjustly of imperialism, fascism and double standards. This Leftist opposition to ‘Zionism’ has continued and grown considerably to the present time and this has left many jews; especially those heavily involved in supporting Israel, fearing for Israel’s future and also that this hostility to Israel may be overlapping into ‘anti-Semitism’[16].

This fear for Israel’s future demonstrates rather well that international jewry; so called, is not unified nor monolithic in its construction but rather is made up of a wide variety of individuals, informal groups and formal organisations who have varying stances about what is good for jews and that these stances are not universally pro-Israel. The fundamental thing that unites these groups; and has united jews historically, is the position that they must serve jewish interests first and other interests second. This can involve jews taking a very pragmatic view of a given situation and throwing some of their fellow jews to the wolves so that the higher quality or more jews [depending on the logic employed and the functional ideology of the individual/group/organisation concerned] can survive and prosper.

Prime Minister Olmert’s comments also bring up a very pertinent reality of jewish cooperation and power world wide in that there is a deep split between those jews in Israel and those jews in the Diaspora. This highlights the fact that when one takes a more macro; or higher level, view of the situation within international jewry; so called, one finds that it is in fact a partnership of two general blocs. Those jews in Israel and those jews not in Israel. The most powerful sub-bloc of jews are those in North America whom have their capital in New York; which is a city largely run by jews[17] for jews[18]. Olmert’s comments reveal the unsuspected reality that in fact the Diaspora is the more senior of the two blocs within jewry and that Israel has to go cup-in-hand to the Diaspora to get the needed assistance from the jewish power structures that can marshal the needed resources to give or get Israel what it wants or needs within reasonable bounds[19].

But the Israelis have to compete with other jewish organisations for attention, endorsements, capital and resources and there are certainly many jewish organisations; such as Jewish Family Services in New York[20] or Jewish Care in the United Kingdom[21] [to give two well known examples], for this. They have to sell these to these powerful jews on a regular basis their vision of a better world for jewry and argue why Israel is so necessary to the jewish future. After all if Israel is not going to benefit jews in the present and the future why should jewish philanthropists

support it?

By focusing on 'Zionism' and Zionist jews rather than understanding that what Zionist jews have at heart is what is best for jews; which is almost de rigeur negative for another group, those who are opposed to jews and/or Zionists are allowing their opponent to sneak under the radar and come back with a new pro-jewish strategy. It should go without saying that people should be less focused on what is going on in Tel Aviv and more about what is going on inside the jewish community of New York.

So in a manner of speaking you could say that the learned elders of Zion don't reside in Tel Aviv but rather in New York City; and holiday in the Catskills and to a lesser extent in Israel.

[1] AIPAC or the American Israel Political Action Committee (<http://www.aipac.org/>) is but the best known of a considerable web of jewish organisation primarily quartered in North America; often given innocuous names, which exist to further jewish; sometimes explicitly Zionist and sometimes not, power in the United States. Other organisations which fall under this broad umbrella include the AJC or American Jewish Committee (<http://www.ajc.org/>), the ADL or Anti-Defamation League (<http://www.adl.org/>), WJC or World Jewish Congress (<http://www.worldjewishcongress.org/>), the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organisations (<http://www.conferenceofpresidents.org/>), the NJDC or National Jewish Democratic Council (<http://www.njdc.org/>) and the RJC or Republican Jewish Coalition (<http://www.rjchq.org/>) to name some of the better known ones.

[2] CFOI/LFOI or the Conservative Friends of Israel (<http://www.cfoi.co.uk/>) and the Labour Friends of Israel (<http://www.lfi.org.uk/>) respectively serve the same purpose as the Republican Jewish Coalition and National Jewish Democratic Council do in the United States. They operate with the elected and unelected structures of government to secure support for Israel and jews in general. The United Kingdom also has its own system of jewish organisations; an example of which is the CST or Community Security Trust (<http://www.thecst.org.uk/>) which has the same function in Britain as the Anti-Defamation League has in the United States, which seek to advance jewish interests within the United Kingdom; these interests are often highly ethnocentric to jews and indeed are often deleterious to British interest both at home and abroad.

[3] The ethnocentrism of jews was admirably; if somewhat inaccurately, covered by Kevin MacDonald in his excellent trilogy on the subject of jews and their psychology as an evolutionary group or race. It is best that one reads all three of MacDonald's books in succession; '*A People That Shall Dwell Alone: Judaism as a Group Evolutionary Strategy, with Diaspora Peoples*' (1994), '*Separation and Its Discontents: Toward an Evolutionary Theory of Anti-Semitism*' (1998) and '*The Culture of Critique: An Evolutionary Analysis of Jewish Involvement in Twentieth-Century Intellectual and Political Movements*' (1998) respectively, rather than the simply reading the best known; '*The Culture of Critique*', on its own.

[4] This is an unfortunate assumption that was adopted into the anti-jewish canon on the idea that all jews are equally evil and that there is fairly little to distinguish between them. This likely originates in both the Aryan [Catholic/Protestant] and Slavic [Greek Orthodox] Christian conception of the jew as a creature who has to be and in some theology cannot be saved from his or her errors. Jews are however very racially stratified and have a strict intra-group discipline which was and still is to a lesser degree illustrated by the Rabbinical tyranny that has ruled/ruled the majority of jews for millennia. The lower strata of jew; which forms the clear bulk of the

jewish population historically and in present times, tend to follow where their authority figures lead; although they do act with equal arrogance in dealing with gentiles since if one is of the Chosen of Ha-Shem [i.e. a jew] then one is still far superior to some goyische gentile.

[5] This is partially why the 'holocaust' is invoked so much; although it is a powerful weapon against gentiles, its use by jews on fellow jews is one emphasising the 'never again!' aspect by comparing Israel to being in the position of being the supposedly harmless often vicious attacked victim of amalek and asking their fellow jews why they remain silent about the 'plight of Israel' just as they supposedly did when six million jews were supposedly exterminated in 'gas chambers' in Eastern Europe.

[6] For more information about this please see Howard Sachar's *A History of Israel: From the Rise of Zionism to Our Time* (Revised Edition: 2007) and Martin Gilbert's *Israel: A History* (1998). For a more critical understanding of the events surrounding Israel's early years please see Norman Finkelstein's *The Holocaust Industry: Reflections on the Exploitation of Jewish Suffering* (2003).

[7] Communism began to go out of fashion among jewry after the 'doctor's plot' in the then Stalinist Soviet Union which assailed 'rootless cosmopolitans'; which was a pseudonym for jews in the Communist party and positions of authority. It did indeed have many jewish adherents outside the Soviet Union but this seems to have largely been a carry over from the early jewish enthusiasm for Communism as a jewish intellectual movement and a way to find a better future; ostensibly free of 'anti-Semitism', for the jews by letting themselves be absorbed as proletarians and 'professional revolutionists'. Jews and Communism is a very complicated subject however and one we will come back to here on Semitic Controversies.

[8] This was the conservative ideology of the time and only with the changing of the Rabbinate in the 1960's did many jewish Rabbis begin to openly endorse Zionism and Israel; while the older Rabbi's bred and brought up in the Diaspora continued to oppose it. One of the few Rabbi's who went against this trend was the extreme Rabbi Abraham Kook; who was Ashkenazi Chief Rabbi of Palestine from 1921 to his death in 1935, who laid the spiritual and religious foundations for the Israeli 'right wing'.

[9] An analysis of the propaganda and how it appeals to jews is one of the projects that is being currently undertaken here at Semitic Controversies. We hope to be able to post this for our readers in the near future; since it is an important area of the mechanics of jewish power; and the network of jewish communities in general, to explore and begin a conversation between interested parties on.

[10] Jewish society; especially that with a religious aspect, is built upon patrimony with the religious leadership of the community; the Beth Din, as the supreme authority which decides on all matters pertaining to the community from the 'Get' (or jewish divorce) to deciding whether the community is to show allegiance to Israel as the jewish state.

[11] Translated 'Repairing the world' which is a phrase found in both Judaism and secular jewish culture. It means that jews have a duty as jews to help lead the world into a better tomorrow; because as the Chosen of Ha-Shem they are required to guide the nations to believing in Ha-Shem and venerating those he has supposedly sent as his messengers and the keepers of the Torah [or law]; the jews. This phrase has been invoked by many jews in support of vastly differing causes from Communism to religious Zionism; it offers a universal underlying characteristic of jewish culture and how jews fundamentally reason and think.

[12] This means 'Commandment' but has colloquially come to mean 'Good deed' as well. It is part of Judaism and indeed part of jewish culture in general that one should be good unto one's

fellow jews but the mitzvah assumes a more cynical disposition around gentiles when one does a 'good deed' for a reason rather than because it would please Ha-Shem.

[13] Quoted in Anshel Pfeffer's article in Haaretz ; *'PM seeks to redefine Israel-Diaspora relations'*. Retrieved 29/06/08 from <http://www.haaretz.com/hasen/spages/995182.html>.

[14] This underlying fear is best expressed in the work of pro-Israel authors on the subject of the 'new anti-Semitism' where jews attack the considerable anti-Zionist movement as being 'anti-Semitic' in order to prevent both what they see as the potential backlash of the nations against Israel for its actions and the jewish Diaspora severing most; if not all, of its support for Israel which would inevitably result in Israel's destruction.

[15] The Soviet Union or USSR began after the reign of Stalin to become more anti-Israel and old Slavic anti-jewish themes were exploited in the language of Marxist jargon; despite a brief flirtation with the idea of Israel being in the Soviet rather than the American orbit which was rudely disappointed by election results in Israel. These themes were translated to the pro-Soviet left who then in turn translated them to the anti-Soviet Left combining with the natural European sympathy for the underdog and the oppressed (which is especially prevalent in those of the Socialist left whose political ideology is devoted to bringing in a government of the 'oppressed proletariat' to supplant the supposed bourgeoisie).

[16] If this indeed so; and if it is it would be the minority of cases, then it is entirely the fault of the jews and their gentile supporters themselves who have repeatedly smeared, libelled and attempted to silence (sometimes successfully and sometimes not) critics of Israel by a variety of methods including undermining their careers, declaring them to be copying 'anti-Semitic/Neo-Nazi hate sites', libelling them as 'anti-Semites' in the mass media [without the ability to reply to the same audience] and organising jewish campaigns against them either at their places of employment or family home.

[17] Until very recently both the Mayor of New York City; Michael Bloomberg, and the Governor of New York State; Elliot Spitzer, were both jewish. The jewish influence in New York is certainly not relegated to the few higher posts but rather is largely endemic throughout the entire official bureaucracy there-in.

[18] To quote a jewess overheard by a contributor to Semitic Controversies; *'Why bother moving to Israel? We've got a jew governor and a jew mayor; it is just like Israel.'* However an analysis of the New York situation is on the cards here at Semitic Controversies as a case study in the use and abuse of jewish power.

[19] It is often argued by 'philo-Semitic' authors that the 'Jewish Lobby' and 'Israel Lobby' theses (they are two different; although related, positions) should have complete power over the United States for them to exist. Not only is this disingenuous it is also deliberately misstating the argument that jews and/or supporters of Israel have disproportionate power over the United States. The argument does not mean they are omnipotent by any means but rather than that they are very powerful; how they choose to use their power behind the scenes however can only be subject to careful speculation.

[20] The Jewish Board of Family and Children's Services operates a wide range of services for the sole benefit of jews in New York; it is a large and systematic operation which expends a considerable amount of capital and resources per year. Interested readers can find their website at the following address: <http://www.jbfcs.org/>.

[21] Jewish Care like the Jewish Board of Family and Children's Services described in n. 20 offers a support service to the jewish community; particularly caring for elderly jews and jewesses in the old capitol of the Diaspora; London. Interested readers can find their website at

the following address: <http://www.jewishcare.org/>.

Einstein: the poor student?

Sunday, 6 July 2008

One of the not so recent; yet continuously purported, myths about Albert Einstein concerns his allegedly poor scholastic endeavours[1]. You might recall the quite typical comment; in the context of not receiving good grades, that Einstein himself failed in mathematics.

As this article aims to prove these rumours and popularised references to him are found wanting. The common variants of the “poor student” myths; that Einstein failed math, and that he was a poor student, are popular misconceptions.

Let's start from the beginning. Einstein's interest in math and science began quite early in childhood: he built various kinds of mechanical devices and models for fun and quickly showed a gift for mathematics. By the age of twelve; he began to study geometry by himself and in his early teens; he also started to read a lot about general physics and most notably calculus. When Einstein was around fifteen years of age; he wrote his first work on science.[2] It was also around this time that he started his own work trying to unify the laws of physics into one explanatory field of theory, something he would spend the bulk of his life pursuing.

When he was nine, he entered the Luitpold-Gymnasium. By the age of twelve, as noted above, he was studying calculus. Studying calculus when you were twelve was highly advanced. Since the students who would normally study calculus were fifteen years old. He was very good at the sciences; though likely due to the 19th-century German education system being quite harsh and regimented, he didn't really develop his non-mathematical skills (for example; history, language, geography and music).

When Einstein was sixteen years old; he took the entrance exam to the prestigious Federal Polytechnic School in Zurich. He failed to pass the test; however he didn't fail on the scientific aspects of the test, but on the non-scientific ones such as language and history. It is important to note that this was a test in the French language; a language Einstein had not learned fluently, since this was in Switzerland he was not accepted. Furthermore, he was sixteen years old during this time, as opposed to the usual age of students taking it who were eighteen.

During Albert Einstein's life his family had to move around on several occasions, naturally resulting in periodical change of schools, even dropping out of school entirely for short periods. Thus with his comparable flaw in general languages, having to learn a new language (French) and then read, write and express himself using it, while deeply entrenched with his interest and private study of physics potentially overwhelmed him.[3]

A year later at age seventeen; Einstein took the entrance exam again and passed it this time. He was thus accepted into the Federal Polytechnic school in Zurich, while still being one year younger than his peers.

However, during the year when he studied French to increase his chances for entering the school in Zurich; he spent an intermediate year at a Swiss secondary school[4], from where he graduated in 1896, the same year he was able to enrol to the Zurich Polytechnic school.

How did the myth of Einstein's poor grades come about?

Well; in 1896 Einstein's last year at the school in Aargau, the school's system of marking/grading was reversed. So the grading of "6", which had previously been the lowest grade, was suddenly the highest mark. So vice versa; the grading of "1", that had been the highest grade, became the lowest mark.

Below is his transcript of his graduation diploma of 1896[5];

"The Board of Education of the Canton Aargau hereby certifies that Mr. Albert Einstein of Ulm, born on March 14, 1879, attended the Aargau Kantonsschule, namely the III and IV classes of the vocational school. After taking the written and oral school-leaving examination held on September 18, 19, 21 and 30, 1896, he received the following marks:

*German 5
Geometry 6
French 3
Descriptive Geometry 6
English -
Physics 6
Italian 5
Chemistry 5
History 6
Natural History 5
Geography 4
Artistic Drawing 4
Algebra 6
Technical Drawing 4"*

What if one would dismiss all of the above; how Einstein had excelled in maths, physics and even managed to get decent all-around grades? Well, one could restrict one's usage of the "poor student" claim to his (college) years at the Federal Polytechnic School in Zurich.

Would this suggestion hold more water for the premise that Einstein was a poor student?

It is no secret that his years at the school were anything but friction-free; Einstein was often in discussions and debates with some of his professors:

"Even as a teenager, Einstein had already developed a profound mistrust of authority. He questioned not only his teachers but also long-standing mathematical and scientific "givens," such as ancient Greek rules of geometry and laws of physics established by other scientists.

Ironically, Einstein's queries and resulting breakthroughs eventually turned him into an authority himself.” [6]

Einstein's doctoral advisor of physics at the University in Zurich was at first Pr. H.F Weber, though naturally they argued over Albert's ideas and where his work was heading so Einstein had to switch doctoral advisors. One thing which bothered Einstein was the fact that the works of James Clerk Maxwell[7] wasn't included, and Maxwell was "the man" of physics in those times. It's as if you attended college astrophysics class today with no mention whatsoever of Hawking's or George Smoot's works.

One of Einstein's classmates (Louis Kollros) noted the following about Weber's omission of Maxwell's work;

“His lectures were outstanding and a magnificent introduction to theoretical physics, but Weber ... was a typical representative of classical physics. Anything that came after Helmholtz was simply ignored. At the close of our studies we knew all the past of physics but nothing of their present or future” [8]

It is worth noting that Einstein wanting nothing more than to work on the contemporary problems that heckled the scientific world of those times. He wanted to pursue the quest which he had started on several years earlier; unifying the fields of physics under one coherent theory, not becoming an outstanding academic example for status and respect, as he had a profound mistrust for authority aligned with slight skepticism of academics. His new doctoral advisor was Alfred Kleiner, with whom Einstein decided not to pursue the similar tone of stubbornness or challenge.

In *“Einstein: A Life”* Denis Brian writes;

“October 1900. Albert wants to get a Ph.D., but not until 1909 did ETH begin offering doctoral degrees. In the meantime, a special arrangement allowed ETH students to obtain doctorates from the University of Zurich. However, in 1900 theoretical physics was only beginning to be recognized as an independent discipline in German-speaking universities. That status and the fact that university professors customarily assigned a dissertation topic presented a bit of a problem for the theoretically and independently-minded Einstein. Nevertheless, the problems were overcome, and Albert proposed "the kinetic theory of gases" as the subject for his doctoral thesis. Professor Alfred Kleiner approved the proposal”. (Brian, Einstein: A Life, 1996, 28)

Einstein also continuously skipped the lectures; as he was more interested in reading about Maxwell in his spare time, spending time in the physics lab than going to lectures. Hence he asked his friend and future co-author Marcel Grossmann (who early on recognized Einstein to have been a brilliant and promising theoretical physicist) to take notes of what the lectures entailed; so that he might still somewhat keep up with the scholastic requirements for what was to be included on the upcoming tests. On the final exam, Einstein ended up on fourth place. Louis Kollros scored 60 points, Marcel Grossmann scored 57.5, Jakob Ehrat 56.5 and Albert Einstein scored 54.[9]

Now; one might consider this to be ample proof of Einstein having been a poor student, though it is important to recognize that his score was quite good over-all. Also that the other three students (Kollros, Grossmann and Ehrat) being between a year to two years older; had naturally studied more thoroughly as to what would be on the tests, which Einstein had neglected out of his interest in the more contemporary and at the time quite exciting problems in physics. Einstein clearly had neglected to cover and acquire the exams decided questions in favour of his own introverted pursuit of the answers to contemporary problems. So; whilst he didn't do the exam to come out as the top of his class, the end result was very respectable for someone who had missed out on most of the lectures that pertained to the exams.

Below is a brief presentation of papers written by Albert Einstein after he had graduated from the University of Zurich and published subsequently published in 1905 (a lot more papers followed these ones, however the list below only includes those from the given year).

In 1905, while Einstein was working at the patent office in Bern, he submitted a dissertation and received his doctorate/PhD from Prof. Kleiner on his thesis;

"Eine neue Bestimmung der Moleküldimensionen" (translated: *"A new determination of molecular dimensions"*).

During this time he also published four additional papers;

* *"On the Motion of Small Particles Suspended in Liquids at Rest Required by the Molecular-Kinetic Theory of Heat"*. [10]

This paper on Brownian motion is one which conclusively proved (along with the tests done by Jean Perrin [11]) the existence of atoms. Prior to this paper the existence of atoms was a matter of great dispute and doubt. As Einstein said himself on this paper; *"My major aim in this was to find facts which would guarantee as much as possible the existence of atoms of definite finite size"*. [12] Here-in, he established the existence and size of molecules.

Perrin received the Nobel Prize in physics (1926) for his work in testing the bold predictions of Einstein's Brownian motion thesis.

This was a ground-breaking paper, showing that Einstein wasn't simply a competent scientist of notable understanding, but also having a remarkable eye for the problems in theoretical physics and how they were to be solved.

* *"On the Electrodynamics of Moving Bodies"*. [13]

In this paper; Albert presented his take on relativity in the form of a special theory of relativity. It contained no actual bibliography of references to prior work on relativity (which had been numerous), it did however contain references to J.C Maxwell and Hertz and also contained reference to Lorentz (on the treatment of the electromagnetic field). [14]

* *"Does the Inertia of a Body Depend on its Energy Content?"* [15]

The three-pages short paper which is a continuance of his third paper (see footnote 11 on previous page). It contained his successful demonstration of using the $E=mc^2$ formula.

Excerpt thereof;

“I base that investigation on the Maxwell-Hertz equations for empty space, together with Maxwell's expression for the electromagnetic energy of space, and also the following principle: The laws according to which the states of physical systems change are independent of which one of the two coordinate systems (assumed to be in uniform parallel-transnational motion relative to each other) is used to describe these changes (the principle of relativity).”[16]

“On a Heuristic Point of View Concerning the Production and Transformation of Light” [17].

Here Einstein explains the physics behind his theory on the photoelectric effect; for which he received the Nobel Prize in 1921, demonstrating how light wasn't just electromagnetic wave (J.C Maxwell) but also a particle which he called “*light quanta*” (photon) and laid further ground for Quantum Theory.

The claim that Albert Einstein was a poor student; and this besides is otherwise in conflict with his scientific work, is as proven above demonstrably wrong. There is little basis of relevance or coherence in attempts made to turn Einstein's merits against him in the sense of them not having been good enough was he really a genius.

[1] Recent examples of this myth have been argued by Christopher Jon Bjerknes in his books; ‘*The Manufacture and Sale of Saint Einstein*’ [available at the following address: <http://www.jewishracism.com/SaintEinstein.htm>], ‘*Albert Einstein: The Incurable Plagiarist*’ [available at the following address: <http://home.comcast.net/~xtxinc/AEIPBook.htm>] and ‘*Anticipations of Einstein in the General Theory of Relativity*’ [available at the following address: <http://home.comcast.net/~xtxinc/AEGRBook.htm>].

[2] Albert Einstein, [The Investigation of the State of Aether in Magnetic Fields](#), 1895

[3] Folsing, Albrecht; “Albert Einstein: A Biography”, 1998

[4] Aargau Kantonsschule

[5] <http://www.amnh.org/exhibitions/einstein/life/popups/school.php>

[6] <http://www.amnh.org/exhibitions/einstein/life/early.php>

[7] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/James_Clerk_Maxwell

[8] Clark, R. W. Einstein: The Life and Times (1971, 34)

[9] Brian, D. 1996. Einstein: A Life

[10] http://www.math.princeton.edu/~mcmillen/molbio/papers/Einstein_diffusion1905.pdf

[11] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jean_Perrin

[12] <http://www.rhfleet.org/einstein/atoms.html>

[13] <http://www.fourmilab.ch/etexts/einstein/specrel/www/>

[14] <http://press.princeton.edu/catalogs/series/cpe.html>

[15] <http://dbserv.ihep.su/~elan/src/einstein05c/eng.pdf>

[16] Princeton University Press; “The Collected papers of Albert Einstein”

[17] <http://www.bun.kyoto-u.ac.jp/~suchii/Bohr/lightQ.html>

That Bane of Rationality: A Response to Revilo Oliver's 'Those Awful Protocols' (Part One)

Sunday, 6 July 2008

We do not here to seek discuss the exact historiography of the Protocols and have an in depth discussion of their origins; rather we will discuss Oliver's general comments there-in which stray outside of the realm of fact and into the realm of suggestion in order to confirm, clarify or reject them. Oliver's article would not normally be of notice[1] but that it is often used as educational material in primers on the Jews and the Jewish question. Hence I feel that a critical response is required since as Oliver himself appreciated; the jewish question is a very complex subject and arguments against and for jews should be treated with equal objectivity.

In 'Those Awful Protocols'[2] Oliver begins by summarising the history of the Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion; his summary is accurate if we excuse the rhetorical flushes that he makes about the destruction of the original copy by Kerensky[3]. However when we get to point 8 in Oliver's account of we find him straying from the factual path when he states that;

*'Ever since the first publication of the *Protocols* in a European language, the Sheenies have been yelping that they are a "forgery," i.e., not actually composed by Jews. That contention, of course, is, for all practical purposes, irrelevant. If we are given a map that purports to be taken from the London Times's great atlas, whereas it was compiled by someone else and is thus a forgery, all that will really matter to us is whether or not the map is accurate.'*

This is not a cogent argument in favour of the Protocols as what they are purported to be by Marsden and zum Beek among others. They are purported to be the minutes of a secret meeting among jews; likely the natural elite of the jewish race, discussing world domination. If indeed this is not the case; then the Protocols are not quite literally what they claim to be; regardless of whether this is considered the jewish position or not. They might indeed not be the minutes of such a meeting and equally they might be; but it is of high importance to their value if they are such a document.

What Oliver seems to suggest is that the Protocols power as a piece of anti-jewish propaganda is great and if viewed as such rather than the minutes of a meeting of high ranking jews; the actual authorship is irrelevant because the case against the jews therein is solid. This is a logical argument if you take as a presupposition that the Protocols is a small book expounding upon a theory of how jewish power operates, how it has worked in the past and how the author thinks it will work in the future.

However; this is not what the Protocols purports to be, was suggested as and still is not used as such by many of the anti-jewish authors who use them. Oliver is taking the Protocols out of its context to suggest that the authorship is *'for practical purposes, irrelevant'*. Since if a document claims to be something it is not then whatever we may esteem its other values to be; it lessens in its original value. Even if it acquires additional value in some other respect it is not what it purports itself to be regardless of what might one might wish to the contrary.

Oliver then goes on to state that;

*‘Whoever wrote the *Protocols* produced a minutely accurate description of the Jews’ conquest of the world by deceit. A cogent argument in favor of their authenticity is the obvious fact that they show an attitude towards *goyim* that is precisely that of the Babylonian Talmud and the authoritative epitome of it, Caro’s *Shulhan ‘Aruk*, Jewish scriptures of which no one can dispute the authenticity. (8)’*

This is not as Oliver would say; a cogent argument towards the Protocols’ authenticity but rather one against their being what they purport to be. It is simply not true to state that the language or logic used are the same because they are not. In the Jewish religious texts; including the Shulhan Arukh[4], the commentators are talking in quite a different far more circumspect manner which unless one has read; and more pointedly understood, the copious authoritative Rabbinical literature then one would more than likely miss the subtle use of double meanings and allegory involved in Jewish thought and written work to indicate the correct understanding to the Jewish reader[5].

The text of Protocols is stereotypically conspiratorial with additional irrelevant notes of how ‘the Goyim can stop us’; etc, with no attempt made to cover up the intended target or ideas. If one was to have such a meeting then one would not be so open about it in the first place and regardless of arrogance one is not so indiscreet as to record the precise minutes of such a meeting. The fact; in itself, that the text contains such allusions without the almost universal Jewish tendency to mask this in a cloak of allegory, legal language and double meanings is a point against its authenticity.

If Oliver was to compare the Protocols to Jewish theological texts (with the notable exception of the Torah) ; he would likely observe that Jewish religious writing; especially the Talmud, often takes the form of debates between noted Rabbinical authorities whom are deciding the correct interpretation of Jewish law. If one selects a quote from a particularly homicidal Rabbi but does not point out that said Rabbi’s thought is not the accepted interpretation in the text or the mainstream of Jewish tradition then one is guilty of selectively interpreting the evidence and creating a meaning and authority that it does not have within the text or the theology itself. .

Oliver is correct to an extent about the underlying attitude but; as we have noted, the texts are quite different both in structure and pattern of thought. What Oliver here seems to be suggesting is that when one looks at the thought behind the Talmud, Shulhan Arukh, Mishneh Torah etc and the Protocols then one sees the same underlying intellectual currents.

Now this would be indeed true if one believed such a work as ‘*The Talmud Unmasked*’ by Rev. Ignatius Pranaitis [6] since in a work of this type; the Jew is indeed a contemptible being who is only contemptuous of his Gentile; especially Christian, fellows. However; Pranaitis[7] himself is guilty of doing what I described above in terms of selective quotation and even more reprehensible; fabricating quotes from the Talmud to make the Jews into something that Gentiles; specifically Slavs, could understand as an enemy.

However; as we have discussed jewish theological thought is indeed quite different and by inferring that the thought and logic behind the Protocols is the same Oliver is making a gregarious misstatement but if we examine Pranaitis' style of writing and thought. We will note that there are similarities to that which Pranaitis suggests the jews say and think in their theological treatises and how the Protocols in fact suggest jews to think like. I suggest this since '*The Talmud Unmasked*' is a popular piece of source literature sometimes used in conjunction with the Protocols in older anti-jewish literature and even in more recent works of the same variety. If indeed the Protocols are a 'forgery' then we should expect to see parallels between the thought and logic used; since Pranaitis puts forward an image of the jew; super-imposed on jews[8], which is taken up in the Protocols[9]. The fact that we do see a direct connexion between the thought behind the Protocols and that behind '*The Talmud Unmasked*' is very telling and as Oliver himself once said it can be construed from this that both works likely came from a similar and possibly the same source[10].

If we thus consider that the thought behind the Protocols and the jewish theological literature are quite different but the thought behind the Protocols and Slavic anti-jewish literature at the time is quite similar we can then say that it is unlikely that the Protocols are authentic[11]; contrary to Oliver's argument.

Oliver does however attach a footnote under this point stating the following by way of explanation for his comment:

*'(8. For a convenient conspectus of some characteristic passages in the Talmud, see the *Christian News Encyclopaedia*, which I cited in *liberty Bell*, November 1989, pp. 1-7. It reproduces those passages photographically from the Jews' official English translation. So far as I know, there is no English translation of the epitome, but it was translated into German by Dietrich Hoffmann, *Der Schulchan Aruch* (Berlin, 1895).)'*

I am sad to say that I have not been able to find a copy of said article from Liberty Bell; which Oliver cites. A letter requesting a reprint of this issue to the address[12] listed on the Revilo Oliver website[13] run ostensibly by Kevin Alfred Strom has not been returned as of this writing. However if we work from the work Oliver asserts that he cited we re-enforce our observation above that Oliver is likely making a gregarious misstatement in likening the two documents since although one can cite passages for many works which might suggest a plan for world domination the Shulhan Arukh is a religious commentary which is meant to be understood in the context of other religious texts and commentaries within Judaism[14]. The two are fundamentally very different and Oliver's argument in this regard cannot be asserted as accurate.

Oliver then states that;

*'That contemptuous hatred of *goyim* appears in many other Jewish compositions, not all of which, surely, can be dismissed as forgeries by nasty Aryan pigs.'*

This is a bit of hyperbole from Oliver; but it is essence correct in so far as there are not a few books of undoubted jewish authorship which display open contempt for Aryans and other gentile peoples[15]. However; this does not mean that the Shulhan Aruk hor other jewish work does so

in the context of its overall direction. However; when you combine the jewish theological literature together to create a definitive interpretation which can be demonstrated to be part of mainstream jewish thought then you can produce such a critique. However simply quoting excerpts from jewish theological works does not prove such an interpretation is common or widespread since one could equally condemn the various and often nefarious sects of Christianity, Islam and various Pagan religions on exactly the same methodology[16].

Oliver is straying on dangerous ground here; which as a much published atheist he should recognise is a slippery slope from sound criticism of a theological system to unsound polemics based on unrepresentative quotation. However without Oliver's article we cannot specifically criticism his thought but rather bring to attention the problems inherent in quoting passages of a work without evidencing a definite interpretation by mainstream authorities within Judaism or any other theological system.

Oliver goes on to state that;

'The Jewish plan of world conquest by economic looting and by using hirelings and dupes to befuddle Aryans is certainly not an invention of wicked "anti-Semites" in the Nineteenth Century.'

We have to concur with Oliver that indeed the '*Jewish Plan of World Conquest*'; if one wishes to call it that, is not an invention of nineteenth century anti-jewish writers but rather we suggest that is simply irrelevant to the Protocols in and of themselves; especially as regards their validity. If one wished to make the argument that the authenticity of the Protocols is irrelevant and that whoever wrote them likely understood the jewish mind very well; with which thesis I personally disagree, then one would take the position adopted by William Pierce of asserting that while the Protocols may or may not be authentic the ideas and concepts they outline are a good summary of the '*Jewish Plan of World Conquest*'. One should not suggest as Oliver seems to that because there may or may not have been a plan in existence for world domination of jewry the Protocols are authenticated by this plan; which one notes would have to correspond closely with that in the Protocols.

Oliver himself argued in a work published after his death; '*The Jewish Strategy*'[17], that one could not understand whether jews were merely acting on a biological urge implanted in them as a racial grouping during their evolution or part of a deliberate world plan which requires the induction of individuals or groups into the conspiracy. This in itself points to the problem of asserting the existence of a '*Jewish Plan of World Conquest*' in regards to the Protocols because if it is the former then there would be simply no need to write down an introduction to 'the plan' if you like. If the former is true then one would assert that the plan should contain the bare minimum of specific detail; because of the danger of the document being captured by the contrary forces, and keep the verbosity to a minimum (since it should be as compact as possible so as easy to conceal and transport without notice as well as easily consumed by flames if one wished to get of the evidence).

The '*Jewish Plan of World Conquest*' as asserted by Oliver would find itself in difficulties if the Protocols was the document there-in produced for the document is badly worded with a veritable

avalanche of unnecessary phrases and language thrown in with too many specific details mentioned to be any kind of conspiratorial document[18]. A fine example can be found within Protocol 2[19], which Oliver himself mentions in footnote 16 to *‘Those Awful Protocols’*:

*‘16. There is only one passage which may arouse misgivings. It is the statement in Protocol 2, "Think carefully of the successes we arranged for Darwinism, Marxism, Nietzsche-ism. To us Jews, at any rate, it should be plain to see what a disintegrating importance these directives have had upon the minds of the *goyim*." This may seem like Christian propaganda, such as a "fundamentalist" holy man might have inserted in a forged document. The English is somewhat awkward--remember that you are reading a translation of a Russian translation from the French--and you should not take 'directives' literally. There is no implication that our enemies invented or inspired the doctrines of Darwin or Nietzsche, and it is quite true that those doctrines, intellectually sound as they are, did serve to increase the disruption of a society that had befuddled itself with Christian superstitions. The Jews, you must remember, are not in the least interested in the truth or falsity of ideas, only in their potentiality for use as weapons to destroy us. There is a highly significant declaration in Protocol 5: "Nowadays it is more important... to catch up and interpret the ideas of others than to eradicate them." You should ponder that statement, especially if you share my dismay at the present state of scientific knowledge and research.)’*

This particular point is very important and one that Oliver realises that he needs to address because it throws doubt upon the authenticity of the Protocols to a considerable degree; which Oliver has hitherto argued is possible rather than openly asserting that believes so[20].

The reason for this is quite simple the passage openly asserts that whoever wrote or edited the Protocols is stating the Elders of Zion; or the jewish elite, organised and facilitated the success of three important doctrines which were at the time completely opposed to theology in general and Christianity in particular. The inclusion of Nietzsche in particular is interesting for us because of the date of the Protocols compared to that of Nietzsche because the Protocols originate according to Marsden in 1884 with one Mlle. Justine Glinka[21]. The reason this is of interest is because Nietzsche’s work only became fashionable in the late 1890’s among some German ‘left wing’ students and only came into the popular arena in the early years of the twentieth century. If we then see this then we see that Oliver’s statement in speculative defense of the passage is quite absurd;

‘There is no implication that our enemies invented or inspired the doctrines of Darwin or Nietzsche, and it is quite true that those doctrines, intellectually sound as they are, did serve to increase the disruption of a society that had befuddled itself with Christian superstitions.’

Since if the doctrines are sound then how can one anticipate their being accepted into popular discourse into some years? It also is implied by the text of Protocol 2 that the doctrines of Darwin, Marx and Nietzsche were jew-inspired and that they are not factually correct as otherwise the Elders of Zion would not be promoting them for they would not otherwise misguide the non-jews[22]. It is obvious from the Protocols text; especially from the paragraph before the quote that these doctrines are being promoted as false jewish doctrines rather than tools simply to create disorder amongst non-jews.

The text before the quote states as follows;

'The intellectuals of the goyim will puff themselves up with their knowledge and without any logical verification of them will put into effect all the information available from science, which our agentur specialists have cunningly pieced together for the purpose of educating their minds in the direction we want.'[23]

This demonstrates that Oliver's argument about the creation of disorder being the goal of using these three doctrines is incorrect in that the Elders of Zion are not attempting to do that here. Rather the author or editor is asserting openly that these three doctrines are the creation of jewish '*agentur specialists*' not doctrines that have been taken up and published by the jewish agents to create disorder.

Oliver's statement in regards to how: *'This may seem like Christian propaganda, such as a "fundamentalist" holy man might have inserted in a forged document.'* Seems all the more likely in the light that in the Russian Empire the development of racial; as opposed to religious, anti-jewish thought was very late by European standards only coming about in the last years of the Russian Empire's existence. Even during this late development there was a highly religious tone to the anti-jewish propaganda; which Oliver himself often derided in his articles in '*Liberty Bell*', which could easily have infected the Protocols which let us remember were published by Sergei Nilus[24] whom published his last edition of them as a chapter in his book on the anti-Christ. This suggests a potential origin for this part of Protocol 2 in that Nilus may have added these few sentences and perhaps more text in to make the Protocols conform to his and still a significant part of Russian anti-jewish thought at that time.

This accounts for all three references for the simple fact that it is quite possible that Nilus; or an earlier publisher when religious anti-jewish thought was still almost exclusively the kind found in Russia, put in this reference to Nietzsche because his thought was beginning to make great progress as a fashionable atheistic trend in Europe at the time of the first major publishing in 1903. Marxism was sweeping the world at about this time with particular reference in Russia to the open terrorism[25] used by Marxists and those associated with them[26] by Russian patriotic and religious writers against the Government. With Darwinism; we have the hostility engendered by its rubbishing of the story of creation as told in the Bible and the resultant creation of many religious skeptics and atheists especially among those which the Protocols states that the '*agentur specialists*' have targeted with their propaganda; i.e. intellectuals.

Darwinism was quite possibly held by some Russians; who let us not forget were and are deeply attached to their Greek Orthodox faith, to be the work of the devil; figuratively speaking, because it was held by many to disprove the story of the creation of the world in the book in genesis. Since the Russian people held in general that the jews were representatives of the devil on earth or were in communion with him; it becomes a simple leap to state that a pious man may well have attempted to connection the jews with Darwinism which let us not forget the Protocols implies has no '*logical verification*' and has been pieced together by these '*agentur specialists*' mentioned. Such a connection between the appellation; work of the devil, and Darwin's work is not uncommon even today within Creationism which has sought to reply to Darwin for the last

one hundred and fifty years or so.

We should however comment that Oliver's point that: '*The English is somewhat awkward--remember that you are reading a translation of a Russian translation from the French--and you should not take 'directives' literally.*' Is not a valid argument in favour of ignoring this passage since this is the copy in general circulation this is what we must deal with; indeed if this passage was not included or was quite different in the original document apparently delivered from France to Russia then it would be a revelation indeed. Without the original document we cannot ascertain whether there was been a compounded mistranslation or addition somewhere along the publishing line.

Therefore; we must opine that Oliver's assertion in regards to this passage is not factually justified and that whatever his motivations for doing so he did and intellectual disservice in not citing the whole passage from Marsden in his article since by doing so it made his case seem stronger than in fact it was.

[1] Oliver's commentary on issues regarding jews and jewry is often excellent with his background as a Professor in the Classics but 'Those Awful Protocols' is an article written in the twilight years of his life and to my mind reflects Oliver's too ready acceptance of critical arguments against his enemies without thoroughly investigating himself. A similar criticism can be labelled against him in regards to some of his writings against Communism but we should also remember that it was much harder in the pre-internet era to investigate claims relating to chains of evidence which are all but lost to history. This is despite his own recognition in 'Conspiracy or Degeneracy?' that there was a considerable problem with anti-Communists and presumably anti-jewish writers not rising above the level of their opponents and thus not being able to show them up for what in Oliver's; and my own, opinion they were and are.

[2] These can be found at the following web addresses;
<http://stormfront.org/rpo/PROTOCOL.htm> & http://www.white-nationalist.info/primer/index.php?option=com_wrapper&Itemid=72 [Accessed: 15.03.2008], and from which I take all my quotations in regard to this article.

[3] We have no direct evidence for this charge; but Oliver is likely correct in so far the 'Protocols' were likely destroyed during the Communist revolution of 1917 and the ensuing civil war between 'White', 'Green' and 'Red' forces as part of the Communist drive to destroy the main proclams of the Protocols in Russia: the 'Black Hundreds'. It seems unlikely it was ordered by Kerensky; even though he was jewish, and more likely that the Bolsheviks regardless of a sizeable number of them being jews destroyed it as 'reactionary propaganda targeting national minorities and distracting the proletariat from class struggle'. An inference of this can perhaps be drawn from Volume 2 of Leon Trotsky's '*The History of the Russian Revolution*' (1930) which expounds at length about the 'reactionary' and 'counter revolutionary' propaganda. The interested reader can read the requisite volume at the following address:
<http://www.marxists.org/archive/trotsky/1930/hrr/>.

[4] The '*Shulhan Arukh*' was composed by the famous Rabbi Joseph Caro in the 16th century and is the standard legal code in Judaism; it is not however scripture but merely the codification of scripture although one of the most authoritative (closely behind Rashi's work) more like the works of the Fathers of the Church rather than the New Testament if you want to use a Christian; specifically Catholic, allegory.

[5] See for example Molly Katz's attempt to make light of this in *'Jewish as a Second Language'* (1991) and Michael Wex's; *'Born to Kvetch: Yiddish Language and Culture in All of Its Moods'* (2006).

[6] 'The Talmud Unmasked: The Secret Rabbinical Teachings Concerning Christians' or 'Christianity in the Judaic Talmud' by Rev. I. B. Pranaitis, 1892, The Imperial Academy of Sciences: St. Petersburg. It can read the following address:

<http://www.jrbooksonline.com/Talmud%20Unmasked/talmudx.htm>.

[7] Pranaitis himself was a Roman Catholic priest from the Russian interior who first came to the attention of the Russian authorities as an 'expert on the talmud' when he wrote, published and distributed a pamphlet against the jews; specifically exposing the Talmud as an source of blood-curdling quotes against Christians and gentiles in general. He testified as an expert witness in the Beilis ritual murder trial of 1911 but he was exposed as ignorant of Judaic theology during his time on the stand when he refused or was unable to answer questions about the jewish theological roots of the blood sacrifice. Pranaitis may well of been involved with the Black Hundreds as an anti-jewish writer; whose career in the academy was built on his non-existent expertise in Hebrew and the jewish theological literature. I have been unable to confirm or disprove this theory of association but it seems likely given his background and his later skyrocketing to a position of some academic importance in the Russian empire. The interested reader is directed to volume four of Leon Poliakov's (translation: George Klin), 2003, *'The History of Anti-Semitism: Suicidal Europe 1870-1933'*, 3rd Edition, University of Pennsylvania Press: Philadelphia, p. 129-134 and Maurice Samuel's, 1967, *'Blood Accusation: The Strange History of the Beiliss Case'*, 1st Edition, Weidenfeld & Nicolson: London

[8] This assertion is often made by authors on the subject of 'anti-Semitism' as with many propagandistic concepts it is based on truth mixed with falsehood. In so far that indeed Slavic anti-Semitism has classically superimposed what it understands as the jew onto the jew. Such superimposition was found less in the West and generally only in when there was strong public feeling against the jews was an image superimposed but this was certainly not always the case. The view that is superimposed onto the jew is not per se incorrect since the jew has done much historically to deserve such appellations and the superimposition is essence right in that it sees the jew as the enemy but it is incorrect in so far that in correctly labelling the jew as enemy it imputes actions, ideas and motivations to the jew which are not jewish or are not wholly jewish.

[9] Although it is not impossible that the author or authors of the Protocols had looked at Pranaitis' work; given the volume of anti-jewish literature at the time. What is alluded to here is that the style of Pranaitis' concept of the jews and their thought was representative of Slavic anti-jewish thought at the time.

[10] I would maintain this source would likely be the Black Hundreds.

[11] It might be objected to that the Russian jewish population was Ashkenazi and hence more likely to think in a similar fashion to their Slavic hosts; but we would remind readers who would use this argument that the Protocols came from Paris whose high-ranking jews were and are generally Sephardi in origin. Although at this point in history there was an increasing Ashkenazi population in France and Paris this population however was at this time low on the social ladder and hence unlikely to be indulging in reading or composing anything like the Protocols suggest they are.

[12] Liberty Bell Publications, Post Office Box 21, Reedy WV 25270 USA.

[13] <http://www.revilo-oliver.com/> [Accessed: 19.03.2008]

[14] We would be most gracious if a reader who had access to a copy of *'Liberty Bell'* in which

this was published (as per Oliver's note) could send us a PDF of the article or could send us an email at the Semitic Controversies email address to let us know that they had a copy and we would be happy to pay a small finders fee and pay for postage to acquire a copy of the above.

[15] Examples of such material in mainstream literature can be found in the works of Max I. Dimont's '*Jews, God and History*' and '*The Indestructible Jews*' both of which display a profound contempt of anything and everything non-jewish singling out the Northern European or Aryan peoples for special derision and contempt.

[16] This is currently en vogue in regards to Islam; which focuses on proving that Islam is out for 'global jihad' and seems to be a very thin allegory for jewish fears in regards to the continuity of their own ascendancy in global affairs. Interested readers should direct their attention to the work of Robert Spencer; and other Zionist Christian/jew authors, I particularly recommend Robert Spencer's; '*The Politically Incorrect Guide to Islam (and the Crusades)*' (2005).

[17] '*The Jewish Strategy*' by Revilo Oliver, 2006, Orig. Pub. 2002, 2nd Edition, Historical Review Press: Uckfield, pp. 53-54

[18] The Protocols even mentions ways in which to 'counter' the plans of the jews; which is more than a little absurd but more likely the policies the author and/or editors wanted to see adopted because they felt they would be prudent measures or would aid in the combating of jewish power and influence in the world at large and apparently Russia in particular.

[19] Victor Marsden, 1934, '*The Protocols of Zion: With Preface and Explanatory Notes*', 1st Edition, The Britons: London

[20] This is implied rather than stated by the fact that he gives a historical summary and assesses some of the arguments presented by the French language publication; '*Revision*' without committing himself to the authenticity of the Protocols themselves. It is this authors personal opinion that Oliver was more likely taking the opportunity of opening a much needed intellectual dialogue about the Protocols; which unfortunately never took place. This response as was stated at the start of this essay is to seek to take over where Oliver began.

[21] See Victor Marsden, 1934, '*The Protocols of Zion: With Preface and Explanatory Notes*', 1st Edition, The Britons: London, p. 98-102

[22] Marxism is arguably inspired from jewish thought as Marx was a jew but we must also assign credit to non-jews such as Friedrich Engels for part of the basis of Marxism; even if Marx himself placed great emphasis on the jewish economist Ricardo's theory of value. We must also recognise that the precedence of Marxism was largely gentile in origin with organisations such as the Chartists in Britain being as far this author can tell largely of native non-jewish stock. For an interesting; although highly sympathetic, history of Socialist thought in Britain; which is the milieu which Marx and Engels heavily drew upon, see Max Beer's (1929) '*A History of British Socialism*' (2 Vols.).

[23] Victor Marsden, 1934, '*The Protocols of Zion: With Preface and Explanatory Notes*', 1st Edition, The Britons: London, p. 151. It should be noted that Victor Marsden had died some time before the Protocols were translated into English and published (as revealed by his obituary) so it is unlikely he was the author but rather that his name was adopted as a nom de plume to give more credibility to the 'Protocols' in their circulation and were not out of place with his 'Black Hundreds' inspired account of the communist revolution of 1917.

[24] Who described himself as a mystic and who seems to have been deeply religious in the manner that only the utterly sincere neophyte can be.

[25] Up to and including bombings and the assassination of ministers and heads of government as well Tsar Alexander II.

[26] Mainly Anarchists who seem to have been involved more with violence against what they saw as 'unjust system' of Tsarism.

A Talmudic Debacle: Part II: Written or Oral Torah, what says Judaism?

Sunday, 13 July 2008

When it comes the question of whether the Talmud and rabbinical interpretations, commentary etc there-of (i.e. Oral Torah) take precedence of the Written Torah (the Tanakh; five books of Moses) we are faced with an inquiry that is anything but boned down through a one dimensional methodology.

Early on in Hoffman's expose on rabbinical doctrine; "Truth of the Talmud", it is claimed that the Oral Torah (Talmud) is the holiest collection of books of Judaism, adding that its authority takes precedence over the Written Torah.

Let's start with a simple and sufficient clarification on what the Written and Oral Torah are fundamentally. The Written Torah constitutes the laws in writing; recieved by Moses from God on Mount Sinai, it includes the five books of Moses (Torah, the Law), the writings of the Prophets; Joshua, Judges, Samuel 1-2, Kings 1-2, Isaiah, Ezekiel, Jeremiah and the Twelve (Hosea, Obadiah, Joel, Amos, Micah, Nachum, Jonah, Habbakuk, Zephaniah, Chaggai, Malakhi and Zechariah).

The Talmud is the Mishnah (codification, rendering of the laws above) and the Gemara; commentary and interpretation of the laws, traditions and customs delivered by the above texts.

Naturally, the voluminous texts of the Written and Oral Torah both carried with them substantial authority as invalible aid for the Torah student in Judaism when it came to understand what the rulings of given laws are.

Rabbi Adin Steinsaltz, one of the most revered and praised rabbis in Judaism of the 20th century and also functions as the Nasi (president) of the recently revived Sanhedrin, had the following to say about the conundrum in question;

"And although the Talmud is, to this day, the primary source of Jewish law, it cannot be cited as an authority for purposes of ruling."[1]

A different take to the above but yet which echoes the essential point made by Rabbi Steinsaltz, that the initial and divine ruling of jewish law is first and foremost based on the Torah, is given by the gentile talmudist and torah-scholar George Foot More.

"The principal task of the schools in the first and second centuries of the Christian era falls under two heads: Midrash, the study of the Scripture by which the harmony of the written and the unwritten law, and of the one with the other, was established-and Halakhah, the precise formulation of obligations and prohibitions, practical regulations for observance in all spheres of life, and many cautionary ordinances designed to keep man at a safe distance from the

unwitting infraction of a law. The [Midrash](#) was not in theory and intention a derivation of the unwritten law from the written or a discovery of authority for the unwritten law in Scripture; and whatever increment the unwritten law received from this source was, in the apprehension of those who made it, only a bringing to light of the unity of revelation.

The unity of the Torah in its two branches was always assumed. The authority of all parts of it was the same; for the divine revelation was one, complete and final, from which nothing could be subtracted, and to which nothing was to be added-nothing had been kept back in heaven. In theory and intention purely conservative, the work of the schools in the interpretation of Scripture and the formulation of tradition was in fact the way of progress; through it the unchangeable Torah was adapted to changing conditions.

As in other religions which recognize tradition as a concurrent authority with Scripture-in Christianity and Mohammedanism, for example-not only is a guarantee of the authenticity of tradition necessary, but an authoritative definition, exposition, and application of tradition. But in comparison with Christianity, it is a significant difference that in Judaism and in Mohammedanism this authority is not ecclesiastical but scholastic; it was the learned who were the voice of tradition, and this, it may not be superfluous to observe, in the sphere of the Halakhah only. Dogmas, in the proper sense of the word, are only the fundamental articles of Judaism, the unity of God and the revelation of religion in the Torah, to which was now added the resurrection of the dead. The Haggadic tradition, however highly esteemed, is not binding."[2]

The "haggadic" tradition referred to in the end here denotes the non-legalistic exegetical and homiletic texts of the Talmud. This puts further problems for the view that the Talmud is more authoritative and take precedence over the Written Torah on the Jewish laws. In the Soncino Talmud, you'll find footnote after footnote where the Tanakh is referenced and used as a corroborative authority the rulings interpreted and given, subsequently you'd be hard pressed to find definite rulings on anything in the Talmud that goes without resting its authoritative ruling on the Written Torah. This lends more credibility to the view that the rulings of law as given in the Talmud are generally derived from the Written Torah.

There is a quote in the Talmud, offered by Hoffman, which reads the following;

"My son, be more careful in the observance of the words of the Scribes than in the words of the Torah."[3]

First; let me point out that I am not unsympathetic to the desire of separating the foundation of Judaism found in the Tanakh with the subsequent rabbinical texts of the Talmud, especially not since as a Christian (like Mr Hoffman) such a separation would be almost necessary if attempting to criticize the authoritative laws within Judaism yet not have a doctrinal beef with the Old Testament. Yet this doesn't mean that the Talmud and what it rules can be regarded as a collection of books that rules independently of the Torah considering that it generally derives authority to rulings, in debate amongst the rabbis, from the Written Torah itself.

At first glance, the above quote does seem quite damning indeed. It appears as if we are told that

you should study with more care and certainty the talmudic texts rather than the Tanakh. However; interestingly enough the entire passage from where the above quote is taken, puts a different light on the context.

”R. Hisda asked one of the young Rabbis who was reciting aggadoth in his presence in a certain order: ‘Did you hear what [was the purport of the expression,] ‘New and old’?9 — ‘The former’10 the other replied: ‘are the minor, and the latter10 are the major commandments’. ‘Was then the Torah,’ the former asked: ‘given on two different occasions?11 But the latter12 [are those derived] from the words of the Torah while the former are those derived from the words of the Scribes.’ Raba made the following exposition: What is the purport of the Scriptural text: And, furthermore my son, be admonished: Of making many books etc.?13 My son, be more careful14 in [the observance of] the words of the Scribes than in the words of the Torah, for in the laws of the Torah there are positive and negative precepts;15 but, as to the laws of the Scribes, whoever transgresses any of the enactments of the Scribes incurs the penalty of death. In case you should object: If they are of real value why were they not recorded [in the Torah]? Scripture stated: ‘Of making many books there is no end’.13”

Notice the continued referens to the footnote 13. It is the a reference to Ecclesiastes 12: 12, which reads;

”Be warned, my son, of anything in addition to them. Of making many books there is no end, and much study wearies the body.”

As we can see, the actual quote which Hoffman uses is in fact a basic verbatim quote taken from the Written Torah. It does seem odd if we would presume the Written Torah to negate its own authority on behalf of the collection of books that were penned down much later now doesn't it?

For those unused and a bit confused by rabbinical discussions, the obvious case in point derived from the context here is that, since the rabbis were generally inclined to interpret the laws in a stricter sense when transgression of the Torah is in danger, which in turn means that if you follow the scribes rendering of these cases carefully enough you will be even less at risk of transgressing the laws of the Written Torah. All that the scribes (rabbis) added here is the fact that due to authority and divinity of the Written Torah, the purpose of adding interpretation is to first and foremost secure the actual law that is given in the Written Torah and thus make it harder to transgress against. Afterall, what is talked about here is the importance of not transgressing against Scripture.

It is also stated in the Erubin quote that since in the Written Torah you have both negative and positive precept then you would do well in recieving advice from the elderly clergy and not assume or add textual interpretation on your own concerning the meaning thereof.

Now, the latter I suppose could be argued to be an authoritative precedence itself, considering the fact that rabbis infuse extra and additional obedience of the Torah in their Oral traditions which ironically can lead to even more possible translations of the same basic law in what ever part of the Tanakh, then again this is the never ending problem for all doctrnal religions; religious authorities take it upon themselves to render the initial laws, through their interpretations, with

either greater or lesser importance attached to them.

In this particular issue the rabbis show natural concern with the possibility that, since some laws that are transgressed in the Tanakh does incur the death penalty, some confused jews might transgress against it by accident or otherwise unintentional error, hence a form of wall is put up around these laws with the ruling to watch more carefully what the scribes say than what you yourself might add, interpret or detract from the Tanakh, that way they could be more certain of possible transgression thereof to be less probable. The Tanakh never stated that accidents or unintentional digressions are ok, when it came to transgression of the law, hence the scribes as noted above echoe the caution to remain orthodox (i.e. learning the law from a mentor clergy) rather than through unorthodox means.

The above is even more thoroughly corroborated by yet another reference found in the Erubin 21b;

"New and old, which I have laid up for thee, O my beloved;3 the congregation of Israel said to the Holy One, blessed be He, 'Lord of the universe: I have imposed upon myself more restrictions than Thou hast imposed upon me, and I have observed them.'"

The issue is thus on the restrictions in favour of keeping the authoritative laws of the Written Torah.

We can not, by the above, declare the Talmud's books to be secondary in command per se, however, since we can only declare the Written Torah to be ruling authority and divine text from where the talmudic interpretations are derived from, upon and based on. The laws are as they are given in the Torah, yet even so, there are additional situations concerning a multitude possibilities that are not covered by the Written Torah but by the Oral Torah, therefore when there is no precedence available by the Tanakh then the talmudic rabbis entered into rather extensive discussion and debate to academically conclude what was the righteous and most obedient approach possible. Yet, even then, there is referencing of the Written Torah.

An example of this would be the issue of non-jewish study of the Torah which, by the prevailing decree of Rabbi Meir through quoting the Torah, strips the gentile of being liable of death for studying the Torah.[4] Here a quote from Leviticus is used to enforce his objection as even more authoritative which thus lends additional strength to the idea that authoritative rulings are based and derived from Scripture and not the preferred musings of the Talmud's rabbis. Still, there are many more cases of debate and uncertainty which find little precedence at all in the Tanakh, this is when and where the rabbinical texts put their respective take on the ruling thereof.

Now, the actual bone of this entire discussion is rather well put in the Talmud itself;

"When doubt arise in Rabbinical Law we are naturally lenient yet where the law is Scriptural we are strict."[5]

Ergo, when there is conflict in the rabbinical rendered laws or rulings, there is lenience and understanding for transgression, or at least there is continued debate on it where involved parties

can make their case but when the law is found in Scripture, ie the Written Torah, the verdict and ruling thereof is strict and not subject to circumstantial plead. At least, this is what is written, whether or not religious jews are or have been obedient to this end is another matter which certainly is a conflict within Judaism historically and in abrahamic religions in general which partially has manifested itself through additional denominations and schools of thought branching out from it.

In conclusion, the Talmud does not nullify the Tanakh as Hoffman states, it does not negate or take ruling precedence over the Written Torah when there is a precedence available in the latter. The Talmud does however, all in all, contribute with voluminous discussions and interpretations where various rabbis have come to impose different historical authoritative meanings on jewish law, not only through different texts yet also with individual verdicts within the talmudic tractates themselves. They can't readily be said to have ruled anything which isn't corroborated and echoed in its essence by the Written Torah, yet it can certainly be said that added avenues of how to be obedient thereof or when a lenient methodology can really be said to be actionable is meted out by the Talmud.

Basically; the more independant and recent a situation and law thereof is from the Written Torah, ie not mention or explained thereof, the more authoritative the rabbinical ruling itself becomes. Likewise, the more dependant a ruling is on the Written Torah's precedence, which it is when there is a precedence in the Tanakh, the more strict it is and the less authoritative the subsequent rabbinical commentaries are, at least according to the Talmud as well as the Tanakh. This doesn't mean this is how religious jews are applying the rulings, the same can be said about Christian followers regarding the ten commandments or the Gospels.

[1] Steinsaltz, Adin, 1976, *"The Essential Talmud"* p. 4.

[2] More, George Foot, 1922, *"Menorah Journal"*, Vol. 8, pp. 1-14.

[3] Babylonian Talmud, Soncino English Translation; Erubin 21b.

[4] Babylonian Talmud, Soncino English Translation: Avodah Zarah 3a.

[5] Pesachim, Soncino Edition, p. 42, n. 2.

That Bane of Rationality: A Response to Revido Oliver's 'Those Awful Protocols' (Part Two)

Sunday, 13 July 2008

In the previous part to *'That Bane of Rationality'*[1] we discussed Oliver's central arguments as to the potential authenticity of the Protocols. Oliver seems; in our estimation, not to have been arguing for their authenticity so much as trying to bring the issue up for rational discussion within Nationalist circles because we suspect he was well aware there is and was a case to be answered about the authenticity of the Protocols as documentary proof of the intentions and existence of a *'Jewish Plan of World Conquest'*. We hope to have thus far presented a solid rebuttal; if not as detailed as we could make it, of Oliver's central argument for their potential authenticity from the Protocols text itself and present the second part of this rebuttal.

In this second part of ‘*That Bane of Rationality*’ we will address Oliver’s argument concerning a Photostat letter taken from the 1934 compilation previously cited on the Protocols[2]. Since he spends quite a lot of time discussing it; we feel that we should equally spend quite some time answering it because it is an oft cited piece of evidence by what we would opine are the less rational critics of Jewry in favour of the Protocols’ authenticity. We will reply to Oliver’s argument that Spanish; or perhaps Iberian would be more correct, Jewry followed these instructions in the third part of ‘*That Bane of Rationality*’.

Oliver in ‘*Those Awful Protocols*’ cites a particular Photostat in the above cited edition which deals with a letter from ‘The Prince of Jews’ to the Jews of Spain who had just been forced by Ferdinand and Isabella to leave their domain or to convert to Christianity.

Oliver’s argument is as follows:

‘It has been attested long before that, for example, in a letter of instructions written by the Prince of the Jews, who then resided in Constantinople, to the Jews in Spain in 1498, when there was already prevalent the popular sentiment that resulted in the expulsion of "unconverted" Jews by Ferdinand and Isabella four years later, in the year of Columbus's fateful rediscovery of the Western Hemisphere.

*A facsimile of what is probably the first printing of this letter, in a book published in Spain in 1608, will be found following page 98 in the edition of the English *Protocols* that I recommended above. The letter is in Spanish, as is natural, since the Jews of the Mediterranean lands all spoke Ladino, a Jewish dialect of Spanish, just as Yiddish is a Jewish deformation of German, while educated members of the international tribe used Spanish for serious writing. (9)*

*The letter, as I have said, anticipates the essentials of the *Protocols* and attests the vampire races's determination to exploit and ultimately destroy the hated *goyim*. The Sheenies will wail, of course, that there is no proof that their Prince actually wrote that letter in 1498, but that is irrelevant, because the orders given in the letter, whoever wrote it, were in fact followed by the Yids in Spain at that time.’*

Now the letter as Oliver has stated is a letter[3] to the Jews of Spain from the ‘Prince of the Jews’ in Constantinople and is a series of instructions to the Jews of Spain[4]. Oliver is right in the essentials of this[5] but he does not state that the Jews of Spain wrote to the ‘Prince of the Jews’ in the first instance which throws not a little context on the issue rather than seeming that the Jews of Spain were ordered to do something out of the blue by the ‘Prince of the Jews’ in Constantinople. The distinction here is a simple one; if one is asking someone what they should do one is asking for advice but if one is just sent orders then one is obeying a command structure.

Both of these lines of thinking however can be answered by providing a letter situational context to this letter especially in regards to the power politics of this period and the Jewish position in the Ottoman Empire.

However; before we do that it would be best to clear up who this ‘Prince of the Jews’ was since it could be argued that there should not have been a ‘Prince of the Jews’ and that this proves that

there was indeed some kind of command structure in jewry at the time (and thus that ‘the Prince’ of the Protocols is identified with ‘the Prince’ in the letter).

The ‘Prince of the Jews’ was quite simply the Exilarch of the jews in the Ottoman Empire; otherwise known as the resh galuta. He exercised power over the jews in the domain of the Sultan and although his post gradually become more ceremonial than real (in terms of power and decision-making) he never-the-less was thought to have great power because of his admittance to the formalities of the Turkish court. The Exilarch was of Princely rank and would of course been the representative of the Sultan to the jewish community (and vice versa) writ large.

So if the jews were in fact writing to the Exilarch; addressing him as the ‘Prince of the Jews’ it would have made sense here because he was quite literally the ‘Prince of the Jews’ in the Ottoman Empire and given that part of jewry in Spain came from the Ottoman Empire it would be no particular surprise that the rest of Spanish jewry thought that the Ottoman Empire might provide them with a place to reside after their expulsion from the lands under the Spanish crown.

The issue of whether the jews are asking for advice or a command is also easily answered when we realise as I have noted above that Spanish jewry was and would have been co-operating with some Ottoman jews with whom they might well have discussed the idea of leaving Spain for Ottoman territory and in fact historically the Spanish jewry did depart for the Islamic territories and the Sultan of the Ottoman Empire issued an open invitation for the jews to come and reside in his territory in the same year; 1492, as the letter from the ‘Prince of the Jews’ is written. We would argue that this is no coincidence and the Sultan adopted a two pronged strategy in dealing with unexpected international event; he encouraged the jews who would to come and live in Spain but likely on the advice of some of his jewish counsellors; converts or open judaizers[6], he also wanted to create a network of jewish agents within the power structures of his great Western foe: the kingdom of Spain.

This is not as ludicrous as it might at first sound as Anna Foa notes in her book; *‘The Jews of Europe after the Black Death’*, that jews in Venice in the 16th century were perceived as agents of the Turkish; i.e. the Ottoman, Sultan[7] and a decree of expulsion was proclaimed against them on this basis[8]. They certainly were seen as agents of the Islamic enemy in Spanish society at the time[9] and it seems likely as before mentioned some of them were in fact agents of the Sultan as they would have been able to pass easily between jewish communities in the Christian world finding shelter, succour and a goldmine of information[10].

Turkish policy in 1492 is rather aptly described by Foa so I will let her words speak for the context of this letter (for they do so admirably)[11]:

‘The principal destination of these migrations was the Ottoman Empire. By 1492, the Turkish sultan had already invited Spanish exiles to settle there, and refugees found a warm welcome and wide-ranging professional and commercial opportunities. To reach the Ottoman Empire meant to find freedom and security again. “Turkey is a land that lacks nothing and where, if you wish, all shall be well with you, ... Here every man may live in peace under his vine and his fig tree,” wrote a German Jew living in Edirne in the first half of the 15th century, comparing the situation under Islam to that in Germany (Lewis 1984: 136)[12].’[13]

Foa's words give us; as above stated, the necessary context to understand this letter since if a German jew in the early 15th century felt that the Islamic lands were a place of such great opportunities for jews then it would be hardly surprising to see some of that sentiment echoed by Spanish jewry who after all were in considerable direct contact as '*Levantine merchants*' with the Turkish Sultan's officials as well as much indirect contact with them as banking families[14]. However the 'Prince of the Jews' is not as it seem; a ruler over all Ottoman jewry, but rather someone who did so at the general sufferance of the Sultan he ostensibly served the interests of and would have acted as the Sultans mouth piece of jews within and presumably outside the Empire (since he would be far more likely to garner jewish support than a Turkish Muslim representative; protected by diplomatic license or otherwise)[15].

So this letter cannot be seen as what it as purported as by Oliver as part of a jewish conspiracy but rather we would argue as piece of clever Ottoman diplomacy and espionage; perhaps inspired by jews but not as a plot by them to attain world domination which is what the Protocols argues it is and Oliver seems to endorse as an example of this attitude, to try and undermine a powerful rival using the jews as willing pawns in a game to destroy the kingdom of Spain from the inside out. Thus we can state that the letter itself does not provide evidence of a '*Jewish Plan of World Conquest*' as it is cited in the article included in the volume of the Protocols aforementioned[16] and nor does it provide evidence of their authenticity as Oliver argues it does.

[1] Available at the following address: <http://semiticcontroversies.blogspot.com/2008/07/that-bane-of-rationality-response-to.html>

[2] Victor Marsden, 1934, '*The Protocols of Zion: With Preface and Explanatory Notes*', 1st Edition, The Britons: London

[3] We will here assume the letter is in fact genuine since Oliver does so.

[4] This is reproduced in Photostat between pp. 98-99 in the Ibid volume with a little background on the supposed letter on p. 98 and a translation there-of on p. 99. It is worth noting here that the letter to the 'Prince of the Jews' from the jews of Spain is not translated although it is reproduced (out of necessity one feels because part of the reply from the 'Prince of the Jews' is on the same page) for us in the same Photostat.

[5] In so far as Spanish jewry spoke Ladino a corrupted form of Spanish and that the more educated jews spoke Spanish as the Spaniards spoke it and also likely spoke several other languages as well; Arabic being likely one of them.

[6] It is worth remembering that jewish advisors to the Ottoman Sultan were not uncommon in this period and nor did they stop working in jewry's best interests. Don Joseph Nasi; the best known of these jewish advisors, was born shortly after this letter was written in 1505 to a prominent Spanish Marrano banking family and proceeded to become a principal advisor to both Suleiman I and Selim III as well as well as having friendly connexions to the Hapsburg dynasty. It is also argued by some authors that Shabbatai Tzevi (or Sabbati Zvi) was cornered by a jewish advisors advice to the then Ottoman Sultan; likely because the Rabbis across Europe regarded Tzevi as a serious threat to their power and a false Messiah (and discrediting him would be easy if they forced him into a corner). For a summary of the situation of Turkish jewry we suggest Jacob Marcus', 1960, '*The Jew in the Medieval World*', 1st Edition, The Jewish Publication Society: Philadelphia, pp. 411-417, Benjamin Ginsberg, 1993, '*The Fatal Embrace: Jews and the State*', 1st Edition, University of Chicago Press: Chicago, p. 16, and Heinrich Graetz' much

republished, 1853, *History of the Jews*, Volume IV, pp. 400-408, 571-581 and 593-630. The complete edition; all 11 volumes, in the original German is available at the following address: <http://www.zeno.org/Geschichte/M/Graetz,+Heinrich/Geschichte+der+Juden>

[7] Anna Foa, Translated by Andrea Grover, 2000, *The Jews of Europe After the Black Death*, 1st Edition, University of California Press: Berkley, p. 165.

[8] This was quickly rescinded and was not actually implemented for what reason I do not wish to speculate here but it seems likely that it might have something to do with what Foa notes on a previous page in so far as: *'After 1530, commercial trade routes linking the Ottoman Empire to the West via the Balkans were "directed by and in the hands of Levantine Jewish Merchants," as the Venetian Senate wrote in 1541'* (Ibid. p. 162). Venice would of course been in the middle of this trade route being located at a strategic land and sea (and thus trade) juncture and had this trade with the Ottoman Empire been cut off due to the lack of jewish merchants from the Ottoman Empire coming into the city to trade it would have strangled the lifeblood of the city's vast trade (and thus the powerful merchant families of Venice would not have stood for anti-jewish feeling getting in the way of their making substantial profits from this trade). Benjamin Ginsberg also cites this power of the jews in international; i.e. Mediterranean, commerce at this time when he asserts that: *'Their geographic dispersion and literacy combined to help Jews become important traders in the medieval and early modern worlds. Jewish merchants linked by ties of religion, culture, and often family, played an important role in international commerce.'* (Ginsberg, 1993, p. 9)

[9] This reference in Spanish culture was from the invasion and occupation of Spain; which became Al-Andalus, by the Umayyad Caliphate in 711-718 A.D. where jews actively aided and abetted the Islamic advance in line with their own racial interests since the Islamic forces contained a number of professing jews and secondly in 612 A.D. the Visigothic Kings had issued a proclamation that the jews were come forth for baptism or they would be subject to banishment and confiscation of property. This is evidenced by Ginsberg's remark that *'As the Umayyeds expanded their control of the Iberian peninsula in the tenth and eleventh centuries, they depended heavily upon Jewish administrators and diplomats.'* (Ginsberg, 1993, p. 14)

[10] Jews as an international commercial enterprise that was largely unchallenged would have had access to a lot of information that had been gleaned from different courts (i.e. jews; converted or otherwise, had frequent recourse to see their jewish families to whom they would likely impart useful information about the goings on at court; which would have been invaluable to an Ottoman Sultan) around the Mediterranean giving them an excellent general picture of what was going on and who was going to do what.

[11] She is at first speaking of the latter migrations of Marranos; or as they were contemporarily called *'the Portuguese'*, from Spain to the Ottoman Empire but in doing so she explains the situation at the time the letter under discussion was written.

[12] The reference Foa is giving is to Bernard Lewis', 1984, *The Jews of Islam*, 1st Edition, Princeton University Press: Princeton, p. 136.

[13] Foa, 2000, p. 163.

[14] Ginsberg, 1993, p. 15. To quote exactly: *'During the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, Jews came to play a major role in the fiscal affairs and administration of the Ottoman empire.'* Ginsberg is ostensibly talking about the considerable administration, tax collecting and customs duties collecting role of the jews in the Ottoman empire; however he hints that there was considering loaning of capital by jews to the Sultan, Imperial Court and the local dignitaries when he prefaces his comments by talking about the jewish financial power behind the Fatimid

throne of Al-Mustansir being the Jew; Abu Saed Ibrahim al-Tustari and how after the fall of the Fatimid dynasty the new dynasty; the Ayyubids, also employed large numbers of Jews and Jewish converts to Islam as administrators (and ergo at that time; financiers) and then speaking of how the Jewish Farhi family of Damascus directed the financial affairs of Syria from the eighteenth century to the fall of the Ottoman Empire. He also states quite candidly on p. 14 that; *'Jews also played a major role in state finance and administration in the medieval Muslim world'*.

[15] This is not to say he may have and likely did have significant power over the Sultan given as before noted there were a lot of Jews; converts to Islam or open Judaizers, in the Ottoman Court and that the Sultans often appealed to Jews to help or exclusively fund their policies. However; in this instance it would seem to be nonsensical that the Jewish powers in Turkey would have wanted to do anything but get their people out of Spain. However to get this we suspect that they had to bring something to the Sultan to get him acquiesce to them doing so; so taking advantage of their knowledge that some of their people would likely convert they sent the letter Oliver is citing declaring that the Jews; on the unspoken assumption that it applied to those only who would stay and not leave Spain, and that because the Ottoman Empire had helped their fellow Jews and had offered to help them they would help it as a proverbial 'paradise for Jewry'. For more information about the Jewish use of power politics between the Christian and Muslim worlds at this time please see Ginsberg, 1993, pp. 8-18.

[16] See Marsden, 1934, pp. 98-103; which gives this letter as evidence of such Jewish plans back into history beyond the then contemporary time. The exact wording of this claim is as follows: *'In this instance "the protocols" mean the "draft of the plan of action" of the Jewish leaders. There have been many such drafts at different periods in Jewish history since the dispersion, but few of them have come into general circulation. In all, the principles and morality are as old as the tribe. By way of illustration we give an instance which occurred in the fifteenth century.'* (Ibid. p. 98) This quite clearly illustrates that this letter is being used to claim that a 'definite program'; to the use 'The International Jew's' wording has existed for centuries if not millennia.

That Bane of Rationality: A Response to Revilo Oliver's 'Those Awful Protocols' (Part Three)

Sunday, 20 July 2008

In the previous parts to *'That Bane of Rationality'*[1] we discussed firstly Oliver's central arguments as to the authenticity of the Protocols and secondly the letter from the 'Prince of the Jews' to the Jews of Spain in 1492 which Oliver used to lend further weight to his arguments[2].

As stated above in this concluding section of our reply to Oliver we will cover the ground of whether as Oliver asserts Spanish Jewry indeed did follow the instructions of the 'Prince of the Jews'.

Oliver's argument is as follows:

'The Prince, for example, orders his subjects in Spain to feign conversion to the religion of the

stupid Aryans, and then slither upward into positions of power in both church and state so that they can dominate Spain and drive it to destruction. That is precisely what most of them did.

*The majority of the Jews in Spain obeyed their Prince's command and masqueraded as converts to Christianity. That is made absolutely certain by the fact that in one typical small town, Borja, almost all of the c. 300 Jews infesting it professed the religion of their hated Spanish hosts to avoid emigration; see Miguel A. Motis Dolader, *Los Judios de Borja en el siglo XV* (Borja, Centro de Estudios Borjanos, 1987), based on the municipal records. One nice detail is the conduct of some of the Yids: they apparently intended to emigrate, sold their property to Christians, and left the town, but, probably on the advice of their superiors, changed their minds, had themselves sprinkled with the Christian's magic water, and returned to Borja to reclaim their property.'*

The Prince[3] states as follows to his supposed subjects[4]:

'The advice of the Grand Satraps and Rabbis is the following:

- 1. As for what you say that the King of Spain obliges you to become Christians: do it, since you cannot do otherwise.*
- 2. As for what you say about the command to despoil you of your property: make your sons merchants that they may despoil, little by little, the Christians of theirs.*
- 3. As for what you say about making attempts on your lives: make your sons doctors and apothecaries, that they may take away Christians' lives.*
- 4. As for what you say of their destroying your synagogues: make your sons canons and clerics in order that they may destroy their churches.*
- 5. As for the many other vexations you complain of: arrange that your sons become advocates and lawyers, and see that they always mix in affairs of State, that by putting Christians under your yoke you may dominate the world and be avenged on them.*
- 6. Do not swerve from this order that we give you, because you will find by experience that humiliated as you are, you will reach the actuality of power.'*

However Oliver's argument forgets something quite important in this regard; in so far that it was a trend within Spanish jewry ever since the time of the Visigoth rule that conversion to Christianity; and Islam during the time of Al-Andalus, was a way to get ahead in gentile society.

This is particularly poignant when we note that the Prince's instructions were to do nothing abnormal to jews and were what jews had been doing for millennia in Spain. However; this would only apply to a certain part of Spanish jewry who would be prepared to abandon the dictates of Judaism; and hence being frum, for the secular advantages of being Christian and so forth. By this we mean simply that only those who held that secular needs required them to become Christian or Muslim would do so rather than become kiddush hashem[5] while those of

a more pious disposition would be more likely to do whatever it took to stay an observant jew. Of course; some jews did try to keep observant while putting on the face of being good Catholics; these jews were the seed of what Cecil Roth has called '*the lost world of the Marranos*'[\[6\]](#).

There were odd events such as the town of Borja as Oliver relates however they would hardly have been 'typical' as he describes them since as Gerber relates many jews chose to become exiles rather than convert and become marranos[\[7\]](#). There were two routes; one to the Western hemisphere[\[8\]](#) and one to North Africa and the Middle East. We can further state that the jews who would want to convert would have done so but it would appear that by the time of the expulsion this number would have limited and only those with a large amount to lose may have decided that now was an opportune time to do so[\[9\]](#).

If we thus fill in the context it indicates to us that the 'Prince of the Jews' orders to his kin in Spain were hardly anything new in the activities of Spanish jewry. Of course; had the 'Prince of the Jews' known this he would not have advised the jews to do so as he did for it would have been an unspoken fact that they would have been expected to do this. For that matter; if the 'Prince of the Jews' had held authority over Spanish jewry beforehand it would have presumably been on his orders that jews had begun to infiltrate Spanish society in the ways described in the 1492 letter. If so then we must ask the question of why the Spanish jews felt the need to write to their ostensible 'Prince' in 1492 for his instructions and why the 'Prince of the Jews' felt it absolutely necessary to repeat his instructions again in so lurid a form when there was every possibility they might be intercepted by the forces of the Church and the Spanish state at sea, at the port or somewhere in the countryside when the presumably jewish messenger was challenged as he or she would inevitably be.

Some might say this is not what Oliver is arguing but we must assert that indeed by supporting Marsden's argument in this regard as to their being a 'Prince of the Jews' with the requisite authority to command all the jews of Spain he is stating that there was some kind of command structure in the form of a conspiracy on the part of the jews to subvert the Spanish state. We note in particular that Oliver has not rejected point number 6; we can presume he would have read this and taken cognitive note of it in order to make the argument he does, which makes clear that the letter is to be perceived as 'an order' but as we noted in Part II to this response this 'order' is most likely to those who perceived themselves to be 'loyal'[\[10\]](#) to the Ottoman Sultan at this time as well as to potentially create a fifth column in Spain to serve the Ottoman's potential need to sabotage a powerful rival from within.

So can we say that the 'Prince of the Jews' is ordering Spanish jewry to 'convert to Christianity'; yes we can, but when seen in context as we have again pointed out in Part II we have to see this the context of the time where-by the jews thought well of the Ottoman Empire and hence might if asked be willing to serve in return for continued good treatment and special advantages given to them as jews in the empire. Further we have pointed out above that conversion; sincere or in most case as a façade, was not a practice that was suddenly adopted en masse after this letter but rather it was a long established tradition among Spanish jewry with historical roots back to the very establishment of the Spanish empire in the forced conversions of the jews undertaken by the Visigothic Kings.

We have also pointed out the problem with the mismatch in that if the ‘King of the Jews’ had indeed been ordering the jews of Spain for sometime then he would should have well known that conversion for the purposes of secular advancement was a long established tradition in his supposed subjects. Oliver’s assertion thus obviously comes into serious problems in terms of the document itself and the mismatch between what he is purporting it to indicate and what in fact it can be said to indicate[11].

When we look at the other four propositions again there is nothing particularly new in this in so far that jews had been seeping into the Church and state for many centuries prior to the completion of the reconquista[12] of Spain by King Ferdinand and Queen Isabella.

This was particularly true in trade with Foa asserting that; *‘commerce and money lending became the privileged terrain of Jewish activity in the thirteenth century’* [13] and that *‘Spanish Jews did not limit themselves to large commercial trade in the Mediterranean. They were brokers and small businessmen as well. They travelled with merchandise hanging around their necks and were involved in the retail sale of goods of every kind, including livestock.’* [14]

This also invalidates the potential claim that could be implied from Oliver’s writing in that the dominance of jews; and later Marranos, in Spanish; and Portuguese for that matter, international trade could be ascribed to the orders of the ‘Prince of the Jews’ in the letter in so far as in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries this was already an accomplished fact. Thus rendering the instruction pointless; because the dominance had already been achieved so we must suggest that it was written by a person or persons who did not already perceive this established position[15].

Further to this lack of perception of the established position; jews had at this time heavily seeped into the Church and even Diego de Deza; a very prominent theologian at the University of Salamanca[16], was heavily suspected of having converso[17] heritage. Numerous priests, bishops, arch-bishops were reputed to have converso heritage and thus became suspect within the Church of being secret jews.

While making this point it is important to note on Oliver’s claim about baptismal water taking away the status of being a jew and while this legally true in that a converted jew did gain the privileges of ostensibly being a Christian he or she was still viewed as a jew by the population and the authorities. This doctrine had come into public discourse in the Visigoth era before the Islamic conquest of Spain. No jew ever really became free of the stigma of being a jew; as Oliver was likely well aware; the distinction of the ‘old Christian’ and the ‘new Christian’ became essentially a racial distinction between the native Spanish and the non-native jewish inhabitants of Spain. Much the same distinction was also used to distinguished between native Spanish and former Muslims; largely of North African i.e. Moorish, stock.

As Gerber notes:

‘Certainly, the population at large drew distinctions; converts were automatically suspect, and Christians began ferreting out crypto-Judaic practices and informing on the practitioners. Such peculiar designations as “baptized Jews” and “non-baptized Jews” entered the national lexicon

along with the novel racial conception of Old and New Christians. The latter were not allowed the slightest doubt about their new faith; wavering or lukewarm converts were threatened with expulsion from Spain by the Eight Council of Toledo.' [18]

We therefore must find Oliver's argument wanting both in terms of the sarcasm he uses in regards to the idea of the baptism of the jewish converts and find that there was indeed a primitive racial conception; tempered by Christian theology, of the jewish people at work behind the actions we have been discussing.

As well as being powerful in the Church jews were also very powerful at court. Foa notes that:

'The "court Jews" stood at the highest level of the hierarchy appointed first by the Muslims and then by the Christian kings as the main administrative officers, tax collectors, functionaries, and court treasurers.' [19]

If we move on down the centuries she notes as follows about the period in question:

'In Spain, especially in Castile, Jewish involvement in the organization of the state reached its peak in the fourteenth century, only to decline in the fifteenth. Even then, moreover, court Jews continued to perform an important role until the expulsion. Particularly in the last decades of the fifteenth century, Ferdinand and Isabella, the Reyes catolicos ("Catholic kings"), resumed the use of Jewish services in the transformation and centralization of the state. On the even of the conquest of Granada and the expulsion, Jews were still among the most important administrators, from Isaac Abrabanel, the tax collector and renowned financier, who was later exiled to Naples and Venice, to Abraham Seneor, tax collector general and, from 1477, "chief rabbi" by royal decree'. [20]

Thus we find that the jews were also ubiquitous at court [21] before the letter was sent out in 1492; that there would again be no need to state this to Spanish jewry had the; presumably jewish, author or authors of the letter known this to be fact. We can therefore say with confidence that the 'Prince of the Jews' did not rule over Spanish jewry and certainly did not issue orders which they followed because they came from his authority. Rather that the practices outlined in the letter were already common among Spanish jews and that what they decided to do after the 1492 decree had been promulgated was decided largely on what they stood to lose and/or whether they were frum and very attached to their Judaic faith.

Therefore; we find that Oliver's article; '*Those Awful Protocols*', to be quite deficient in facts; although quite humorous at times, and that Oliver's argument as to the authenticity of the Protocols cannot be accepted as valid since the arguments he presents are not grounded in what we would consider a coherent and contextually accurate version of history but rather a very selective one. This isn't to pillory Oliver; who was a star academic and authored some truly excellent short works concerning the jewish question, but rather that we feel he realised the case he was making was weak and tried to bolster it by using selective references; building on the Marsden edition's notes, to create a much stronger and learned case on the surface but unfortunately a rotten one when one digs into the minutiae of the issues that Oliver deliberately; and occasionally inadvertently, brings to light.

[1] Available at the following address: <http://semiticcontroversies.blogspot.com/2008/07/that-bane-of-rationality-response-to.html>

[2] Oliver lists this as 1498 but Marsden (1934) cites this as being in fact 1492; which ties it in with the expulsion of Spanish jewry at this time; while Oliver's date of 1498 would have no correlation with any major events in Spanish jewry's history.

[3] For more information on the Exilarch as well as the Nagid (Chief of Egyptian jews). Please see Anna Foa, Trans. Andrea Grover, 2000, *'The Jews of Europe after the Black Death'*, 1st Edition, University of California Press: Berkley, pp. 64-65

[4] We use the version Oliver is presumably using on p. 99 in Victor Marsden, 1934, *'The Protocols of Zion: With Preface and Explanatory Notes'*, 1st Edition, The Britons: London

[5] Jewish martyrs and the conception of jewish martyrdom in Judaism.

[6] This is further outlined and qualified in Cecil Roth's, 1941, *'A History of the Marranos'*, 1st Edition, Jewish Publication Society of America: Philadelphia

[7] Jane Gerber, 1992, *'The Jews of Spain: A History of the Sephardic Experience'*, 1st Edition, Simon & Schuster: New York, pp. xxii- xiii

[8] This is well described; with a focus on England, in Albert Hyamson's, 1951, *'The Sephardim in England: A History of the Spanish and Portuguese Jewish Community 1492-1951'*, 1st Edition, Methuen: London in particular see pp. 1-23.

[9] Since they might have been able to keep some measure; but not likely all, of their wealth by supplication to King Ferdinand and Queen Isabella and arguing that they would generate more money for them in taxes in the long run than they would be able to if they lost all their wealth and had to build up their wealth from nothing again.

[10] Jews have historically not been loyal to anything but their own interests but they can seem to be acting in the interests of any given state as long as that state's interests and their own coincide. They will do what they think is best for the state and themselves as far as it can be reconciled. However as any good cynic knows if you put your own interests ahead of that you are ostensibly serving you will fall from grace so the jews would have reserved their own interests as an absolute priority only in areas which they thought were vital to their interests and acted relatively beneficially most of the time.

[11] Which I maintain is far more likely the Ottoman Sultan; on the explicit advice of his jewish courtiers and courtiers, trying to either get a fifth column in Spain (likely not knowing many Spanish jews were already converts and established in high office (both clerical and secular)) or to make frum; or pious, jews flee to the Ottoman Empire where they would then be subjects to him (and thus bring him tax revenue, staff his customs service, serve as tax collectors and potentially offer him loans).

[12] This is the Spanish for re-conquest; in reference to the re-taking the Iberian peninsula from Islamic and replacing it with Catholic rule.

[13] Foa, 2000, p. 80

[14] Ibid.

[15] A more complicated explanation could be offered on my thesis whereby the presumed jewish author of this letter to the Spanish jews wishing to keep the jewish domination of international trade a secret injected this point into the letter to make it seem as if there was not a virtual jewish monopoly on this kind of trade and that connexion between the jews of the Ottoman Empire and those elsewhere were not as strong as they in fact were. The reason for this might be that other courtiers; such as perhaps the Sultan's Vizier, would have read the letter

before it was dispatched and the presumably jewish authors might have indeed

[16] Gerber, 1992, p. xviii

[17] New jewish converts to Christianity.

[18] Gerber, 1992, p. 13

[19] Foa, 2000, p. 79

[20] Ibid. Also see Gerber, 1992, pp. xxi-xiii.

[21] Some would likely use this as evidence that they the jews did not have significant influence in Spain however the very fact there was so many in high places and that they survived numerous trials by using their influence is a testament to their power. There is also a story; which as far as we know is unconfirmed, that the jews almost managed to stay their expulsion by offering a hefty bribe to Ferdinand and Isabella and that they were only expelled because Torquemada burst in and appealed to the very strong religious zeal of both King and Queen to do their Christian duty and expel the murderers of Christ. Power does not always equate the ability to save oneself but rather it is the ability to alter policy and sometimes policy comes in such a form that it cannot be altered because there is an ulterior driving force (which we would argue comes from the external impetus of the Church in this case).

Why Semitic Controversies Was Created

Sunday, 27 July 2008

Some responses that we've had to our efforts here at Semitic Controversies have been quite critical of the fact that we take to task the anti-jewish literature far more than we ostensibly do the jews. Although if you carefully read the articles that we have written. It should become apparent that we are not defending jews, but rather making an effort to set anti-jewish discourse on an even and factual keel.

Semitic Controversies is doing this, because we believe that anti-jewish literature has been dogged by a whole range of canards, general lack of knowledge about jews and a very two-dimensional interpretation of them as a race. We have found in our considerable combined experience in discoursing with others about jews and with jews themselves. That those who criticise jews are often badly informed about jews and seem to take little trouble in trying to understand their ostensible opponent. It is often the case that those who criticise jews are as badly informed as those who apologise for them. That is an unpleasant statement for strongly anti-jewish people, such as ourselves, to make, but one that is unfortunately a truism at the time of writing.

This is not to say that some anti-jewish critiques and writings that have appeared over the years have not been without merit and that there have even been some trenchant ones. That have realistically and precisely defined the jewish foe in the light of the knowledge and literature available at that time. However: what has happened since the end of the Second World War is that discourse about the jews has ceased to evolve for all practical purposes and has not changed to suit the times that it is in or changed state of the intellectual landscape that it now has to contend with. In essence: it has stagnated and the assertions it makes about jews have ready-made powerful answers. Jews can, for example, rightly charge that the quotes from the Talmud

used by many are either made-up, altered or taken out of context[1].

These quotes from the Talmud may be instructive to us as serving as an example. In so far that these quotes have their origins in at least the early 20th century, although they can be arguably traced back to the 12th century, and have not been checked by anti-jewish writers for their voracity it would seem. Works such as *'The Talmud Unmasked'* of Reverend Pranaitis[2] and *'The Jewish Religion: Its Influence Today'* by Elizabeth Dilling[3] continue to be used as basic materials by critics of jews. Despite the fact that in the first instance: they contain outright fabrications and quotations out of context. In the second instance: they contain out of context quotations and quotations without the rabbinical interpretation being sufficiently stated as to explain the meaning correctly.

You might argue that it doesn't matter as to meaning, especially when a quote is so lurid as to speak for itself, but then what if that quote isn't actually accurate and it in fact opens itself to powerful or even devastating rebuttal. For example: one finds in Dilling the repetition of the argument that the Kol Nidre is a prayer to remove the jews from the necessity from telling the truth[4]. This is a repetition of an older allegation made by Marsden where-by you cannot believe what a jew says because he or she has said the Kol Nidre and therefore is under absolutely no obligation to tell the truth. Ignoring the obvious logical issues with that argument: [5] we find that the origins of the Kol Nidre are found in the Sephardi world[6] and actually refer to the Christian, and to a lesser extent the Islamic, faith rather than anything more general. The reference to the Christian faith is simple in that the forced conversions from the Visigothic period onwards the jews were generally not allowed to return to Judaism despite having been forcibly baptised into the Christian faith. When these individuals and groups were given the opportunity to return to Judaism: they often did so. However many jews, who of course still defined themselves as being jews, did not have thus luxury and instead publicly observed Christian or Islamic rites but in private carried on with the Judaic rites. Now these jews could not of course perform all the rites that an observant jew could and would in jewish eyes blaspheme Hashem by having to accept the Eucharist. Thus the Kol Nidre was devised as a theological device by jews to help their kindred whom were forced to retain an outwardly Christian or Islamic direction. The vows it refers to are, of course, the prayers and rites of Christianity and Islam.

It could be argued that this has a wider scope, but one would have to be able to positively evidence it in terms of the rabbinical response and practical application. So you would have to find a clear rabbinical permission for this to be used as well as jews in fact invoking this Judaic precedent in an actual event. Unless you have this, which no author to our knowledge has, then one cannot argue that the Kol Nidre is anything but a prayer removing the jews from their bonds inside the Christian and Islamic faiths. This can be read into as much as one likes, but one should not make an utterly speculative argument, because as soon as you leave the solid base of what you can evidence with the jewish and non-jewish literature as well as real events then you stray onto a dangerous path. That dangerous path often leads you into making unfounded speculative assertions based on no actual evidence at all and will allow your opponents to rubbish and debunk your arguments by simply dealing with your speculative assertions rather than the parts of your argument based on a solid mass of evidence.

Dilling thus provides us an excellent example of where an argument can seem on the surface to be quite correct but because it is not given any context nor is the reason for a given rabbinical ruling considered it in fact is heavily misconstrued and thus is easy for a Rabbi or anybody who has a knowledge of the rabbinical literature in the context of jewish history to answer quite conclusively and thus make the person asserting the more outrageous argument (for example the assertion that the Kol Nidre is in essence a blank check for the jews to do what they will to the gentiles) look like a sinister liar or a fool who did not check the literature himself before hand. Thus the pro-jewish literature can then declare the person making the argument to be 'irrational' and 'uneducated'. Using this as back up to their common assertion that 'anti-jewish prejudice' and 'anti-Semitism' are in fact the products of not knowing enough about jews and Judaism (as well as based on 'bigoted superstition'). Thus the anti-jewish argument becomes fodder to the pro-jewish one, because the anti-jewish argument has not been checked for factual accuracy and nor has it been subject to considered criticism from other anti-jewish persons and authors. We can therefore say that, because of this dynamic of jews using bad anti-jewish arguments to bolster their own argumentation as well as their propaganda depicting the anti-jewish person as some kind of inbred, illiterate moron. That when one makes a bad anti-jewish argument and uses one or more standard anti-jewish canards without checking them then one is actually helping the jewish cause far more than that same person would had they have written a good pro-jewish argument.

We at Semitic Controversies believe that to fight jewish power you first need to clean up your own argument by weeding out the unreliable aspects there-of. We contend that, because as an anti-jewish person you are dealing with a legalistic race of beings who specialise in nit-picking over points of argument and making black into white, that you need to make sure your own argument is whiter-than-white in order to prevent the jews making it seem to the folk at large that it is in fact black. Anti-jewish argument will not be accepted as credible until it weeds out some of the bad arguments, and occasional lunacy, which has dogged it for so long.

If you take for example the anti-Zionist arguments: they have been developed rather differently from anti-jewish arguments. They were created using a historical basis and linking in aspects of jewish power around the world and what the Israeli state (and its jewish citizens) have been doing in Palestine and to a lesser extent elsewhere. It grounds its argument in facts, statistics and appropriate testimony, which allows it to then take an intellectually credible position. Anti-jewish argument must do the same thing, and the only way to do this in our opinion here at Semitic Controversies is to take a surgical knife to anti-jewish arguments and examine what lurks underneath. In doing so we believe we will find, and indeed have found, many anti-jewish arguments based on rotten premises, but we have also discovered some good arguments, often neglected and unused, which deserve intellectual attention.

In finding new good arguments: we use the pro-jewish literature to find them generally speaking. That might sound strange to most seasoned anti-jewish authors and thinkers, but take a few moments to consider it. The pro-jewish arguments are based on the very considerable pro-jewish literature out there. Now in the course of this literature jews have to account for their activities since the dawn of their history. To do so they have to make concessions here and there to allow them to fit their history with some kind of coherent narrative.

For example: in our response to Revilo Oliver's '*Those Awful Protocols*'. We used pro-jewish literature to point out that in fact jews were extremely powerful in the world of government and commerce in middle ages and early modern Europe. This cannot be denied by pro-jewish authors, because it is an accepted fact within jewish historical circles and jews themselves have made no move to deny this as being true. Since they believe it proves their own superiority and necessity to civilisation.

Now think about what the pro-jewish authors can do if you put a different spin on these facts and incorporate other facts from across the pro-jewish literature to make the situation not nearly as rosy and wonderful as the pro-jewish authors try to make it. Now what can pro-jewish authors actually do to rebutt, debunk and/or explode your arguments? The answer is simply: not much. All they can do is suggest that your argument is not cogent on interpretative rather than factual grounds. This means that their opportunity for decisive critique is limited and they are forced to concede to you the status of a valid intellectual position *ipso facto* regardless of whether they openly announce it or not. If you take the arguments that jews have been using to justify their own interpretations for years and offer a different interpretation they cannot do much to you intellectually, or even legally, since all you have done is offer a differing interpretation of the facts that they themselves accept as true.

Doing this will allow you to begin to gain ground of jewry and be able to oppose them as a force to be reckoned with rather than a fringe movement, because your intellectual opinions are no longer based on sheer speculative argument or are easily debunked by an investigation of context and facts. They will win adherents, because they will be good arguments based on a wide range of sources, primary and secondary, which require intellectual consideration rather than simple dismissal as so much paranoid rubbish.

It is time for anti-jewish argument to begin to evolve again and to win back the adherents it has lost in the intervening years since the end of the Second World War. This no longer the world of Henry Ford, Eduard Drumont, William Pierce, Revilo Oliver, Adolf Hitler, Dietrich Eckart, Eugen Duehring and Elizabeth Dilling, it is a new century, a new millennia and it is time for a real new anti-Semitism.

[1] A comprehensive picture of this can be found in David Golinkin's, 1996, '*The Responsa of Professor Louis Ginzberg*', 1st Edition, Jewish Theological Seminary: New York, pp. 234-250.

[2] The full text is available at the following address: <http://www.talmudunmasked.com/>

[3] The full text is available at the following address: <http://www.come-and-hear.com/dilling/dcontents.html>

[4] Dilling's exact argument is available at the following address: http://www.come-and-hear.com/dilling/chapt04.html#Kol_Nidre

[5] Such as how you can evidence this actually occurring.

[6] They are actually found in much older times referring to a point of ritual but the usage we are referring to here dates from the Sephardi era when it comes into practical effect to help jews who cannot be observant due to secular circumstances.

The Open Double Standard: Doctor Aribert Heim versus Doctor Yitzhak

Arad

Sunday, 27 July 2008

It's been all over the mainstream media and some of the 'alternative' media outlets as well; SS Officer Doctor Aribert Heim is supposedly alive and well in South America and 'Dr.' Ephraim Zuroff of the Simon Wiesenthal Center is 'hot on his trail'[1]. Doctor Heim is supposed to have committed numerous crimes at Mauthausen concentration camp during the Second World War. The crimes of which Doctor Heim has been accused are indeed bestial; if they are true, but their supposed purpose would tend to logically discredit them from having occurred for this purpose and having been ignored by the SS administrative and medical personnel both at the camp and in the respective central offices.

Marc Perelman writing in; *'The Jewish Daily Forward'*, reports that Doctor Heim performed *'torture experiments he conducted on Jewish prisoners at the concentration camp in Austria.'* Now what Perelman does not state openly; for what reason we shall not speculate on, is the nature of the crimes alleged to have been committed. Doctor Heim; to be specific, is alleged to have injected jewish concentration camp inmates with toxic chemicals; such as petrol, to see what would happen. Now any competent physician in the 1920's or 30's let alone the 1940's when these experiments were supposedly conducted knows what will happen when you inject a highly toxic and corrosive substance into the bloodstream. The patient is going to die in excruciating agony with the time depending on the dosage given to them[2].

What has perhaps not been asked by Mr. Perelman and even by Doctor Heim's 'hunter' who seems to view Doctor Heim as some form of 'prey'; like a wild beast to be corralled in a cage[3], is what the purpose of these alleged experiments in fact was. If Doctor Heim was in fact doing these experiments he must have had a good medical reason for doing so and certainly he would have had a research objective? However; we are forced to wonder in the literature what the research objective and medical reason for doing said experiments was? After all in a state of war would it not have been a criminal offense to use scarce materials; such as petrol and medical supplies, which were in extremely high demand on all military and civilian fronts for a non-essential purpose would have been a crime against the German folk and the Third Reich itself. But what possible reason could there be?

Mr. Perelman in fact implies the accepted reason; at least among the jewish people generally, when he uses the phrasing; *'torture experiments'*, to describe Doctor Heim's alleged crimes. That phrase tells us that in fact the supposed purposes of these experiments was supposedly to *'torture jews'* and that there was no obvious research goal or medical need for the data that was supposedly gathered. What purpose these experiments served or more precisely what the research goal was is to the best of my knowledge completely unanswered in the literature on the 'holocaust'; rather we get a formulation similar to that which Mr. Perelman offers us where jews are simply the target because they are jews.

Now are jews really so special as to be the specific target of torture just because they are jews; this is as far as we can ascertain the generally jewish view on the matter in that they are so unique and special that they have been persecuted throughout history because the gentiles; and

the world at large, is jealous because they are the 'chosen of Ha-Shem'. So therefore this special status is the root in the jewish mind of why Doctor Heim; and presumably the Third Reich itself, though it was so very important to torture jews to death in horrific ways simply because they were jews.

This jewish interpretation of their own history is perhaps surprisingly the standard by which the world at large looks at jews. When an author opposes some of the key established interpretations; such as jews being the victim of 'irrational prejudice' rather than the party provoking the other parties in a given settlement, province or country to rise against them. Then one is automatically guilty of 'anti-Semitism' or more precisely 'irrational hatred of the jews' to use the general jewish definition there-of.

Now the stalking of Doctor Heim; if he is indeed alive, is something quite unusual in that here is a man alleged to have been involved in gruesome experiments but jews are so obsessed in finding him that they will do anything to bring publicity to their cause; as the German prosecutor was quoted almost as a criminal in Mr. Perelman's article noted. What seems obvious to the reader of Mr. Perelman's article is that jews and jewry are doing anything and everything in their power to find Doctor Heim but the question remains why. If they have proven nothing against him from the documentary evidence; why are they pursuing a very old man to death's door? Ephraim Zuroff himself has stated repeatedly that '*time in no way diminishes the crime*'[\[4\]](#) but then what about so-called 'war crimes' committed by jews?

A story which has been getting less coverage in the international press; but quite a lot within Israel itself, is the issue over the Lithuanian government's investigation of a leading jewish 'holocaust' historian; Doctor Yitzhak Arad[\[5\]](#), in connexion with crimes committed against the Lithuanian population in Kaniukai by Soviet anti-German partisan units[\[6\]](#). What is of interest here is the double standard being used by the jewish people in regards to alleged crimes committed in the same war. On the one hand; well-funded specialist jewish organisations are pulling out all the stops to find Doctor Heim; including threatening south American governments with their considerable international commercial and political clout, who is alleged; but not proven, to have been involved in 'war crimes'. Whilst we have a famous Israeli 'holocaust' historian; to whom Israel has denied Lithuania access[\[7\]](#), who is being investigated in relation to a massacre of 38 people in a village in 1944.

Of particular note here is that jewish organisations[\[8\]](#); as well as the Israeli government, have been expressing 'outrage' and 'shock' about how a jewish person who 'fought against the Nazis' could possibly be investigated for 'war crimes'. Now if the jewish organisations and the Israeli government[\[9\]](#) wanted 'truth and memory' then they would happily give Lithuania access to Yitzhak Arad. What do the jews; and presumably the Israelis as well, have to hide?

Surely; they wish to document potential crimes by their own people towards this goal; after all are we not told by what Norman Finkelstein has aptly termed '*The Holocaust Industry*'[\[10\]](#), that we must '*never forget*' and that the slogan of '*never again!*' should always be on our lips. But does this not apply when looking for justice for the murdered villagers of Kaniukai? Apparently; this is not the case.

Arad is quoted by Mr. Perelman and Ms. Gerstein as stating:

'The murderers are now becoming national heroes, and we, the few surviving victims who took up arms and fought the murderers, are under investigation as criminals.'

Now let's stop and re-read this breath-taking bit of audacity for a moment. Dr. Arad is telling us that he is not a criminal; that's quite a normal statement to make. However; if he is not a criminal; firstly he should open himself up for investigation to the Lithuanian authorities in Israel; after all we presume he has nothing that he wishes to hide? Secondly; he should voluntarily put himself at the disposal of Lithuania's public prosecutor in order to clear up the matter and actually lend his own help to clear his name rather than trying to derail attempts to come to an objective conclusion in the matter.

Dr. Arad has not done this and as in any criminal investigation when your suspect, his friends and associates don't co-operate and begin to proclaim their unconditional innocence to the world you are going to get suspicious. After all if you have nothing to hide; why bother it is far easier to just go down to the proverbial police station and get this sorted out. That is what any good law-abiding citizen; i.e. not usually those of Jewish extraction, would do[\[11\]](#).

Now we look at the first far more audacious part of Dr. Arad's statement in which he says that *'the murderers are now becoming national heroes'*; now this might seem a little odd to readers out of context. What it refers to is the theory put forward by Israeli and Jewish sources that there is a 'right-wing conspiracy' at work here; which seeks to put a Jew up for trial for offenses against the Lithuanian people; the underlying logic being that Dr. Arad is a 'scapegoat' for all the wrongs of communism; since he was part of a Soviet partisan unit, against the Lithuanian people as well as being a Jew [and therefore a representative of communism].

Now let us ponder this 'conspiracy' for a moment.

Mr. Perelman and Ms. Gerstein describe it thus:

'As a part of his work, Arad drew the ire of right-wing groups when he publicly asked that the country address the role of Lithuanians in the murder of Jews during the Holocaust. After a number of attacks on Arad in right-wing Lithuanian newspapers, Lithuania's chief prosecutor opened a pre-trial investigation of Arad's wartime actions in Kaniukai. A Polish institute had earlier found that 38 people in the town were killed in 1944 by a Soviet anti-Nazi unit consisting of 120 to 150 people, including both Jews and non-Jews.'

Now it is obvious from reading this quotation that Mr. Perelman and Ms. Gerstein are intimating that because Dr. Arad was demanding recognition of some 'war crimes' against Jews; please note the wording *'against Jews'* not against *'ethnic minorities'* or some such but quite specifically: *Jews*, he has had an investigation; which is implied by Mr. Perelman and Ms. Gerstein to be spurious, being opened into his alleged 'war crimes'. The supposed spuriousness of these 'war crimes' is implied at the end of the article by Mr. Perelman and Ms. Gerstein quoting Carl Rheims[\[12\]](#) as follows:

‘These are absurd charges. It's an outrage that these charges are being levelled. Even seeking these people as witnesses is obscene.’

Now apparently it is also ‘*obscene*’ to investigate jews for war crimes as well; particularly such an established and well known individual as Dr. Arad. Why is not ‘*obscene*’ to charge; let alone ‘hunt’ him across the globe, Doctor Heim with crimes that cannot be proven beyond ‘he said, she said’ testimony[13] but I would suppose that perhaps this is righteous? Because Doctor Heim allegedly killed jews; which is apparently the root[14] of all these screaming and spittle-flecked denials of guilt and allusions (as well as accusations) of ‘anti-Semitism’ that we have thus far quoted.

What Mr. Perelman and Ms. Gerstein are saying is not what would appear to be the case from the distortion of the facts presented by them. Let us untangle their paragraph to understand the situation as it presents itself.

Dr. Arad was temporarily residing in Lithuania after having been invited by the country’s president to help with examining supposed ‘war crimes’ involving Lithuania during the Second World War. It came to light that he; as a member of a Soviet anti-German partisan group in 1944 may have been involved in a massacre of civilians in Lithuania. ‘Right wing’ newspapers and organisations then understandably began to agitate for Dr. Arad to be investigated in relation to these charges and the government; being the supposed democracy that it is, decided to investigate these serious charges which might compromise Dr. Arad’s position on the commission. It continues these investigations in secret because it doesn’t wish for a scandal; however the Israeli government is informed as per diplomatic etiquette that Lithuania would like to question to Dr. Arad in relation to potential ‘war crimes’ offenses in Kaniukai. Then with the ‘right wing’ newspapers and organisations in Lithuania welcoming this opportunity to clear up some of the uncertainty surrounding the Kaniukai massacre; the jewish organisations and newspapers [Israeli and Diaspora] begin to shriek loudly to the effect of that this inquiry is an ‘*obscene*’; as per Mr. Rheims, and that this should be dropped immediately [presumably with a grovelling apology]; as per Mr. Baker of the American Jewish Committee.

So Mr. Perelman and Ms. Gerstein are telling us that this a ‘right wing conspiracy’; because a prominent Israeli jew is being asked to come forward and help investigators understand the massacre of Lithuanian people in Kaniukai? I think not; rather what has occurred here is something that is common across jewish history whereby jews as a general rule simply refuse to take responsibility for anything negative.

When Elliot Horowitz discussed this very point in his book; ‘*Reckless Rites: Purim and the Legacy of Jewish Violence*’, he notes in relation to the slaughter of Christians; either perpetrated or encouraged by jews [depending on the account you read], in Jerusalem in 614 that:

‘The tendency in Israeli historiography, both academic and popular, to ignore the slaughter of Jerusalem’s Christians in 614 and/or the Jewish role therein only strengthened after the city came under exclusive Jewish rule as a consequence of the Six Day War.’ [15]

In this regard; we can the same is occurring with the Second World War in that alleged or real

‘war crimes’ against the jews are the subject of a very considerable amount of popular and academic literature; references being made to them even in works that don’t deal with jews or the so-called ‘holocaust’, and that those alleged or real ‘war crimes’ committed by jews are just to be straight out ignored by the world.

So we get to the bizarre situation that we have discussed where Doctor Heim; an allegedly 94 year old man if he is still alive, is being pursued through the world by jews on the premise that he ‘must answer’ for his alleged crimes for which we have nothing more than a heap of; likely contradictory and/or physically impossible, jewish testimony that these things supposedly occurred[16]. While a jew who may or may not have had something to do with a massacre in a Lithuanian village is lauded with honours and then protected by his own people; while loudly denouncing his accusers as part of a ‘right wing[17] conspiracy’ against him.

If Dr. Arad had nothing to do with these ‘war crimes’ then why does he not come forward voluntarily and help the Lithuanian public prosecutor with his investigations. If he is not guilty it should be a simple matter; since he has many friends to stand up for him and allow for a fair trial; while Doctor Heim; presuming he is actually still alive, does not have a favourably disposed government or a large body of international media to support him unlike Dr. Arad.

The double standard in operation is obvious... if you are a jew apparently you are allowed to quite literally get away with the murder of non jews[18]. However if you are a non-jew and you are alleged to have murdered jews then the jews will allow nothing to get in their way of finding you and serving jewish ‘justice’ upon you.

The chutzpah involved here is quite astounding... even for jews.

[1] For a recent example see Marc Perelman, ‘*Nazi-Hunter Claims Most-Wanted Prey is Alive and Free in South America*’, The Jewish Daily Forward, 24th July, 2008, Accessible at the following link: <http://www.forward.com/articles/13850/>. We shall use this article to analyse what is actually being said; by implication rather than literal statement, by Mr. Perelman in reference to this case.

[2] A sample of what would happen even if you engaged in the much milder practice of petrol sniffing can be found at the following address:

<http://www.abc.net.au/health/library/stories/2005/11/24/1831506.htm>

[3] The imagery evoked by Perelman’s article is a wild, animal trapped in a pit with the hunters circling; this imagery is likely deliberate to convey the impression to the reader that indeed Zuroff’s proclamations that he will ‘find Heim soon’ carry some weight of authenticity. It seems however unlikely that Zuroff’s claims are actually authoritative as Perelman himself notes in passing that (and treats the statement like it was itself criminal): ‘*When contacted by the Forward to discuss the sightings, the German state prosecutor leading the cold-case investigation into Heim’s whereabouts alleged that Zuroff had manipulated the facts in order to garner press coverage.*’ Which in fact suggests that Zuroff is lying and/or misrepresenting his real position to the world in order to achieve some other objective; since the German government is very much at the mercy of jews and jewry given that is consistently blackmailed into giving ‘holocaust survivors’; as well as Israel, capital or payment in kind.

[4] He famously asserted this in relation to Alois Brunner in the television documentary directed

by Guido Knopp; *'The SS: The Mystery of Odessa'* between 36:38 and 36:41 minutes.

[5] A former Chairman of the world famous Yad Vashem holocaust museum and the author of one of the standard works on the 'holocaust' concerning Belzec, Sobibor and Treblinka (the 'Operation Reinhardt Death Camps').

[6] One recent article which has been co-written by Mr. Perelman is: Lana Gerstein, Marc Perelman, *'Tensions mount over probe into Jewish 'war crimes''*, Haaretz, <http://www.haaretz.com/hasen/spages/1000086.html>, Accessed: 27/07/2008.

[7] The wording is as follows: *'In June 2007, Israel was formally asked to question Arad - a request that Israel declined'* in Ibid.

[8] Including the influential American Jewish Congress who stated in Ibid that: *"There was a fair degree of frustration and disappointment because there was nothing really forthcoming, nothing new, no commitments, no promises," said Andrew Baker, director of international Jewish affairs at AJC. "We are all puzzled at why the investigation isn't closed."*

[9] These two generalised entities; the influential jewish organisations and the Israeli government can be generally presumed to equate the will of the jewish people as their well-financed representatives at the international level so we must assume if they generally agreed then they speak to all intents and purposes with the united voice of international jewry; so-called.

[10] Norman Finkelstein, 2001, *'The Holocaust Industry: Reflections on the Exploitation of Jewish Suffering'*, 2nd Edition, Verso: New York. On this point also see Barnett Litvinoff's, 1969, *'A Peculiar People: Inside the Jewish World Today'*, 1st Edition, Weidenfeld & Nicolson: London, pp. 264-271.

[11] In the case of Doctor Heim it is well recorded by previous; such as the Demjanjuk, trials of this kind that he would not get a fair trial and that regards of the evidence brought forward in his favour the jury and judges would be inevitably biased against his defence case. This is as true now as it was for Adolf Eichmann when he was tortured in Jerusalem for information and to ensure that he towed the standard 'holocaust' line; at that time, at trial. For more information about this please see Theodore O'Keefe's review of *'Eichmann Interrogated: Transcripts from the Archives of the Israeli Police'*; which is available at the following address:

http://www.ihr.org/jhr/v06/v06p237_Okeefe.html.

[12] Carl Rheims is the Executive Director of the YIVO Institute for Jewish Research. This organisation can be contacted and researched at the following address:

<http://www.yivoinstitute.org/>.

[13] For example: the witnesses who claim he put dried jewish heads on his desk to decorate it and the experiments which we have already discussed which apparently served no purpose whatsoever other than making life for jews that bit more uncomfortable.

[14] Along with the jewish preoccupation with being the 'Chosen people' and therefore a cut above the rest of humanity. For more on this point I would suggest reading the following: Nathan Perlmutter & Ruth Ann Perlmutter's, 1982, *'The Real Anti-Semitism in America'*, 1st Edition, Arbor House: New York, pp. 39-41; Dennis Prager & Joseph Telushkin's, 1981, *'The Nine Questions People Ask About Judaism'*, 2nd Edition, Simon and Schuster: New York, pp. 25-31; John Allegro's, 1971, *'The Chosen People: A Study of Jewish history from the time of the Exile until the Revolt of Bar Kocheba'*, 1st Edition, Hodder and Stoughton: London, pp. 5, 42-51 and 105-126 and Ephraim Levine, 1955, *'The Jewish Heritage: A Symposium Edited by The Rev. Ephraim Levine'*, 1st Edition, Vallentine, Mitchell & Co.: London, p. xii.

[15] Elliot Horowitz, 2007, *'Reckless Rites: Purim and the Legacy of Jewish Violence'*, 1st Edition, Princeton University Press: Princeton, p. 243.

[16] We haven't taken the time to peruse this testimony concerning Doctor Heim but if it is true to form it will be lengthy, internally contradictory, contain numerous impossibilities/nonsense's and contradict each other as well as established 'holocaust' historiography at the same time.

[17] And presumably 'anti-Semitic'; as most observers of jews quickly realise anything that a jew doesn't happen to link is 'anti-Semitic' using the same logic as Marxism in the part of its doctrine concerning 'counter-revolutionaries'.

[18] We are assuming here for a moment that Dr. Arad might have had something to do with these 'war crimes'.

A Letter to the Ambassador: The Open Double Standard in Action

Sunday, 3 August 2008

Last week on Semitic Controversies we published our article; '*The Open Double Standard: Doctor Aribert Heim versus Doctor Yitzhak Arad*'[1], in it we commented at length about the general hypocrisy of jews and how jews only really care about themselves[2]. It came to our attention that a letter from a jew; by the name of Dreyfus, had been posted on the '*Jewish Club Maoz*' Yahoo group[3] about this very issue addressed to the Lithuanian Ambassador in the United States[4]. Since this letter confirms some of the points we made in our article we are publishing it; since the author has already made it public domain by allowing it to be published on a Yahoo Group.

We will analyze it here and breakdown Dreyfus' argument piece by piece whilst relating it back to the double standard that we described in our original article.

Dreyfus writes as follows:

'Ambassador Bruzga:

I am outraged that Lithuania is investigating Jewish victims of the Holocaust. A people fighting genocide suffered immeasurable pain and its efforts to defend itself were heroic.

Stop these vile proceedings now. You are heaping infamy on yourselves, and further tarring your name by indefensible efforts against a people already unimaginably damaged by your country in the past, and now revisited in yet another century by your unforgivable bigotry and epic injustice.

Millions of my countrymen are disgusted, though only thousands of letters may be sent you and your cohort in malice and cruelty.

*MDS Dreyfus
New York, NY
United States'*

Dreyfus begins the letter with the declaration that he or she is '*outraged*' that Lithuania could

possibly investigate ‘*victims of the holocaust*’ and goes on to justify this statement with the assertion that their people; the jews, ‘*suffered immeasurable pain*’ whilst ‘*fighting a genocide*’ and that their efforts were de facto ‘*heroic*’ because they were supposedly in self-defence.

Let us think about what Dreyfus is actually saying here. Dreyfus is suggesting that because a people; the jews, were subjected to the rule of law and that some atrocities were supposedly committed against them that they are not allowed to be investigated for potential atrocities they may have committed during their ‘*heroic*’ resistance. The jews therefore should not; in Dreyfus’ view, be investigated for anything they have supposedly done and anything they have actually done, which would fall under the legal charge of ‘war crimes’ is to be ignored because they were supposedly unjustly persecuted.

Now hang on a minute. Isn’t Dreyfus simply stating to us that jews should not be charged with any crimes at all; irrespective of whether they committed them, because they are jews. This meaning is further clarified when Dreyfus states as follows:

‘You are heaping infamy on yourselves, and further tarring your name by indefensible efforts against a people already unimaginably damaged by your country in the past, and now revisited in yet another century by your unforgivable bigotry and epic injustice.’

This directly asserts that the ‘*people*’ that Dreyfus refers to are in fact the jews; of which people he is also presumably a member, and that it is because of the jews status as the ‘persecuted people’ that removes them from any responsibility from what they have potentially done. It should be noted in this regard that Dreyfus is operating on a simple bit of logic in his or her mind at the moment in so far that the jews because of their long history of coming under the legal, judicial, military and economic censor are the victim of pointless hatred towards themselves. In Dreyfus’ mind it would seem that the jews have in his or her words been subject to ‘*unforgivable bigotry and epic injustice*’ and that they have never put a foot wrong as a people and have never deserved any of the censorship that they have received.

What Dreyfus’ claims here is essentially based on the jewish status of being the ‘Chosen’ of Ha-Shem and therefore as the earthly representatives of Ha-Shem and made in his image; they are unable to do anything wrong and what the nations of the world; i.e. the gentiles, see as negative jewish behaviour is them carrying out the will of Ha-Shem since as jews they are above others and in communion with their god. As the representatives of their god; their resistance; because National Socialism supposed desired to erase them off the face of the earth[5], is ‘*heroic*’ because they ‘*had no other choice*’.

Does resisting an enemy give license to commit ‘war crimes’ at will? For you are always faced in a choice in war for nobody forces you to simply massacre civilians; which Dr. Arad is being investigated for potentially being involved in. The answer is simply no; it does not. Since although you can resist an enemy; you can choose who you kill and you have to answer for that. The German people have been called to account for alleged, real and fictional atrocities committed by its forces and has had to answer. Other countries; such as Russia[6], have been; and are still being, called to account for what their forces have done during war time and have had to answer. The German people used partisans; the Werewolf units, who engaged in heroic

resistance and did things that might seem reprehensible and the Russian use of partisans is familiar to most. Both could be argued to have been engaging in the same type of activities and on the same grounds as Dreyfus claims Dr. Arad was operating on. So if they committed atrocities should they not be called to account; we suspect Dreyfus would be one of the first baying like a blood mad hound if a former Werewolf had been involved in the shooting of 38 jews with his partisan unit. However; he defends Dr. Arad from mere investigation claiming that the mere investigation of these charges; against a jew, are 'vile' and 'sully the name' of Lithuania.

It should be noted that Dreyfus is not only defending Dr. Arad from the charges but also from even the actual investigation of them. So are we only allowed to investigate non-jews in relation to war crimes? Are not jews also able to commit 'war crimes'? Are not jews human like the rest of us; or are they special? Do the jews not want 'truth and memory' when it concerns one of their own? We would opine that Dreyfus in fact thinks that jews as special and do not have to conform to the rest of humanities standards since they are in Dreyfus' mind... above that. Since apparently jews can't commit 'war crimes'; especially not 'holocaust survivors', then what are we to do? Fall onto our knees and worship the jews as special beings; more than human and closer to the divine than us mere gentiles biologically?

I think not.

For surely; as we observed in the aforementioned article, if Dr. Arad was innocent of these charges he would voluntarily come forward and help the Lithuanian public prosecutor with his investigations since he would surely like to clear this question mark from his good name. However Dr. Arad has not done so; he has hidden behind accusations of a 'conspiracy' against him^[7] and has been unconditionally support in this by the organised jewish establishment; both Israeli and Diaspora. Such an action; as previously noted, is highly suspicious for if he has nothing to hide why bother making such a hullabaloo about it when has powerful supporters behind him should they need to step in and allow a fair and impartial investigation (unlike Doctor Heim; who has no powerful supporters; if he is still alive, and no government willing to fight for his rights)?

Does this not directly suggest that a double standard is in practice in Dreyfus' writings; similar to the one we argued in our article; '*The Open Double Standard*', was in operation?

We think so.

^[1] This is available at the following address:

<http://semiticcontroversies.blogspot.com/2008/07/open-double-standard-doctor-aribert.html>

^[2] Although it should be noted that jews often engage in ostensibly altruistic behaviour towards the world at large this is not it would appear out of love for the world but rather for selfish and propagandistic motives. This can quickly understand by looking at their habit of announcing their generosity to the world and the widespread jewish habit; especially in relation to Israeli jews, of

^[3] This can be found at the following address: <http://groups.yahoo.com/group/JewishClubMaoz/>

^[4] H.E. Audrius Bruzga

[5] The impression one gets from reading jewish accounts of the ‘holocaust’ and of the censorship that they were subjected to in Europe at the time is one of; ‘*how dare they do this to us*’ rather ‘*why are they doing this to us*’. The ‘why’ to the jewish mind would seem to be answered by the conception created by authors on ‘anti-Semitism’ after the defeat of the Third Reich; on this point we suggest a reading of The Jewish Black Book Committee, 1946, *The Black Book: The Nazi Crime Against The Jewish People*, 1st Edition, The Jewish Black Book Committee: New York and Phyllis Chesler, 2005, *The New Anti-Semitism: The Current Crisis and What We Must Do About It*, 2nd Edition, Jossey-Bass: San Francisco.

[6] Such as the ethnic cleansing of Germans from Poland, the mass rapes and murders committed by its soldiers against defenceless German women and the deliberate slaughter of tens if not hundreds of thousands of prisoners of war in captivity. The total destruction after the war; inflicted by the Soviet Union, accounting for at least two million persons if not more. For more information on this point; we suggest a reading of James Bacque’s, 1989, *Other Losses: An Investigation into the Mass Deaths of German Prisoners of War at the Hands of the French and Americans After World War Two*, 1st Edition, Stoddart: Toronto, and 2002, *Crimes and Mercies: The Fate of German Civilians Under Allied Occupation, 1944-1950*, 2nd Edition, Time Warner: London.

[7] Perhaps; we should label Dr. Arad a conspiracy theorist for he and organised jewry; including Dreyfus apparently, seem to believe there is an international conspiracy against jews and in this case it emanates from Lithuania. If somebody was to say that there was a freemasonic conspiracy against Barack Obama and use the fact that there has been a lot of ad hominem based articles run about him then surely Dreyfus would call it a ‘conspiracy theory’ but if we have a situation concerning jews where they claim to be the victim then it supposedly not one.

A Change to the Schedule for this Week

Sunday, 10 August 2008

This week on Semitic Controversies we will be updating the blog on Wednesday rather than today with some long articles on various subjects. We are doing this firstly because these articles will be longer than usual and secondly because the editor of Semitic Controversies is currently taking a few days to himself by way of a summer holiday and because some of the contributors are also off on their holidays.

Next week however things will return to normal and two articles will be posted up on Semitic Controversies as usual. Sometimes due to time constraints we manage to only produce the one article per week but we try to make it up to you; our reader, by producing longer original articles and responsa for the next update.

Yours truly,

The Editor,

An Einstein-Poincaré Conundrum

Wednesday, 13 August 2008

As previously mentioned[1]there exists several continuously purported myths about the physicist Albert Einstein, one of which we will have a look at in this very article: the claim that Einstein plagiarised/stole his work from the scientists Henri Poincaré.

Let's begin with the in the book *"The Incorrigible Plagiarist"*[\[2\]](#).

Bjerknes writes:

"Why is Albert Einstein's name associated with the "principle of relativity", and not Poincaré's"

What is missed here is the known fact that Poincaré's name actually is associated with the PoR (Principle of Relativity). An initial noteworthy difference, before we go into it in more detail it is enough to start with how Poincaré was never able to turn it into a coherent or testable theory, as Einstein was. That's a significant difference; for example Stephen Hawking writes;

"Between 1887 and 1905 there were several attempts, most notably by the Dutch physicist Hendrik Lorentz, to explain the result of the Michelson-Morley experiment in terms of objects contracting and clocks slowing down when they moved through the ether. However, in a famous paper in 1905, a hitherto unknown clerk in the Swiss patent office, Albert Einstein, pointed out that the whole idea of an ether was unnecessary, providing one was willing to abandon the idea of absolute time. A similar point was made a few weeks later by a leading French mathematician, Henri Poincare. Einstein's argument were closer to physics than those of Poincare, who regarded this problem as mathematical. Einstein is usually given credit for the new theory, but Poincare is remembered by having his name attached to an important part of it."[\[3\]](#)

In fact, no single scientist/physicist can actually claim ownership of the PoR. It goes way back to at least Galileo.

Concerning the general scientific establishment, when Einstein papers were reviewed the problem was never that he was unoriginal or had unlawfully "copied" anything, on the contrary; Einstein had made quite daring and original predictions which appeared to the scientific community as new, not the fundamental mathematics or field of inquiry itself though but then again, Einstein not once claimed that he had invented the mathematical tools for proof, such as the Fitzgerald-Lorentz contraction[\[4\]](#), tensor-calculus etc. However, he had succeeded in unifying several results under the "umbrella" of one theory. Any theft of Poincaré would be rather hard to do if not for anything then for the fact that he was nothing less than the most important mathematician of his times, hence it would be borderline impossible for anyone to steal/plagiarize his work, anything he put forth were and are well known in the world of physics. Therefore, the thesis purported by Bjerknes that Einstein had just taken it, somehow retracting credit from the creators of the given tools, is glaringly fraudulent.

One might ask; considering some people claim Einstein plagiarized Poincaré, what differences

made Einstein's work his own original venture? As an initial note, let it be known that it is grossly incoherent to look at the work of scientists and take any hint of them not working in an intellectual vacuum as a sign of plagiarism.

First of all; Poincaré did maintain an inclusion of ether as crucial, even as late as in his 1909 Lille address. Even if Poincaré did equations to explain why the Michelson Morley experiment hadn't yielded proof for aether; he continued to base his predictions and assumptions that there was an aether. This was one of the reasons why he didn't accept Einstein's predictions or work to be accurate (had it been a case of plagiarism; why would Poincaré disagree with the material that he himself purported?).

A reason why Poincaré might not have liked Einstein (Poincaré didn't include Einstein's work or theories in his lectures, writings etc, yet never accused him of plagiarism) was probably because Poincaré never managed to establish much from the relevant conjectures and good ideas, to which Einstein received much of the thunder that Poincaré had hoped to achieve; not fame because he had that already but to be correct. Also he might have felt offended by Einstein when he didn't include him as a reference in his initial paper, which came out a few months after Poincaré's that dealt with similar problems.

However, contrary to popular yet erroneous claims made by Bjerknes or the article written; riddled with error, by Richard Moody Jr[5], Einstein did mention Lorentz in more than one of his 1905-1907 papers and also gave reference to Poincaré's work.[6]

A notable difference between those who get credit for a "good idea" and those who do not is that one is only, generally, credited when turning a "good idea" into a complete, testable and proven theory/thesis, which Einstein did with Special Relativity.

Ergo, when already known formulations/theories/tools are used to derive new equations then that derivation is a unique entity, if not then Newton, Oppenheimer and so forth would be major plagiarizers along with a heap of others. Here are a few points to consider for the reader, on the differences between Einstein's and Poincaré's presentation of special relativity:

- *Einstein completely discarded the ether, as he predicted and theorized that the expressions of the laws of physics should be the same or similar for any inertial frame. Also; as mentioned before, his meaning of "new kinematics" meant that time and space measured (in differing inertial systems) were on the exact footing.

- *Poincaré didn't exclude the ether, as he viewed it as the privileged reference-frame wherein "true" space and time were defined.

- *Einstein viewed the radiation paradoxes of Poincaré to be only solved by assuming the inertia of energy.

- *Poincaré didn't bring up this paradox problem again.

- *Einstein brought forth the operational meaning of time dilation.

*Poincaré didn't elaborate or consider the aspect above.

SR basically established that the relativity principle is fundamental to physics in the sense that the laws of physics; in all inertial frames, must be identical. Since Einstein discarded a privileged frame (an aether for example); this was given, Poincaré didn't discard it and he in fact based his assumptions and predictions on a privileged frame. Poincaré formulated the principle differently, since according to Poincaré's relativity principle; it would be impossible by means of an experiment internal to a given inertial frame to know whether this frame is in motion or at rest with respect to the aether frame. Hence, Poincaré's approach to extended space time transformations, unlike Einstein's approach, assumes an aether frame. The space and time transformations improved by Poincaré from Lorentz were therefore based a set of "fictitious" transformations; since they had obtained them based on systematic errors during their measurements. Einstein's theories differed greatly. Poincaré simply did not establish; or reveal, the alterations and changes to the space-time predictions that follow from the theory of relativity. Einstein did however. The key points of Poincaré's "*Sur la Dynamique de l'Électron*" yielded that; under L-transformation, the equations of Maxwell were invariant. Einstein viewed the radiation paradoxes to be only solved by assuming the inertia of energy, this was in contradiction with Poincaré's views and papers and also; Poincaré never addressed this problem again. Einstein brought forth the operational meaning of time dilation whilst Poincaré didn't consider the above. [7] These were just a few points, but it is obvious that Einstein's SR differed substantially from Poincaré's. [8]

Let's take a look at another quote from Bjerknes' "*The Incorrigible Plagiarist*":

"Dyson, Davidson and Eddington, made Einstein famous by affirming that experiment had confirmed, without an attribution to Soldner, Soldner's 1801 hypothesis, that the gravitational field of the sun should curve the path of light from the stars"

Soldner did not present a testable; nor specific, theory or calculation, or even prediction for that matter on the arc of bending at all. Also; Bjerknes states that Einstein turned Special Relativity into an explicit geometrical theory. Which isn't true; it was actually Minkowski who did. And Einstein did attribute the initial invention of the space-time model of events as used in Special Relativity to Minkowski in his book "*Relativity, the Special and General Theory*" [9], which is why it was there forth known as "*Einstein-Minkowski space-time*". [10]

By using the very same claims of "plagiarizing" as some certain people tend to use against Einstein; one could ask if Newton plagiarized Euclid or Descartes. Or did Galileo plagiarize Copernicus? Did Copernicus plagiarize Ptolemy's astronomy? Did Oppenheimer plagiarize Einstein? The well known truth in the scientific community is that there were several thoughts/theories on relativism before Einstein. This is no secret.

As a thought-experiment of turning the tables; if we would follow the linear path of faulty logic and wayward grasp as presented in Bjerknes work "*The Incorrigible Plagiarist*", well then Newton would have to be a plagiarist too; the assertion of which, of course I would disagree with as well.

For example, Descartes' law of inertia;

“Every body, As far as in its power, Always remains in the same state”[\[11\]](#) Which Newton renamed to his first law of motion; *“Each thing, As far as it is compelled, preserves its state.”*

Using the same line of accusation as oft applied toward Einstein; one could be equally justified in saying that Newton plagiarized Huygens law of momentum-conservation and renamed it Newton's Third Law. That Newton stole Kepler's Third Law and rewrote it as two Newton's laws; Newton's law of gravity and Newton's second law; or that he stole Horrock's lunar-theory in the aftermath of discovering that his own "occult hallucinations" of force and mass failed to explain the motions of the moon. Thus took Horrock's model based on trigonometric series expansions and renamed it Newton's lunar theory.

Some people say Newton discovered the concept of gravity. Does it make Newton a plagiarist; because he wasn't the first to assert that gravity might obey an inverse square law, and that his could account for the planets moving in ellipses for example?

Did Newton plagiarize Descartes or even Leonardo's principles? He didn't reference to these either.

"All movement tends to maintenance; or rather all moved bodies continue to move as long as the impression of the force of their motors (original impetus) remains in them."(Principle of Leonardo)[\[12\]](#)

“Every body continues in its state of rest, or of uniform motion in a straight line, unless it is compelled to change that state by forces impressed upon it.” (Wording of Newton's first law of motion)[\[13\]](#)

Or how about this:

“Robert Hooke (a highly respected researcher) took umbrage at Newton's concise paper of 1676 , suggesting Newton plagiarised and condensed most of it from Hooke's own work , observations and inquiry , published in the voluminous work " Micrographia". Many parallels can be found between the two works . Whether guilty or innocent , Newton never forgave Hooke . Newton became more reclusive . For a time , he refused to publish his works . Much later , when Newton eventually became The President of the Royal Society , he acted in a most unprofessional and vindictive way , attempting to remove all references to Robert Hooke from the pages of scientific history.” [\[14\]](#)

It is incredibly easy to launch proverbial charges and accusations of plagiarism, fraud and so forth to any number of praised scientists. It requires a bit more in-depth knowledge together with common sense to see that these colourful attacks are rarely correct, certainly not in the case of Albert Einstein and not for Isaac Newton either.

People like Richard Moody and Christopher Jon Bjerknes basically takes any hint of Einstein not

working in a vacuum as a sign of plagiarism. Anyone who erroneously claims it all; everything the whole shebang, to Einstein, is wrong but it isn't Einstein's error but rather contemporary media and public misinformation.

In any case let's get back to Poincaré, his work on special relativity tried to reconcile two incompatible ideas, which were the existence of a preferred inertial frame and the relativity principle. Einstein discarded the idea of this given and privileged reference frame, which was the correct and revealing move to do at the time of these predictions.

The very notion that anything could have been stolen from Henri Poincaré is inherently moronic in my opinion because; among other things, in 1905 Poincaré was already a superhero, one of the world's most famous scientists and mathematicians. The researcher and faculty reviewers in the scientific establishment in Europe jumped over anything published by Poincaré. Hence; through a close but educated analysis, what is clearly revealed is that Henri wasn't able to formulate a proper theory of relativity. [\[15\]](#)

Whilst Henri Poincaré effectively and quite philosophically adhered to the PoR, acting as an intermediate step between Lorentz and Maxwell concerning relativity; he did believe that this principle might actually be deducible from a nice revised version of electrodynamics. Subsequently; Poincaré was not ready to take the important step of eliminating the ether concept that had hampered effective and revealing critical insight, whereas Einstein succeeded in eliminating it.

This concept was in stark contrast with the essence and simplicity for a correct grasp of the principle of relativity; since is supposed to treat all frames on an equal footing. Poincaré was also a bit bewildered by the fact that gravitational phenomena seemed to be inconsistent with the PoR. Therefore, in a sense; he was obstructing himself by having too large a canvas per se.

Poincaré's work was more an intermediate, or transitional step between the prior standard of electrodynamics and the more complete and defined theory formulated by Albert Einstein. Besides the aether problem persisting within Poincaré's explorative works; he also persisted with holding a difference between the effect of contraction of moving bodies, along the direction of relative motion, and the notion of relativity of simultaneity, which follows from the idea of a local time.

The essence of special relativity lies in the thesis that Newton's account of space and time is incorrect and that all processes unfold against a space and time governed by SR. That thesis was laid out clearly in Einstein's 1905 paper. [\[16\]](#), [\[17\]](#)

Poincaré did not build on two kinematical postulates but worked in terms of the Maxwell equations; he also didn't take the following steps necessary and it is here, these differences that set Einstein's work sharply apart from his. Poincaré never laid out that central thesis.

He did make some suggestive remarks about the speed of light and simultaneity yes. But most importantly, they were never developed into the simple claim (nor provable, testable) that Newton was wrong on space and time.

What Poincaré does say is a great deal muddier with philosophical avenues and open to other interpretations; e.g. Poincaré had clear conventionalist leanings and here there seemed to be more than one natural way to distribute time through space using notions of simultaneity.

Similarly; one must realize, aspects Poincaré's remarks on the principle of relativity were inconclusive. He was remarking that no experiment will reveal our motion with respect to the ether. That is fully compatible with continuing to believe that there is ether with a distinct state of rest. If Poincaré had the special theory of relativity and believed that processes unfold against a space and time governed by a kinematics different from Newton's; why did he not just say it? As Einstein showed in his paper, it is not that hard to lay it out in a few simple sections, and Poincaré was hardly inarticulate.

One might think to critique Einstein for applying the aether concept himself later on in 1920 so we should comment on this. For Einstein the most important thing that was rejected in 1905 was the ether state of rest. Later around 1920; presumably in response to his personal friendship and admiration for Lorentz, he began to use the word "ether" in his writings. But; it referred to the metric field of general relativity. There was no preferred state of rest attached to it!

One of Einstein's key contributions to this was to recognize that there was no essential difference between a resting and a moving frame of reference. In other words, Einstein was indeed the first one to give up the idea of singling out a reference frame at rest relative to the ether completely and scientifically.

However it is a note to be put forth that Poincaré was quite near the solutions and he did bring forth a lot of relevant angles which most mainstream historians have missed;

“Historically, the important point is that this more limited principle was a major novelty when Poincaré introduced it. Another example of a pro-Einstein bias is the ignorance or downplaying of Poincaré's interpretation of Lorentz's local time. Until very recently, most historians of relativity overlooked the fact that Poincaré offered this interpretation in 1900, in a widely read memoir. Even if they acknowledged its occurrence in Poincaré's St. Louis lecture of 1904, they failed to see the structural similarity with Einstein's derivation of the Lorentz transformations.

Other historians have had the opposite bias. Exclusive focus on the formal and empirical content of relativity theory (the Lorentz group and covariance properties) has led some of them to ignore the difference between Poincaré's and Einstein's concepts of space and time, while nationalism, anti-Semitism, or esprit d'Ecole induced others to read much more into Poincaré's text than is really there. For instance, it has been claimed that Poincaré had the second principle of relativity theory on the basis of his having written in 1898 that the astronomer [who dates stellar events in light-years] has begun by supposing that light has a constant velocity and, in particular, that its velocity is the same in all directions. That is a postulate without which no measurement of this velocity could be attempted. . . . The postulate conforms to the principle of sufficient reason and has been accepted by everybody; what I wish to emphasize is that it furnishes us with a new rule for the investigation of simultaneity.

It is clear from the context that Poincaré meant here to apply the postulate only in an ether bound frame,”[\[18\]](#)

Another quote from Bjerknes in his aforementioned writings:

“[Einstein's] paper 'Zur Elektrodynamik bewegter Körper' in Annalen der Physik. . . contains not a single reference to previous literature. It gives you the impression of quite a new venture. But that is, of course, as I have tried to explain, not true. -- Max Born.”

It's important to note how Bjerknes bends over backwards in his obsessive quote-mining; for example with this quote above, striving to imply Born to have thought Einstein to be a plagiarist. First of all, this is complete nonsense. The quote referred to is taken from a speech which Max Born held in 1955 during the International Relativity Conference in Bern. It's not by any stretch an accusation by Born on plagiarism by Einstein. You see; Born was marking on the common misconception that the view prior to Einstein, was that "*all is well with mechanics*", that no one was even considering the many inconsistencies between the Newtonian field of mechanics and the field of electrodynamics. Furthermore; the paper mentioned by Born, while not containing a bibliography, does mention Maxwell, Hertz and Lorentz. The paper was essentially completely self-contained and its mathematics is not that lofty so there was less of a need for references.

Hence I find the usage of Born's quotation misleading; which is no doubt the intended effect, because it gives the impression that Born thought Einstein to be a plagiarist. Yet, in the book "*Principles of Optics*"[\[19\]](#); written by Born and E. Wolf, they both credit Einstein with special relativity in several places, as Born states:

“The anomaly was resolved by Albert Einstein in 1905 in his special theory of relativity. The theory is founded on a critique of the concepts of time and space and leads to the abandonment of Euclidian geometry and the intuitive conception of simultaneity. Its further development into the so-called general theory of relativity led to a completely new conception of gravitational phenomena by a "geometrization" of the space-time manifold. The application of this theory involves the use of special mathematical and physical methods which, although relevant to optics in many cases, may easily be considered separately from it.”

I've stated that Poincaré's work; on what came to be known as Special Relativity, was close but too speculative, incoherent and erroneous. I also mentioned that it didn't arrive at a solid formulation of the special relativity theory; as it was Einstein's critical insight that did this.[\[20\]](#)

In Poincaré's "*Sur la dynamique de l'électron*"(1906); he does indeed disclose the modern form of the Lie algebra of Lorentz group, Lorentz transformation, velocity addition theorem. But most importantly; Poincaré neglects analysis of the relativity of simultaneity, it also neglects analysis of the inertia of energy. I don't think Poincaré really understood Einstein's contributions issuing from the Lorentz convention. Poincaré was a brilliant mathematician yes; he was however not equally brilliant as a physicist. He clearly regarded geometry to be an abstract science.[\[21\]](#)

Additional quote from "*Albert Einstein: The Incorrigible Plagiarist*":

“In point of fact, therefore, Poincare was not only the first to enunciate the principle, but he also discovered in Lorentz's work the necessary mathematical formulation of the principle. All this happened before Einstein's paper appeared.” -- G. H. Keswani”[\[22\]](#)

Apparently this is somehow a means to strengthen the case of Einstein's alleged plagiarism, but this quote tells you little save for the known fact that much of the maths; which Einstein used to formulate his theory, was already there. When have we ever heard about the Einstein-Calculus? The Einstein-Conjecture, the Einstein-contraction or the Einstein-Transformations (save for on occasions which include lots of alcohol or hallucinogens)?

Most of the mathematical tools used in Special Relativity were created by Lorentz, Hertz, Maxwell, Poincaré etc. This is however not equivalent with having reached the breakthrough of revealing a testable, workable formulation of Special Relativity. Nor is it reasonable thereof to suggest more credit is due unto Poincaré than Einstein in revealing the physics, the beating (and functionally testable) heart of the theory of Special Relativity. Poincaré regarded the aether as a medium necessary to propagate the electromagnetic waves. He acknowledged the Lorentz aether which assumes the existence of a privileged aether frame. He expressed his agreement with Lorentz in the following terms: *“the results I have obtained agree with those of Mr. Lorentz in all important points. I was led to modify and complete them in a few points of detail.”*[\[23\]](#)

This agreement implies that the speed of light is isotropic exclusively in the privileged frame, as is easily deduced from Lorentz theory (for that, see his explanation of Michelson's experiment where the speed of light is $c+v$ or $c-v$ in the two opposite directions).[\[24\]](#)

It was Poincaré who seemed a bit confused and bewildered on these issues; thus in a sense he dropped the ball on SR quite obviously. In hindsight; it might be hard to imagine how he wasn't able to establish the breakthrough material needed. If Poincaré declared in other texts that the speed of light is constant then this assertion is at variance with his approach of *"Sur la dynamique de l'électron"*.[\[25\]](#) He confirmed his belief in the aether many times. For example:

“Does an aether exist, the reason why we believe in an aether is simple. If light comes from a distant star and takes many years to reach us, it is during its travel no longer near the star, but not yet near the Earth, nevertheless, it must be somewhere and supported by a material medium.”[\[26\]](#)

Einstein considered that the relativity principle was not compatible with a preferred frame. Einstein first considered this aether; the privileged frame matter, as superfluous. He did never acknowledge the existence of a preferred frame, so his theory was compatible with the relativity principle.

In his 1905 publications, Einstein did describe the construction of inertial coordinate systems, and he implicitly asserted that the propagation of light was isotropic with respect to the same class of coordinate systems, in terms of which mechanical inertia is isotropic.

The fact that Lorentz work was notably important is not disputable. The fact that Poincaré was brushing around the bush, probably coming close to arrive at a correct and provable theory of

special relativity is correct. The fact that Einstein's work on Special Relativity put the pieces together and revealed the complete theory in a coherent, correct and provable formulation is not really disputable.

Lorentz and Poincare developed most of the math used, but never fully embraced the principles behind it. As late as 1909, Poincare apparently still held some doubts as to whether Einstein was right or just plain crazy! (Of course, many others also had similar doubts).

On some level Lorentz grasped the superiority of the purely relativistic approach, as is evident from the words he included in the second edition of his "*Theory of Electrons*" in 1916: [\[27\]](#)

"If I had to write the last chapter now, I should certainly have given a more prominent place to Einstein's theory of relativity by which the theory of electromagnetic phenomena in moving systems gains a simplicity that I had not been able to attain. The chief cause of my failure was my clinging to the idea that the variable t only can be considered as the true time, and that my local time t' must be regarded as no more than an auxiliary mathematical quantity."

The general idea of associating mass with energy had in one way or the other been around for about 25 years prior to Einstein's 1905 papers, as Einstein himself viewed it; this association was already implicit in Maxwell's theory in a sense. In the 1905 paper containing his deduction of mass-energy equivalence, Einstein acknowledges that it was explicitly based on "*Maxwell's expression for the electromagnetic energy of space*". [\[28\]](#)

Here's what Einstein himself had to say about these matters:

"By and by I despaired of the possibility of discovering the true laws by means of constructive efforts based on known facts. The longer and the more despairingly I tried, the more I came to the conviction that only the discovery of a universal formal principle would lead us to assured results. The example I saw before me was thermodynamics. The general principle there was given in the theorem: the laws of nature are such that it is impossible to construct a perpetual mobile (of the first or second kind). How, then, could such a universal principle be found?"

After ten years of reflection such a principle resulted from a paradox upon which I had already hit at age sixteen: If I pursue a beam of light with the velocity c (velocity of light in a vacuum), I should observe such a beam of light as a spatially oscillatory electromagnetic field at rest. However, there seems to be no such thing, whether on the basis of experience or according to Maxwell's equations. From the very beginning it appeared to me intuitively clear that, judged from the standpoint of such an observer, everything would have to happen according to the same laws as for an observer who, relative to the earth, was at rest. For how, otherwise, should the first observer know, i.e., be able to determine, that he is in a state of fast uniform motion? One sees that in this paradox the germ of the special relativity theory is already contained". [\[29\]](#)

Surely; one could bring up the pre-1905 work of Poincare and others too, on the electron mass arising from its energy, yet, these suggestions were all quite thoroughly restricted in their coherence and practicality. It didn't amount to the assertion of a fundamental equivalence such as emerges so clearly, brilliantly and beautifully from Einstein's relativistic demonstrations and

interpretations.

Consider the photograph available at <http://www.alwaysbeta.com/wp-content/uploads/bshih/016.jpg>, there's Planck, Schrodinger, Heisenberg and Lorentz who were obviously not pointing out to the Fifth Solvay Conference, to the scientific establishment nor each other that Einstein had "plagiarized" anything of their work. Are we required to believe that Einstein plagiarized, amongst others, Schroedinger, Planck, Heisenberg, and Lorentz? Also that none of them pointed this out or objected to it.

Perhaps, using Occam's razor, it is because his work was actually different from theirs? We might ask ourselves how on earth Einstein managed to get published; in the most read, investigated and respected scientific journals, approved by Planck (peer-review editor), when it should have been apparent to the editors that Albert Einstein was merely repeating the most important work of the most important scientists?

Or wasn't it so because his work was actually different from theirs? Furthermore; is he really supposed to have plagiarized work from Planck, Schrödinger, Heisenberg and Lorentz for which they are credited by historians of physics and science, also for which they themselves received Nobel prizes? All these four men received the Nobel Prize, much for the work allegedly stolen by Einstein according to Moody and Bjerknes? Was this just utter folly on the part of the Nobel committee, the scientific establishment and the other scientists at, for example, the Solvay Conference? Or was his work actually different from theirs?

[1] Available at the following address:

<http://semiticcontroversies.blogspot.com/2008/07/einstein-poor-student.html>.

[2] <http://home.comcast.net/~xtxinc/MainPage.htm>

[3] Hawking, Stephen: '*A Brief History of Time: From the Big Bang to Black Holes*' (pp 22-23).

[4] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Length_contraction

[5] <http://www.nexusmagazine.com/articles/einstein.html>

[6] Einstein, Albert; '*Das Prinzip von der Erhaltung der Schwerpunktsbewegung und die Trägheit der Energie*', *Annalen der Physik* 20(1906):627-633.

[7] <http://www.levynewphysics.com/3-someimportantquestions1.htm>

[8] <http://arxiv.org/ftp/physics/papers/0607/0607067.pdf>

[9] Einstein, Albert: "*Relativity, the Special and General Theory*", 1920, chapter 17, p. 55.

[10] <http://physics.syr.edu/courses/modules/LIGHTCONE/minkowski.html>

[11] <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/descartes-physics/>

[12] Lahanas, Michael; "*The myth of Newton's apple, did Hipparchus discover Newton's gravity and inverse square law?*"

[13] Newton, Isaac; "*Philosophiae naturalis principia mathematica*" 1687.

[14] <http://home.iprimus.com.au/longhair1/chap11.htm>

[15] Sinha, Supurna "*Poincaré and the Special Theory of Relativity*", *Resonance - journal of science education*, February 2000.

[16] <http://press.princeton.edu/catalogs/series/cpe.html>

[17] <http://dbserv.ihep.su/~elan/src/einstein05c/eng.pdf>

[18] Darrigol, Oliver; "*The Mystery of the Einstein-Poincaré Connection*" (2004).

[19] Born, Max and Wolf, Emil; "*Principle of Optics*", Pergamon Press (1986)

[20] <http://www.mathpages.com/rr/s8-08/8-08.htm>

[21] <http://www.iisc.ernet.in/academy/resonance/Feb2000/pdf/Feb2000p12-15.pdf>

[22] Keswani, G H; “*Origin and Concept of Relativity (I)*”, The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science, Vol. 15, No. 60 (Feb., 1965), pp. 286-306

[23] “*Sur la dynamique de l’électron*” quoted in Relativity and Aether Theory by Dr. Joseph Levy.

[24] McCormmach, Russell; “*H. A. Lorentz and the Electromagnetic View of Nature*”, Isis, Vol. 61, No. 4 (Winter, 1970),

[25] http://spartan.ac.brocku.ca/~lward/Poincare/Poincare_1905_toc.html

[26] “*La science et l’hypothèse*”, chapter 10, page 180 of the french edition, “*Les theories de la physiquemoderne*”.

[27] Lorentz, H. A; “*The Theory of Electrons: And its Applications to the Phenomena of Light and Radiant Heat*” second edition, 1916.

[28] Einstein, Albert; “*Does the Inertia of a Body Depend on its Energy Content?*” 1905, Ann. d. Phys, 17, 891.

[29] Einstein, Autobiographical Notes, “*Albert Einstein: Philosopher-Scientist*”, Volume One, p. 53, Open Court Classics

Joe McCain’s Jewish Mythos Making: Part I

Wednesday, 13 August 2008

The following article entitled ‘*Senator John McCain's brother on The Jews & Israel*’[1] was posted on the ‘*Israel Politics*’ Yahoo group[2] recently. Since Mr. McCain is the brother of the current Republican presidential candidate: John McCain. We at Semitic Controversies thought it was worth responding to the article as an example of the philo-Semitic misconceptions of jews and the myths that are often invoked there-in. In order to do this we have reprinted the article in full. Rather than respond to it our own monologue: we have after each pertinent section included our reply and analysis. At the end of all our replies we shall summarise the general problems of Joe McCain’s pro-jewish screed for the reader.

We will start the first part by discussing Mr. McCain’s comments as per Iran because they are related to the international political and diplomatic situation at the moment and therefore require timely comment. The other elements of Mr. McCain’s argument are historical in nature; in particular relating to what Howard Sachar has described as ‘*the course of Jewish history*’[3], we will address these misconceptions in the second part of this article.

Joe McCain writes as follows:

‘There is a lot of worry popping up in the media just now -- ‘Can Israel Survive?’ Don't worry about it. It relates to something that Palestinians, the Arabs, and perhaps most Americans don't realize -- the Jews are never going quietly again. Never. And if the world doesn't come to understand that, then millions of Arabs are going to die. It's as simple as that.’

It is unclear as to when this article was originally written so we can’t really answer the question;

‘Can Israel Survive?’, but if we presume that it is of fairly recent origin then the basis for the comments as to whether the Jewish state can survive come from the alleged danger of Iran. More precisely put as an argument: the Iranian nuclear program is going to result in an ‘Islamic atomic bomb’; although please note that Pakistan already has nuclear weapons and a very unstable regime, and that because the Iranian’s are led by a religious fanatic they are going *‘wipe Israel off the map’* because they simply don’t care about the consequences.

Now we are not in favour of Iranians or any other Arab or Semitic state[\[4\]](#) having atomic capability but then of course we are not in favour of Israel (and Diaspora Jews) having atomic capability either.

Why you ask?

The simple question here that we must ask to answer this is whether the Jews are as irresponsible as the Iranians apparently are and quite willing to take the whole world with them in a ‘nuclear holocaust’.

Now the president of Iran has supposedly threatened to *‘wipe Israel off the map’* but what McCain forgets is that Israel has threatened the world with worse before. The so-called ‘Samson option’ threatened by Moshe Dayan and David Ben-Gurion was bald-faced declaration that Israel would destroy the world if it was allowed to die[\[5\]](#). It would be rather hard to get a more obvious expression firstly of absolute ethnocentrism and secondly of the Jewish perception of themselves as the ‘Chosen of Ha-Shem’[\[6\]](#).

Now what kind of responsible state does that; especially I might add one with a considerable nuclear armament? This isn’t entirely in the past; as some Jewish apologists might argue, in the present diplomatic confrontation with Iran the Jews and Israel have threatened to/suggestively hinted that they could attack Iran’s reactor(s). They would ostensibly do this by mounting an operation much like the one carried out against Iraq’s Tammuz-1 nuclear reactor in 1981[\[7\]](#) but then what kind of irresponsible state would go around launching aerial assaults on other country’s nuclear reactors[\[8\]](#)?

There has been talk of launching; and even out and out calls to launch, a pre-emptive nuclear strike on Iran among the religious and secular right in Israel[\[9\]](#). It isn’t just fringe figures on the Israeli right either.

Jonathan Ariel; former Editor in Chief of Maariv International[\[10\]](#) and as well as having worked at the Jerusalem Post[\[11\]](#) and Haaretz[\[12\]](#), is a respected figure on the Israeli ‘right wing’ and has stated as follows:

‘One of the best ways to ensure the world doesn’t get wobbly over Iran, is to make it understand that although Israel prefers to regard the rogue Islamic regime as an international problem, we will, if necessary, do whatever it takes to ensure our survival, including a preemptive nuclear strike.’[\[13\]](#)

Now this is simply a bare-faced call to the international community that unless Israel gets its way

and the world ‘*deals with Iran*’ in compliance to Israel’s wishes then Israel should simply start a nuclear war in one; if not the most, volatile regions in the world today. Ariel couches his argument in the language of the defence of Israel but lets think about it a moment; if you wished to actually defend your country against a potential nuclear strike perhaps the first thing you should think about is why the country allegedly wants to risk the possibility of a nuclear attack upon you in the first place[14]. This of course assumes you know for certain that the country concerned wishes to destroy you utterly in the first place.

The rationale that has been offered is that the president of Iran is a delusional religious fanatic; in a terrible and brutal religion (Islam[15])[16], who seeks to bring about Armageddon and therefore doesn’t care about this world because he will go to paradise in the next. However; this is quite faulty not because the President of Iran isn’t a very religious; and potentially delusional man[17], but rather because it applies a double standard.

The President of the United States; George W. Bush, is a ‘born-again Christian’[18] who like the President of Iran wears his religious politics very much on sleeve. George W. Bush also believes in Armageddon and coming to paradise because of his earthly actions. It can be reasonably argued he has just as much motivation in this for launching a pre-emptive nuclear strike on countries that disagree with Israel as the President of Iran.

George W. Bush has access to a considerable atomic[19] arsenal while the President of Iran does not currently; so why is this being used as an argument for launching a pre-emptive nuclear strike on Iran and causing a potential M.A.D.[20] (or ‘Samson Option’) scenario to occur, in the first place?

The President of Iran’s alleged statement that Israel should be ‘*wiped off the map*’ has also been successfully questioned by academics as Juan Cole[21] and this questioning has been publicised in British ‘Guardian’ daily newspaper (as well as the New York Times). Guardian columnist Jonathan Steele states as follows:

‘The New York Times’s Ethan Bronner and Nazila Fathi, one of the paper’s Tehran staff, make a more serious case. They consulted several sources in Tehran. “Sohrab Mahdavi, one of Iran’s most prominent translators, and Siamak Namazi, managing director of a Tehran consulting firm, who is bilingual, both say ‘wipe off’ or ‘wipe away’ is more accurate than ‘vanish’ because the Persian verb is active and transitive,” Bronner writes.

The New York Times goes on: “The second translation issue concerns the word ‘map’. Khomeini’s words were abstract: ‘Sahneh roozgar.’ Sahneh means scene or stage, and roozgar means time. The phrase was widely interpreted as ‘map’, and for years, no one objected. In October, when Mr Ahmadinejad quoted Khomeini, he actually misquoted him, saying not ‘Sahneh roozgar’ but ‘Safheh roozgar’, meaning pages of time or history. No one noticed the change, and news agencies used the word ‘map’ again.”[22]

Steele goes on to qualify the context further:

‘Does this quibbling over phrases matter? Yes, of course. Within days of the Ahmadinejad

speech the then Israeli prime minister, Ariel Sharon, was calling for Iran to be expelled from the United Nations. Other foreign leaders have quoted the map phrase. The United States is piling pressure on its allies to be tough with Iran.' [23]

If we note all this additional rationale or arguments for 'nuking Iran' or for Iran being more of a danger to the world than Israel collapse under their own weight. We should also note that the quote was immediately popularised by the Israeli leadership and is still two years later used in political conversations inside and outside Israel.

To be quite frank the jews are never going to go quietly, but rather than adding the 'again' we point out that it hasn't happened before so it cannot occur 'again'. The myth Mr. McCain is invoking is one which is often used by jews and Zionists (mainly jews but it is also common currency among supporters of Israel) alike to support their version of a heroic and lionized; but quintessentially Semitic, jewish history. This mythos has become the bedrock of much thought; largely jewish, about 'anti-Semitism' and has created a very significant misperception of jews from a quasi-religious perspective of being truly a 'special' or 'chosen' people. We can point this out rather simply by posing a simple question to the reader:

What historical event has occurred where the jews as a people have meekly gone to their deaths?

We've studied jewish history quite a lot here at Semitic Controversies and we must admit we have never found a single event in jewish history where a jew is to die for being a jew where he or she has meekly gone along with their being put to death (even in the so-called 'holocaust' the standard literature tells us that jews did not meekly go to their supposed deaths and this fact has also been lionized (in a piece of classic chutzpah) by Zionists side-by-side with the assertion of meekness).

So we lay a challenge before our readers; if you disagree with us, please find such an event and let us know.

[1] This is the name of the article given on the mailing but we presume it originally had another name probably; '*The Jews and Israel*' or some such. We have been unable to find the original copy of this article and nor where it was originally published.

[2] This is available at the following address:

Judaism_Israel_Today_and_Tomorrow@yahoogroups.com

[3] See Howard Sachar, 1958, '*The Course of Modern Jewish History*', 1st Edition, Weidenfeld and Nicolson: London.

[4] Iranians often assert that they are indeed the original Aryans and claim 'pure Persian descent' but one only need to look at the population genetics of the area and its history to comprehend the falsity of this argument since it presumes that there has been little to no intermixing in an area often subject to the conquering armies of different races and mass movements of peoples.

[5] On this point see Seymour Hersh's, 1991, '*The Samson Option: Israel's Nuclear Arsenal and American Foreign Policy*', 1st Edition, Random House: New York; Avner Cohen's, 1998, '*Israel and the Bomb*', 1st Edition, Columbia University Press: New York and Israel Shahak's, 1997, '*Open Secrets: Israeli Nuclear and Foreign Policies*', 1st Edition, Pluto Press: London.

[6] The roots of the jewish status as the 'Chosen people' appears to be religious in origin but we would contend that it actually predates jewish religiosity and that the jewish race came before

the jewish religion. With Judaism in actuality being the expression and legalistic refinement of the jewish race's attitude about itself and how it views the world rather than Judaism forming the ethnocentric attitudes of the jewish race. For further reading on a viewpoint similar to our own we suggest Revido Oliver's, 2001, *The Jewish Strategy*, 2nd Edition, Historical Review Press: Uckfield. For an opposing view; i.e. that the religion created the race, we suggest a read of Kevin MacDonald's, 2002, *A People That Shall Dwell Alone: Judaism as a Group Evolutionary Strategy, with Diaspora Peoples*, 2nd Edition, Writers Club Press: New York.

[7] On the 7th of June 1981 the Israeli Air Force (or IAF) mounted a surprise aerial strike upon the Iraqi nuclear reactor located at Osiraq destroying it. This was the world's first attack on a nuclear reactor and goes to show just how little the Israeli government; and therefore at least (granted the junior) part of the jewish power structure often called international jewry, actually cares about any other country or nation other than itself and the jewish nation in Diaspora. For more information we suggest a reading of Dan McKinnon's, 1987, *Bullseye One Reactor: The Story of Israel's Bold Surprise Air Attack That Destroyed Iraq's Nuclear Bomb Facility*, 1st Edition, Airline: Shrewsbury.

[8] A type of attack which could quite easily lead to a nuclear disaster in the region, which would of necessity and the nature of nuclear programs have literal as well as diplomatic and military fallout across the world.

[9] For example see: Jonathan Ariel, *'Israel Needs A Preemptive Nuclear Strike Against Iran'*, Israel News Agency, <http://www.israelnewsagency.com/iranisraelnuclearariel3890624.html> [Accessed: 10/08/2008].

[10] A highly regarded 'right leaning' Hebrew daily paper; which has the second highest circulation in Israel.

[11] The most internationally read and best known Israeli 'right wing' paper; which is effectively the press organ of the Likud party. This can be found at the following address:

<http://www.jpost.com/>.

[12] The most internationally read and best known Israeli 'left wing' daily paper; which is to all intents and purposes the press organ for the Labour party although it also seems favourable to the Kadima party. This can be found at the following address: <http://www.haaretz.com/>.

[13] Ariel, Op. Cit.

[14] Since the use of an atomic weapon would likely bring the wrath of the world upon a nation using one; if not a hyper power in the vein of the United States of America or an emergent super power in the vein of the People's Republic of China.

[15] Both Sunni and Shiite sects of Islam are included in this appellation irrespective of the theological differences there-in.

[16] To put to bed any argument that might be used that we are colluding (knowingly or unknowingly) with Islam or are apologists for it. We state candidly and openly that we at Semitic Controversies are very much opposed to Islam as a religion and its majority adherents on the basis of race. We deal with jews here and the issues surrounding Islam are well stocked with both rational and irrational critiques (largely of a philo-Semitic nature we might add) that can be found elsewhere.

[17] As we would argue most 'world leaders' are; not being a power themselves but rather a proverbial; although not always a literal, slave to internal and external interests of which jews and jewish interests are a major power bloc; i.e. jews represent a lot of different factions and thus apply all the more considerable pressure to get what they want put in place.

[18] A colloquial term for several major world wide; although mainly headquartered in the

United States of America, sects of Protestant Christians who use a theological system of biblical interpretation that puts the emphasis on the end of the world, the final battle between heaven and hell and the saving of souls.

[19] Not to mention chemical, biological and conventional weapons with similar physical destructive power to atomic weapons.

[20] Mutually Assured Destruction.

[21] Juan Cole discusses Steele's article on his blog; '*Informed Comment*' and the translation issue, which can found at the following address: <http://www.juancole.com/2006/06/steele-on-ahmadinejad-of-arenas-of.html> [Accessed: 10/08/2008].

[22] Jonathan Steele, '*Lost in Translation*', June 14th 2006, the Guardian. This can be found at the following address: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2006/jun/14/post155>

[Accessed: 10/08/2008].

[23] Ibid.

Einstein's Alleged Plagiarism, The 9/11 Truth Movement and Other Curiosa

Sunday, 17 August 2008

Some readers might be wondering why we have published several articles now defending Einstein and pointing out the errors in the fallacious critiques offered of him by Christopher Jon Bjerknes and Richard Moody Jr. After all Semitic Controversies is dedicated to jews, Judaism and their influence on today's world not physics.

This is precisely why these articles on Einstein are being published because Einstein is the classic example of a jewish person who did in fact do something original and of benefit to the world[1]. It would be very simple for us just to say Einstein didn't do what he his credited with and believe Bjerknes and Moody in their argument because it can to an unfamiliar eye seem correct. This is for the same reason in our opinion that many people believe in ideas such as the Illuminati and ghosts (as in paranormal apparitions) because there at first glance is quite a lot of good [or 'hard' as it is often described colloquially] evidence to support such assertions [it also plays on people's fantasies and emotions but that would lead us off into the world of scepticism and parapsychology].

However dig deeper and you will find that a lot of what at first glance seemed to be solid evidence is in fact: fabricated, is caused by other things, misrepresented and/or is out of context. The key to this that the argument for Einstein being a plagiarist has often been cited [and argued for that matter] on large and well known 'White Nationalist' forums such as Vanguard News Network and Stormfront; where it would seem to have been adopted for the reason described above i.e. that it is a ready-made and potentially (if it was correct) powerful argument against jews. The problem with the argument however is that it isn't true and that anybody with a graduate or possibly even an undergraduate education in physics could explain in detail why if he or she took the time to research the material.

Argument against and critique of the jews needs to be based on arguable fact rather than juicy fiction. If it is not fact based then it will fail intellectually for the same reason that Lysenko's

conjectures in biology and genetics failed because it is based on juicy fiction rather than arguable fact.

The same applies to the '9/11 Truth Movement' whose ideas have again largely been co-opted by the 'White Nationalist' 'movement' to prove that jews; specifically the Israelis, attacked the United States to force it into a war with Iraq, Iran and so forth. The claims made by 'White Nationalists' in this regard often include lurid claims about the Mossad[2] being involved and actually planting the alleged demolition charges themselves. All these claims have been systematically debunked by people such as Mark Roberts[3] but they are still common currency on the two 'White Nationalist' boards cited above.

There is simply no need to make the jews so ubiquitous that they have now started taking direct actions to get states to do what they wish. This is not only against how jews[4] actually operate when they want something to get done but it is rather self-defeating for their own short and long term interests[5]. One could simply and accurately critique the jews and the Israel for their hand in causing the attack to occur i.e. forcing almost unconditional US acceptance of Israeli policy in the Middle East. It would be far better to focus on what the jewish power structure has been doing with 9/11 than simply declare that 9/11 was a jewish-inspired plot; which is a nice get out clause of having to do some time-consuming reading and analysis (since it makes it fit all together nicely in terms of a general conspiracy).

Criticism of jews is quite an intricate topic because so much pro-jewish literature is out there in both the academic and popular literary formats on just about every topic imaginable from intricate treatises on Yom Kippur to claims that there was a jewish kingdom in southern France in the 10th century. There is simply no need to cite arguments; which are often quite old[6], that you have not investigated at least slightly yourself. It is in fact more useful and dare I say accurate to look at the literature that currently exists; especially of the pro-jewish variety, and work from that to form new arguments and back up any good existing ones.

In order to get people back on track; we hope, Semitic Controversies will be publishing occasional articles debunking silly claims; which directly and/or indirectly concern the jews, about 9/11, Einstein and other curiosa as it comes up. We might even publish an article or two on the 'Illuminati' to explain why such a theory is illogical and downright silly and then compare it to the standard theory of how jews operate; similar to the style outlined in the Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion, to show that it is fundamentally wrong in its conception of them. We will of course also publish a companion article explaining how we argue jews in fact do operate and how they wield their collective power.

In summary: it is time to critique jews as they are not how you want them to be.

[1] Nobody can deny this; but what can be disputed is just how much jews have actually contributed to Western [i.e. European] civilisation. This should be the focus of debate not whether the jews accrued any benefit to Western civilisation.

[2] The Mossad is an extremely overrated foreign intelligence organisation that has become feared largely due to its own mystique and public relations but if we go on what has been published and their own success (or lack of it) then we would have to say that it lags rather badly

behind Western intelligence services such as MI6, the CIA etc. Its name however because of the popular perception of its power and reach is a frequent byword for accusations of involvement in a plot/conspiracy against X, Y and Z.

[3] More information on the claims (and why they are wrong) of the '9/11 Truth Movement' can be found at the following address: <http://wtc7lies.googlepages.com/>.

[4] We use jews here for ease of use; but it is more correctly stated as a faction of jews (more often than not including some non-jewish hangers on).

[5] Because they run the very real risk of being found out and no matter how powerful and aggressive their lobbying, community and defence organisations are it would not likely stop the US intelligence and military establishment; which is not in our estimation particularly from forcing the cat out of the bag for very long.

[6] For example most 'White Nationalist' literature on the jews is well over 60-70 years old and some of it is much older. Age doesn't diminish the accuracy of critique to be sure but having read most if not all that is commonly available to 'White Nationalists' we would suggest that it has not aged well. Some of them are outright fiction [although some of these works and theses would have been arguable at/correct with the information to hand at the time of printing] and often others are compounded errors (such as the Talmudic quotes). We will explain this in another essay on the subject at an undetermined future date.

Rabbinical Rule in the Middle Ages and Early Modern Central and Eastern Europe: Terror and Despotism (Part I)

Sunday, 17 August 2008

In '*Yiddish Civilisation*'[1] we have an unusual piece of popular literature on the jews in so far as it brings to life a grim area of jewish history often read about as a sorrowful epic of jewish innocence and gentile brutality and bigotry. When we say a grim area we mean exactly what we say: the history of the '*Yiddish civilisation*' or Ashkenazi jewry in the Pale of Settlement[2] is indeed grim but it was grim largely because the jews themselves made it grim.

The sorrowful epic of jewish innocence is quite simply a collective fabrication apparently based on the need to create a national mythos for the jewish people to aspire to; which found vent in two ways as Paul Kriwaczek records, Zionism and Communism. This view of Ashkenazi jewish history focuses its attentions on what was done to the jews by gentiles whilst lionizing the Talmudic ghetto culture of the Pale as being one of erudition, peaceful scholarship and beatific attempts to create peace between the jews and their gentile neighbours[3].

This; of course, is not accurate in the slightest as any reader can make themselves aware by looking at the status of Hebrew poetry in the Pale; while the view above presented would suggest that it should have been cultivated, it was in fact savagely suppressed and reading poetry and history was relegated to the privy as such subjects were ruled to be unclean (and hence associated with and at the level of excrement) by the Beth Din and Kahals of the ghettos[4]. The Rabbis and the Tzaddiks were more interested in learning the lore of the Torah, the Talmud and the Cabbala than focusing on such 'irrelevant' subjects as history (even of the biblical variety) and such apparently pornographic tomes as poetry.

Although to give the Rabbis and Tzaddiks a slightly redemptive opportunity if that poetry that they had in their minds was anything like the poetry proffered by the late Ashkenazi jew Allen Ginsberg[5], which focused on his anus and what he could stick up it. Then the Rabbis could be forgiven for their flinging such poetry books into the privy, which was after all the place the Ginsberg's poetry was indirectly focused on.

Woe betide those jews who dared read, let alone print, a history book (especially if it was in the Hebrew language) for such things just weren't frum, and therefore were a criminal offence, in the Ashkenazi vision of the world.

Despite the pro-jewish contention that jews were largely at the mercy of their gentile neighbours and masters the fact remains that the jews at this time largely governed themselves. Kriwaczek records it thus:

'Since the Jewish estate governed itself under its own religious law, there must have seemed as good a reason to put rabbis in charge of their society as there is for modern nations to turn to lawyers for their presidents or prime ministers. However, legal experts are acceptable as politicians where there exists checks and balances to their power, and where the legal code has democratic legitimacy. This was no more the case in medieval Jewish Poland than it is in modern Islamic Iran.'[6]

It is worth noting the implications of Kriwaczek's statement here that lawyers with checks and balances have some democratic legitimacy, but that without them they turn into tyrants ruling over their communities with a despotic iron fist. This is exactly what Kriwaczek recalls happened in Eastern Europe, but rather than it being lawyers. The power was given to the rabbis who, as the rough equivalent of the Church infrastructure within jewry, would according to quite innocent Christian logic rule the jews in the jewish best interest. After all if the priesthood could look after and minister to the Christians around them then surely the jewish priests; the rabbis, would be equally magnanimous in their treatment of their own flocks.

The rabbis turned out to be the worst form of tyrant; an evil despotic mix of Talmudic learning used to justify draconian punishments for trivial offences and endemic personal corruption[7]. Kriwaczek records this despotic power in the following words:

'They had the right to excommunicate, to expel, to imprison, to order physical punishment and even to execute.'[8]

This is hardly surprising given that these were the sort of powers the Catholic and Orthodox Church's possessed although the rabbis actually had more power than the Church in the control of their congregations. The Churches could impose a death sentence and order physical punishment but could not actually carry it out. The secular authorities had to act as a surrogate to the Church and could if they so wished refuse to carry out the punishment showing the weakness of the power of the Church in temporal matters[9].

Myer Lew in his *'The Jews of Poland'* records the use of such powers by a very prominent 16th

century rabbi, Moses Isserles, when he states that:

‘In the well-developed juridical system of the Polish Jewish communities Isserls found much scope for his marked ability and great knowledge. Though the youngest member of the “Court” he enjoyed undisputed authority and in the administration of justice was invested with wide power, viz. to flog, to ban and to impose fines.’[\[10\]](#)

Lew doesn’t here mention the use of death sentence and this is correct in so far as ostensibly the rabbis were not allowed to pass such penalty in Poland: although they were elsewhere. However, as Kriwaczek citing Lew’s later discussion of another very prominent Rabbi Solomon Luria points out, in practice the Jewish rabbinical courts did pass such sentences although they knew full well it was not within their legal powers conferred by the monarch and the higher nobility to do so.

Lew describes the blood thirsty; and fundamentally illegal, nature of the rabbinical courts attitude to informers thus:

‘In earlier centuries the Jewish courts in other countries had imposed the death penalty upon informers. No such rigorous measures were taken in Poland in our period. The evil was, however, dealt with indirectly. Although the Jewish Court in Poland had no right to inflict capital punishment the rabbinical authorities acquiesced in the lynching of informers as an extra-judicial measure.’[\[13\]](#)

Kriwaczek also tells us that Rabbi Luria ‘sanctioned the lynching of informers’[\[14\]](#) and that ‘local tradition in Posen remembers the last execution of an informer at the end of the eighteenth century’[\[15\]](#).

Clearly the informer, as the rabbis refer to him or her as, must have done something absolutely terrible akin to murder or rapine to deserve such a punishment by the rabbinical court. Kriwaczek describes the informers as those ‘appealing to gentile authorities’[\[16\]](#). Lew on the other hand gives a slightly more detailed description:

‘As in previous ages in other countries, the informer was a source of anxiety and concern to the Jewish communities of Poland. Denunciation, described aptly by Kaufmann as “this canker of Jewish social life”, appears to have been rampant. Luria says that the Jewish courts were unable to administer justice for fear of informers. Jewish merchants found it necessary to have funds available for the purpose of influencing State officials not to pay any regard to informers. A responsum of Meir of Lublin throws much light on the evil caused by informers. He writes: “And it is well-known that had the person in question carried out his evil intentions and succeeded in obtaining money with the help of the baron, the number of offenders would have increased.”

Little wonder that the informer was regarded as a man outside the Pale of the Jewish community.’[\[17\]](#)

Lew’s argument here is self-evident. He is implying by quoting Meir of Lublin that what the

informers said about the jewish community was wrong and that it was slander; since it was false information, because it was bringing down the gentile government on the heads of the jews. The ostensible reason given is that the gentile authorities are after money; which indeed is a potential motive given that in some countries and cities; such as Leipzig in Germany, at approximately the time Meir was writing it was the custom to confiscate the possessions of a dead jew.

This is attested to by the contemporary of Rabbis Moses Isserles and Solomon Luria; Gluckel of Hameln who states that:

‘Some time later, while my husband was attending the Leipzig Fair he fell grievously ill. In those days Jews ran a terrible danger in Leipzig; if one among them, God forbid! Died there, all his possessions were forfeit.’ [\[18\]](#)

However this confiscation was due to an edict from 1537 which forbade all jewish residence in Saxony and hence if a jew died there because he was not a resident of the duchy his property fell intestate to the duchy [\[19\]](#). We have been unable to find a similar law in an admittedly brief look into Polish jurisprudence at this time but what we did discover was that the status of jews in terms of their relation to ruler of the territory in which they resided.

Anna Foa in her book; *‘The Jews of Europe after the Black Death’* notes that:

‘In 1264, Boleslaw of Poland issued a statute – the first of many – that placed the jews under his direct protection, and under the direct jurisdiction of the kings and the high nobility. This gave them a legal status very similar to the Jews in the Empire’ [\[20\]](#) and the rest of the West. Moneylending was strongly encouraged, and, together with the taxes they paid, made Polish Jews the main source of liquidity for the monarchy and the nobility.’ [\[21\]](#)

This would make us question whether Lew’s implication of innocence can be regarded as correct since if the jews are under the direct protection of the monarch and the high nobility then they are not going to have land confiscated or have their members held for ransom for money. Since if they are bled dry then the monarch and the high nobility are going to have financial problems since their main source of liquid wealth has been drained dry. Only a very desperate monarch would do so rash an act as to leave himself in a bad position strategically and financially.

This is not to say that this has been done by some monarchs; Polish and otherwise, but this was not the case in the 16th and 17th centuries in Poland and nor did large scale anti-jewish pogroms begin to occur until the mid 17th century with the Chmielnicki pogrom of 1648 [\[22\]](#).

However what the jews more likely did fear was not so much that there were falsities being told to the monarch and the high nobility but rather than the informers might have informed these parties what in fact the jews were taking in terms of revenues and what they were up to in their own domain.

The latter of these can be linked to the comments quoted by Lew in regards to Luria’s; and the rabbinical court’s, taking into their hands powers that were strictly speaking not theirs to exercise. For example by informally executing a jew, by lynching as in Rabbi Luria’s statement,

who was a subject under the monarch's personal protection, then the monarch would have to intervene against the Rabbinical court in order to put down this usurpation of his own authority by the leaders of the jew. Since an organisation without the power to sentence let alone carry out capital punishment has done so and it has affected one of the monarch's subject rendering his power in question within the borders of his own territory.

In the former case it is worth pointing by way of context to Meir of Lublin's remarks that the Ashkenazi jews of Poland and Eastern Europe in general served as a form of middle class between the aristocracy and the church and the peasants on the land. They also quite importantly served as tax farmers for the monarch, church and aristocracy. Dubnow cites an instance in 1562[23] where the diets of Piotrkow banned jews from being granted the ability to farm taxes (as well as lease salt refineries[24]) and in 1595 during the reign of Sigismund III jewish communal leaders took it upon themselves to pass ordinances within the jewish community not to lease royal mints[25], large arendas[26] or farm the tolls and exercise.

We can argue that this was forbade because jews were heavily engaged in these trades in Eastern Europe, as Benjamin Ginsberg notes[27], and hence because they were unpopular as a result the rabbinical councils took steps to try and limit their unpopularity due to their role as tax farmers. Since tax farming involves paying the monarch or duke a set amount of money for the right to collect taxes and then the tax farmer (i.e. the person, in this case a jew, who has bought the right to collect the taxes) tries to recoup his or her fee and make a profit. To do this jews would naturally need to very miserly and to try and suck as much tax revenue out of the communities as possible.

This tax farming activity was carried on by jews until at least the 18th century[28] and it can be reasonably argued that the Chmielnicki pogrom of 1648 in Poland and the Ukraine was largely a result of this activity. Ginsberg notes that:

'In the seventeenth-century Ukraine, Jews were aligned with the Polish nobility, whom they served as estate managers, tax collectors, administrators, and operators of such enterprises as mills and breweries.' [29]

So despite the rabbinical court's apparent injunction in the matter jews were still actively engaging in farming taxes for the monarch and we suspect; but cannot prove, that in fact the Rabbinical courts edict was ignored by its own members since tax farming and other activities were highly profitable and throughout history jews have been willing to almost anything to make a profit for themselves[30].

Stephen Brook quotes as follows:

"Jews are very much drawn to moneymaking," observes Sir Claus Moser, "which is not a disgrace. Jews are natural traders. Negotiation comes naturally to us. The typical business-minded Jew is an entrepreneur. In finance and in property there is a speculative element, which is what appeals to Jewish instinct. We are more natural risk-takers and loners than we are organization men. There's nothing wrong with that. And so we're very much drawn, and always have been throughout modern history, to property and to banking." [31]

Therefore Lew's inferential argument on the issue of informers can be regarded as not correct because it lacks context and the assumption of good intentions that it rests on cannot be founded among the literature nor jewish description of themselves.

Continuing on the issue of the informers Kriwaczek goes on to give a jewish council's, of Konice in Moravia, 1674[32] edict on the matter:

'It is the duty of every Jew to shatter the slanderers and those who burden the princes with their lies and to cut off their hands and their feet.' [33]

This is a pretty foul declaration of despotic government on the part of the Rabbis over their fellow jews; whom had been entrusted to their care by the very Princes mentioned in the edict itself. Kriwaczek seeks to excuse the edict itself by claiming that it was '*intended as a metaphor*' [34] but this seems rather unlikely given the rather vicious nature of the punishments that he describes on the same page as well as the corrupt nature of the Rabbinical courts which he describes later[35].

We can therefore only conclude from this that the terror and despotism of the rule of the Rabbinical courts over the jews of central and eastern Europe at this time was truly monstrous in that they usurped powers that were not their own and did anything including organising lynch-mobs to illegal execute (i.e. murder) those jews who thought to inform the monarch and gentile authorities what was actually taking place in the ghettos and in the counting houses of their jewish tax collectors, merchants and administrators.

However as we shall see this illegal use of the death penalty was only the tip of the iceberg of Rabbinical courts terror and despotism over their fellow jews as well as their abuse of the authority granted to them with the best of intentions by the gentile monarchs and higher nobility of central and eastern Europe.

[1] Paul Kriwaczek, 2006, '*Yiddish Civilisation: The Rise and Fall of a Forgotten Nation*', 2nd Edition, Phoenix: London.

[2] A concise summary of the creation of the Pale of Settlement is given in Gladys Scott Thomson, 1947, '*Catherine the Great and the Expansion of Russia*', 1st Edition, The English Universities Press: London and Oscar Halecki, 1983, '*A History of Poland*', 3rd Edition, Routledge & Kegan Paul: London.

[3] For example in the works of the influential jewish philosopher Martin Buber.

[4] See Israel Shahak, 2002, '*Jewish History, Jewish Religion: The Weight of Three Thousand Years*', 3rd Edition, Pluto Press: London, pp. 19-20.

[5] For information on this disgusting jewish homosexual individual please see: Michael Schumacher, 1994, '*Dharma Lion: A Biography of Allen Ginsberg*', 1st Edition, St. Martins Press: New York.

[6] Kriwaczek, Op. Cit., p. 140.

[7] See Shahak, Op. Cit., p. 14.

[8] Kriwaczek, Op. Cit., p. 140.

[9] The Church could of course fight back with spiritual and social weapons such as

excommunication and refusing to give the person or people involved the sacraments until such time as they did as the Church bade them. However; this is not comparable to the ability to inflict physical punishment on their own which the rabbinical authorities had.

[10] Myer Lew, 1944, *'The Jews of Poland: Their Political, Economic, Social and Communal Life in the Sixteenth Century as reflected in the Works of Rabbi Moses Isserls'*, 1st Edition, Edward Goldston: London, p. 37. This was the accepted thesis for Lew's degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the University of London.

[11] Lew, Op. Cit., pp. 128-130. Kriwaczek (Ch. 7, n. 19) doesn't actually give a direct citation to the page in Lew but we suspect he took this particular point from n. 65 on p. 129 of *'The Jews of Poland'*.

[12] For more information please see Responsa 11 of Solomon Luria, 1859, *'Sheelot u-Teshubot Maharshal'*, Lemberg: Poland.

[13] Lew, Op. Cit., p. 129.

[14] Kriwaczek, Op. Cit., p. 140.

[15] Ibid.

[16] Ibid.

[17] Lew, Op. Cit., pp. 128-129.

[18] *'The Memoirs of Gluckel of Hameln'*, Trans. Marvin Lowenthal, 1932, 1st Edition, Harper & Brothers: New York, p. 66.

[19] For a description of the concept of inheritance as it concerned jews in Germany at this time please see Guido Kirsch, 1949, *'The Jews in Medieval Germany: A Study of Their Legal and Social Status'*, 1st Edition, University of Chicago Press: Chicago, pp. 223-241 with particular emphasis on pp. 227-229.

[20] The Holy Roman Empire.

[21] Anna Foa, Trans. Andrea Grover, 2000, *'The Jews in Europe after the Black Death'*, 1st Edition, University of California Press: Berkeley, p. 186.

[22] See Jacob Marcus, 1961, *'The Jew in the Medieval World'*, 1st Edition, Jewish Publication Society of America: Philadelphia, pp. 450-453.

[23] Simon Dubnow, Trans. Israel Friedlander, 1916, *'History of the Jews in Russia and Poland'*, Vol. 1, 1st Edition, Jewish Publication Society of America: Philadelphia, pp. 75-81.

[24] The refining of salt was a very profitable and essential industry in medieval Europe. Since salt was widely used in meat preservation it was essential to the economy and therefore because of a restricted supply and high demand it achieved high prices.

[25] Leasing a Royal Mint was common practice in jewish circles as a way to make a lot of money very quickly and the activities of jews in this regard could be convincingly argued to be the origin of the 'coin-clipping' (or debasing the coinage) accusation levelled at them. We suspect this accusation had some truth to it and indeed if we look at the continuity of jewish involvement with speculative monetary dealings and mints as well as the long record of considerable jewish fraud then we cannot but reach some rather negative conclusions about the pro-jewish argument that the 'coin-clipping' accusation was nothing but jealousy.

[26] Large medieval commercial farms in essence.

[27] Benjamin Ginsberg, 1993, *'The Fatal Embrace: Jews and the State'*, 1st Edition, University of Chicago Press: Chicago, p. 9

[28] Ibid.

[29] Ginsberg, Op. Cit., p. 35.

[30] For example in modern times jews have been quite willing to try and defraud governments

because they are not 'commanded to pay VAT' (to use an example from the United Kingdom). For more information please see Stephen Brook, 1989, *The Club: The Jews of Modern Britain*, 1st Edition, Constable: London, pp. 310-311.

[31] Brook, Op. Cit, p.303.

[32] Please note that this is a century after Rabbi's Isserles and Luria; demonstrating a continuity of judicial prohibition of this activity within the jewish community.

[33] Kriwaczek, Op. Cit., p. 140.

[34] Ibid.

[35] Kriwaczek, Op. Cit., pp. 253-254.

A Lubavitch Debacle

Sunday, 24 August 2008

The Chabad-Lubavitch sect is religious branch of Hasidic Judaism that rests on the fringes of Judaism and is one of the largest hasidic denominations with some 200,000 followers. As so it has been the subject of much press and general attention much through the aid of its (now deceased) seventh and latest Rebbe: Menachem Mendel Schneerson.

The label "Rebbe" is how the given leader of the Chabad-Lubavitch group is referred to, it literally means "master, teacher" or "mentor" and it is a yiddish derivation from the hebrew "rabbi".

The Chabad-Lubavitch movement originated in Belarus during the late 18th century by the first self-proclaimed Rebbe Shneur Zalman and he took the name "Lubavitch" from the village of Lyubavichi which served as the main base for the group until almost a century later when the bolsheviks began rooting out fundamental judaic groups in Eastern Europe which led the contemporary Rebbe Yosef Yitzchock Schneerson move it to Poland and then at the brink of WW2 he relocated it once more; to New York where it has since then held its headquarters.[1]

A main point of bewilderment amongst several critics of the Lubavitches on 'white nationalist' forums, to begin with in my experience, has been the labeling of "fringe" for such a notable group. I've argued on occasion from the premise that they are indeed correctly called a fringe group in Judaism, which has been met with much scorn and in general polemic disagreement from other European and American Racialists. Common arguments against my given premise is that the Lubavitches have enjoyed much attention by the US Government in having meet the President in the White House on many occasions and that their latest Rebbe had a day of remembrance per se passed to honour him.

These two arguments are quite intertwined since they all have to do with the "*Education and Sharing Day*". This day was enacted by the US Congress to honour the civil work of Menachem Schneerson's missionary prowess and success he had had with the Lubavitch movement through their educational centers also called "*Chabad Centers/Houses*"[2]. It was created in -78 by the Carter Administration and has since then been acknowledged by each following presidential administration, every time the proclamation is written anew; members of the Lubavitches visit

the White House to witness the signing of it and having their picture taken with the President.

While the above might sound slightly strange a service or attention given to a fringe group, one has to realise that their status of being a minority group within Judaism and a fringe group in general is not negated by the amount of press they achieve nor the extent of how much their deceased Rebbe is honoured by the US Government. In my previous arguments on this note with fellow Racialists and others of such persuasions on forums, I used the comparison of Opus Dei. I stated that the Opus Dei is as fringe to Christianity (or Catholicism alone even) as the Lubavitchers are to Judaism. An argument I've faced to this was that the Lubavitchers can't possibly be comparable since they have members in prominent places in society. Well, the Opus Dei which can be correctly called a fringe group within Christianity have had its fair share of members of note, for example a variety of government officials in the Spanish, Italian and British Government such as: Ruth Kelly (who is the Secretary of State for Transport in the UK), Antonio Fontán (who was the President of the Senate of Spain in 1977-1979), Jesus Estanislao (who was Secretary of Economic Planning and subsequently Finance Secretary of the Philippines), an FBI agent (Robert Hanssen, who was found guilty of espionage for the Soviet Union), prominent European journalists, renowned academics, influential clergymen in the US (like Archbishop José Horacio Gomez, of San Antonio, who was listed by Fortune Magazine as one of the top 50 most influential Latinos in the US etc[3].).

Also, as an organisation it has non-profit assets estimated at \$2,8 billion worldwide and around \$350 million in the US[4]. This in no way negates what the term "fringe" implies, which is:

"Fringe: something regarded as peripheral, marginal, secondary, or extreme in relation to something else: the lunatic fringe of a strong political party."

This doesn't mean that their fringe position negates any concern of them having disturbing amounts of influence and potential of becoming more so. They are a religious group that has been expanding rapidly since its relocation to Crown Heights in Brooklyn, New York and, mostly due to their latest Rebbe, the movement has grown to become a worldwide missionary enterprise in educating Jews to non-Jews alike to the teachings of their version of Judaism, especially targeted are the gentile (ie non-Jew) population through their Noahide Campaign.[5]

Here follows a few quotes by the given Rebbe to illustrate the point of their evangelistic pursuit:

"America is not lost, you are not different from. You Americans sincerely crave to know, to learn. Americans are inquisitive. It is the Chabad's point of view that the American mind is simple, honest, direct-good, tillable soil for Hassidism, or just plain Judaism"[6]

"In these critical times, when nations are challenging one another and violence is increasing in an unbelievable manner, the Jews have the power to bring about peace in the entire world.... Ideally, a Jew should stand proudly before the gentiles and explain to them the Seven Noahide Laws, emphasizing that they should be carried out not because they appear to be logically sound, but because G-d commanded them.... When a Jew carries out mitzvos with pride, a non-Jew stands in awe of him and, hence, will not consider war."[7]

"The Rambam uses the expression, "lakuf ("to forcefully influence") all inhabitants of the world to accept the Noachide commands." Although obviously one must do this in a pleasant, gentle, and peaceful way, it still must be done with persistence. If you have already tried several times, try again nevertheless. We frequently see that although people are sometimes spoken to five times, they do not change until they hear it a sixth time!"[\[8\]](#)

The above explains one of the main purposes of the Chabad-Lubavitches and it's a highly proselytising in a sense. They are not looking to convert non-jews to Judaism, moreso to influence them in becoming followers of the Laws of Noah. Those laws are prohibitions against murder, idolatry, blasphemy, sexual depravity, stealing, and eating the flesh or limb of a living animal (often interpreted in general as cruelty to animals) and the seventh law which is to establish courts of law that ensure the keeping of the previous six commandments. These laws are, as their name might hint, given by God to Noah in the book of Genesis. They are, with the exception of cruelty to animals and the establishment of courts, not that astranged from the Ten Commandments of Moses. This is in essence a manifestation of the judaic quest of *"Tikkun Olam"* (*"repairing the world"* or *"perfecting the world"*). It is an old rabbinically derived purpose that, while in essence a common aspect in abrahamic mythology, employs in this case the obedient jewish clergy with the responsibility of bringing the truth of the Torah to the world.

As the jews had already been given the Written and Oral Torah at Mount Sinai, it is believed by them that they were therefor ordained to spread the light of God's commandments to the nations (goyim = non-jews) and act has the intermediate wisdom between God and humankind (Bnei Adam = sons of Adam) which, despite erroneous extrapolations of talmudic texts, does include non-jews as demonstrated by the following two quotes:

"A gentile has the ability to purchase land in Israel in order to dig holes and caves as it says (Psalms 115:16) "As for the heavens, the heavens are the Lord's; but the earth He has given to mankind (Bnei Adam)." [\[9\]](#)

"Rabbi Meir would say: How do we know that even a gentile who engages in the study of Torah is like a Jewish high priest? We learn from the verse (Leviticus 18:5) "which mankind (here is the word HaAdam=the men, plural) shall do [i.e. study] and by which he shall live [in the afterlife]." [\[10\]](#)

It is considered that the spreading of this unity of God and the truth of his path (the tikkun, creation) can only come from obedient jews[\[11\]](#) (those obediently adhering to Judaism). The Seven Laws of Noah acts as a simplified extension of the essential commandments that God seeks all mankind to keep, which has since then been recognized as the only necessary laws a gentile must keep in order to gain share of Olam Haba (the hereafter). These sentiments have in past centuries been increasingly popular by hasidic and kabbalist jews (often the two are found to be interchangeable). Here is a quote that illustrates further the educative mandate in question:

"Would we not be sinning were we to abandon these children without adapting ourselves to each and every child, in order to educate them according to their own path while they are still at the critical point... We must adapt ourselves and speak their language, practically turning ourselves into children in order to speak to them according to the way they think and the level they are

on.”[12]

The above is from a book called *”Chovat Hatalmidim”* (*The Student's Responsibility*)[13]. It was written by the hasidic kabbalist and Grand Rabbi of Piaseczno, Poland; Kalonymus Kalman Shapira. While he has not had much influence on Orthodox Judaism, he has had impact on Hasidic Judaism. For example, in the early 20th century he was appointed of Piaseczno and established the Da'as Moshe yeshiva in 1923 which subsequently attracted many hasidic jews through its pioneering outreach programs (later repeated by the Rebbe Menachem Mendel Schneersohn) and became one of the largest yeshivas in the Warsaw-region between WW1-WW2.[14]

Another excerpt from this Rabbi Shapira which provides additional insight to the nature of how Hasidism regards the non-noahide gentile is explained by the following quote;

”But know for that every choice that must emerge from an individual chooser himself, there must be an individuated self to choose. There must be a person who can stand by himself, who can decide what he wants for himself. But if there is no person, just one of the crowds, there can be no free choice or personal will. Because who will choose if, besides the herd mentality, there is no there at all? So a person must individuate himself with the essence of who he really is:... Without this, not only is he not a Jew but he is also not even a person. Become a person who can choose for himself- the prerequisite for reaching God.”[15]

It is not uncommon for Hasidic literature to expand like this on the idea of a non-obedient jew (a minim, heretic) or more commonly on the non-noahide gentile not truly being a fully developed human being or person. This can be regarded through a cursory read to mean all gentiles are animals as opposed to human, however as I noted on before this claim is not compatible nor supported by the Talmud in this strict sense. Gentiles are human, only not equally as developed or spiritually endowed and this very ethnocentric attitude takes the the essential point given that a gentile is simply a vessel that has not heeded to the spark of God's truth and therefor is incomplete, living in a material world empty of spiritual enlightenment where the true essence of a person lies according to Judaism. The point of the hasidic and temporarily Lubavitch Noahide Campaign is to perfect gentiles. Yet as noted earlier by the Rebbe himself and also in the latest quote by Rev Shapira, it can not be a forced adhering but it can certainly be forcefully influenced. The potential grey-area of differences between the two methods remain debatable though.

The influence of this campaign can be readily seen by the commentary to the bill that created the *”Education and Sharing Day”* in honor to Rebbe Schneersohn in time for his 90th birthday, it reads as follows:

*”One Hundred Second Congress of the United States of America
AT THE FIRST SESSION*

Begun and held at the City of Washington on Thursday, the third day of January, one thousand nine hundred and ninety-one

Joint Resolution

To designate March 26, 1991, as 'Education Day, U.S.A.'.

Whereas Congress recognizes the historical tradition of ethical values and principles which are the basis of civilized society and upon which our great Nation was founded;

Whereas these ethical values and principles have been the bedrock of society from the dawn of civilization, when they were known as the Seven Noahide Laws;

Whereas without these ethical values and principles the edifice of civilization stands in serious peril of returning to chaos;

Whereas society is profoundly concerned with the recent weakening of these principles that has resulted in crises that beleaguer and threaten the fabric of civilized society;

Whereas the justified preoccupation with these crises must not let the citizens of this Nation lose sight of their responsibility to transmit these historical ethical values from our distinguished past to the generations of the future;

Whereas the Lubavitch movement has fostered and promoted these ethical values and principles throughout the world;

Whereas Rabbi Menachem Mendel Schneerson, leader of the Lubavitch movement, is universally respected and revered and his eighty-ninth birthday falls on March 26, 1991;

Whereas in tribute to this great spiritual leader, 'the rebbe', this, his ninetieth year will be seen as one of 'education and giving', the year in which we turn to education and charity to return the world to the moral and ethical values contained in the Seven Noahide Laws; and

Whereas this will be reflected in an international scroll of honor signed by the President of the United States and other heads of state: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That March 26, 1991, the start of the ninetieth year of Rabbi Menachem Schneerson, leader of the worldwide Lubavitch movement, is designated as 'Education Day, U.S.A.'. The President is requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Vice President of the United States and

President of the Senate."[\[16\]](#)

One might wonder if the above can be grounds of concern of the US becoming a soon-to-be Lubavitch governed one with a forray of laws implemented by or on the behalf of Hasidic Judaism, infringing on the american's life and living. Personally I do not see any such grounds of concern because, while the Lubavitches have had notable and increasing popularity for the past couple of decades, it is but one group of many that have been catered and cuddled with through governmental attention.

The bulk of the Chabad-Lubavitch popularity has been due to their very charismatic leader, the Rebbe who charmed politicians, institutes and average people (notably jewish) from the left to the right across the world. He died in 1994 and left no heir, the succession of Rebbes ended with him. This led to a substantial fragmentation of the Chabad-movement, generally between those who believed the Rebbe to have been the Messiah (something he himself never claimed) and

those who believed this was a heretical claim.[\[17\]](#) [\[18\]](#)

While the Noahide Campaign and the missionary activities of their Chabad-centers have not been visibly hampered by this rivalry, due to the vacuum of any actual leadership or point of mentoring authority it has lead to conflict within the segmented fractions who seek to attain the helm and control of the Chabad-movement. Therefor, in the midst of a vast plethora of competing interest groups, religious groups, political groups, industrial cooperations and companies, it is safe to say that the religious as well as the political fate of the US will not rest to any noticable extent in the hands of the Lubavitches.

I'd still like to mention one particular argument stemmed from the concern of Lubavitch-takeovers. The argument, which has been made on forums such as Stormfront, purports that the Lubavitches have publically engaged in campaigns to ban any form of christmas celebration and marked it down as idoletry through a series of leaflets and pamphlets. While it is true that at the core of their Hasidic beliefs they probably regard any religious celebration not of Judaism to idolatrous, such leaflets have not been written, printed nor given to anyone by the consent of the Chabad-Lubavitch movement.[\[19\]](#)

The origin of these pamphlets and leaflets stem from the self-proclaimed "true lubavitches" behind the website; "JAHG-USA" (*Jews and Hasidic Gentiles-United to Save America*). I can also mention that as they began to put up their leaflets at Chabad-Houses and so forth, they were met with resistance from Lubavitch rabbis.

Here is an excerpt from the people behind the above website where they describe and complain about the formentioned resistance;

"In accordance with these guidelines, members of JAHG-USA wrote a flier promoting our campaign to abolish Christmas celebration; it was aimed at recruiting Jewish support and featured key quotations from Maimonides, the Rebbe, and other sources. In November 2001, two volunteers posted this flier in a major Chabad synagogue in Los Angeles; when some members of the congregation repeatedly tore down the fliers with the holy Torah quotations, the volunteers instead distributed the fliers throughout the neighborhood to Jewish homes.

It was astonishing enough that, while gentiles had little or no objection to our materials on this campaign, a firestorm of opposition came from "Hasidic" Jews — especially Lubavitchers, the very ones who normally claim to follow the Rebbe! But more amazing was the furious objection of the head Chabad representative of California, Rabbi Shlomo Cunin."[\[20\]](#)

An additional quote by the guys behind JAHG, obviously not happy with their treatment from the Lubavitches and especially their Rabbi Cunin:

"In a display of sheer brazenness, he tries to hide his rebellion against Torah and mitzvot, and against the Lubavitcher Rebbe, by insisting that he has been somehow delegated to power to suppress such mitzvah campaigns. In his words, he claims that this alleged "authority" was granted to him by the Lubavitcher Rebbe — and thus portraying us as the "renegades" against Judaism and the Rebbe for doing a mitzvah campaign, even though it is the Rebbe's own

directive to initiate such campaigns without approval from any "authorities"! In other words, Cunin literally turns reality upside down, rather than backing down and doing teshuvah (repentance) for his earlier attempt to interfere."

Since the words of Rabbi Cunin has not been met with anything but agreement by the Chabad-movement and the their Rabbis, it is safe to conclude that the guys behind the JAHG site are in fact renegade self-proclaimed hasidic lubavitches who are not accepted nor affiliated with the actual Chabad-Luvaitches nor their movement or campaigns.

There is much more one could write and critique about this particular Hasidic Group (e.g the Chabad-Lubavitches) as well as on the variety of exagurated claims and myths about them, I feel the reader have been given a sufficiently curious article on them for the time being.

[1] Altein, R, Zaklikofsky, E, Jacobson, I, 2002, "*Out of the Inferno: The Efforts That Led to the Rescue of Rabbi Yosef Yitzchak Schneersohn of Lubavitch from War Torn Europe in 1939-40*", page 270. Merkos L'Inyonei Chinuch.

[2] As explained at www.chabad.org, a Chabad House or Center is; "*a Jewish community center in the truest sense of the term -- the nerve center of all the educational and outreach activities of the Chabad-Lubavitch lamplighter, serving the needs of the entire Jewish community, from the youngsters to the elderly, and everyone in-between. The Rebbe called for the expansion of activities in existing Chabad Houses, and the establishment of new Chabad-Lubavitch centers wherever Jews live, in the cities, in the suburbs, on college campuses throughout the nation and around the world. And his representatives are responded and are still responding to the Rebbe's call.*"

[3] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_prominent_members_of_Opus_Dei

[4] <http://www.newsday.com/news/nationworld/world/ny-woopus0415,0,7378258.story?coll=ny-top-headlines>

[5] The Chabad-Lubavitch goal of enlightening and influencing the non-jewish populations of the world to adhere to the Seven Noahide Laws. (see http://www.half-jewish.org/noahide_laws.shtml)

[6] Quote by the Rebbe Menachem Schneerson, cited in Raddock, Charles, "*The Jewish Forum*", April, 1951

[7] *Yud Tes Kislev*, 5743, *Sichos in English*, vol. 13, p.19, 33

[8] *Purim*, 5747, *Sichos in English*, vol. 35, p. 4.

[9] *Babylonian Talmud, Soncino English Translation; Tractate Gittin 47a.*

[10] *Babylonian Talmud, Soncino English Translation; Tractate Avodah Zarah 3a.*

[11] *Derech Hashem, II:4:9.* (a text translated to mean "*Way Of God*", written in the early 18th century by an italian kabbalist; Rabbi Moshe Chaim Luzzatto. More information about the concept of Derech Hashem can be found at this website; <http://derechhashem.com>

[12] *Chovat Hatalmidim*, p. 14

[13] <http://www.jewishagency.org/JewishAgency/English/Israel/Resources/TikunOlam/Chovat>

[14] Nehemia Polen, 1994, *The Holy Fire: The Teachings of Rabbi Kalonymus Kalman Shapira: the Rebbe of the Warsaw Ghetto'*, Jason Aronson Inc., pp. 1-2

[15] Shapira, Kalman Kalonymus: "*To Heal the Soul: The Spiritual Journal of a Chasidic Rebbe*"

[16] <http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/z?c102:H.J.RES.104.ENR>:

[17]

<http://web.archive.org/web/20070216051535/http://www.thejewishweek.com/news/newscontent.php3?artid=9558>

[18] Avrum Erlich, Jason Aronson: "*Leadership in the Chabad movement*", 2000.

and <http://www.noahide.com/infiltration/xmas.htm>

[20] <http://www.noahide.com/infiltration/cunin.htm>

The Design of a Conspiracy: The Anti-Jewish Thought of Arnold Leese (Part I)

Sunday, 31 August 2008

Arnold Leese is not a name well known to the public or even to a near absolute majority of so-called 'White Nationalists' and anti-jewish individuals and groups. In fact if you were to organise a snap poll of individuals associating with Nationalist causes; regardless of whether they are actually Nationalists or not, then we suspect you would be very lucky to get more than one or two people out of a sample of hundreds or even thousands who knew who he was and what he did.

The reasons for this obscurity are fairly simple in that during the time, which Arnold Leese was active in fascist and Nationalist politics. He was largely eclipsed by his far more dynamic and populist rival Oswald Mosley[1], infamous leader of the British Union of Fascists (or B.U.F.) during the inter-war years and the Union Movement in the post-war era[2].

Leese also had the comparative misfortune, although he would have probably looked upon it as a personal boon, of having a far more famous protégé in the arguably National Socialist Colin Jordan[3] who carried on where Leese left off and in many ways super-ceded Leese in both terms of intellectualism and literary skill[4].

Another factor that has played into Arnold Leese's comparative obscurity is that his contributions to the anti-jewish literature came at the time of the Third Reich. When large amounts of anti-jewish tracts and books, of varying quality, were being translated from the pens of German and foreign authors inside the Third Reich as well as by 'The Britons' publishing house. This coupled with having to compete alongside the infamous William Joyce's intellectual broadsides against jewry[5] and the even more intellectual, although quite inaccurate, thought concerning the jews of Francis Parker Yockey[6] in the post war-years[7].

However Arnold Leese's contribution to modern anti-jewish thought is considerable for unlike many others of his day. Leese wrote almost exclusively on the subject of jews and their influence on the world around him. He is most famous for his work '*My Irrelevant Defence*'[8], which is a small book detailing why Leese put faith in the ritual murder accusation[9] against the jews when the ritual murder charge was being derided throughout Europe as an irrational superstition and medieval falsehood.

'*My Irrelevant Defence*' is still a widely read and cited book on the subject of jewish ritual

murder and is still considered a classic piece of literature in anti-jewish circles[10]. Whilst Leese's other volumes such as '*Gentile Folly: The Rothschilds*'[11] and '*The Jewish War of Survival*'[12] are still reprinted and sold by Nationalist publishers and retail outlets[13].

The importance of Leese's thought however does not lie so much in its creativity. For Arnold Leese despite his virtues was not a very original or intellectual man but what Leese was good at was providing a reasonable case, at the time of printing, surrounding other's arguments. Arnold Leese himself stated in his short autobiography; '*Out of Step*'[14], that he had learnt how to research through his experience as an assistant/apprentice to the accounting firm of Messrs. Craggs, Turketine & Co[15].

Leese describes it quite circumspectly thus:

'At least I got a fine training in two things: firstly, in sticking out a monotonous job; secondly, rapid and accurate casting up for figures. Both these, especially the first, have been of great use to me in after-life.'[16]

This attitude of sticking out a monotonous job very much characterises Leese's approach to the Jewish question in that it, becomes obvious when reading his work that he does not enjoy his research into the Jewish question and is doing so only because he believes it is essential to the preservation of what he holds dear: the Aryan race and the British Empire. This research attitude is reflected largely in Leese's sourcing for his arguments which he almost exclusively uses official parliamentary and government publications, newspaper articles and contemporary popular non-fiction books[17] to support his arguments rather than more academic works and journal articles which were also reasonably well known at the time.

The sourcing of material from contemporary popular works might be easier than wading through academic books and journals but it is considerably less accurate in general evidential terms. Certainly Leese's use of popular literature for citation in place of academic literature is undesirable and weakens his arguments since by using it there are fewer controls on its integrity and accuracy as there are with academic works. The mitigating circumstance here is that Leese may have used it out of sheer expediency as it was locally available and he would not have had to travel far to access the information he required. The fact that Leese did his research to a large extent in public libraries reflects in the sources he uses and is very much in line with his own stated methodology of viewing this as a laborious task that had to be done (much like totting up and checking a balance sheet) rather than as a labour of love.

Leese however described his own work differently suggesting that he had conducted his research in a scientific and therefore objective manner and he only presented what his conclusions were on the current state of his research.

Leese writes thus:

'I have been conducting research on the Jew Menace ever since; and I wish here to emphasise that I have done it in the same scientific spirit as when I was investigating camel diseases in the world's deserts. I have been after the truth, not propaganda; In fact, I investigated the diseases

of the body politic!' [\[18\]](#)

However Leese's anti-jewish thought is wholly conspiracy-based with an emphasis on the Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion as the plan that the jews are following. Leese occasionally makes mention of the racial aspects of the jewish problem in regard to their power and influence, but this is not the main focus of his thought. This latter aspect is what one would expect if Leese had indeed conducted his work according to scientific standards [\[19\]](#). Since because racial science is based on large amounts of data and a great many biological knowns it is possible to reconcile what is known about jews as a race with what is known about their activities and their history. This approach would glean suitable evidence and data for an incisive deductive or inductive analysis to be carried out.

Leese on the other hand focuses as we have said on the conspiratorial side of the anti-jewish argument using the Protocols of Zion as his basic guide as to how jewry is operating and what its plans for the future are [\[20\]](#). He works from the assumption that the Protocols of Zion form a definite 'World Plan', as he puts it, of jewry and that everything that happens in the contemporary world, especially in domestic and international politics, is to be interpreted in the light of the Protocols of Zion.

Leese to my knowledge never attempted to debunk or examine the arguments against the Protocols of Zion being genuine nor does he seem to have considered the racial characteristics of those who first purported them, i.e. the Slavs of the Russian Empire, in accepting them as genuine despite purported to be a Racist interested in the National Socialist weltanschauung [\[21\]](#). Had Leese been adhering to the 'scientific spirit' of study of the jewish question, as he claims, he would have, as we have said, taken the racial origins of those first purporting such a find and any refutations, whether from jews or non-jews, into account and offer his reasons why he believed the Protocols of Zion to be genuine (as well as offering a reasoning as to why the criticism levelled at that them was false).

What we are told by Leese on the subject of the Protocols of Zion is a canard, in which he states that they 'rang true' [\[22\]](#) in the light of the situation as it was in Leese's time [\[23\]](#). This is an argument that was first offered by Henry Ford in defence of his book; 'The International Jew: The World's Foremost Problem', and is not a cogent one for the simple reason that any document with general statements in the vein of the Protocols can seem to anticipate current and future events. In the same way that the writings of Nostradamus [\[24\]](#) have been interpreted as foretelling specific events such as 9/11 because they are general and if one places emphasis on specific passages (or words) often without any historical context. Then they can seem to talk of contemporary events but one also must ask, for example, whether there other historical events that could be interpreted in the same passage by placing different emphasises within the work/passage. If there are such events then you have to offer a very specific (and evidenced) reasoning as to why they refer to the current rather than the historical event(s).

This holds as true for the Protocols of Zion as for Nostradamus and since Leese did not address this point nor the objections to the authenticity of the Protocols of Zion his claim that he examined the question in the same manner as he would a camel disease cannot be held to be valid.

Since Leese is using the Protocols of Zion as his authoritative document and filter, through which the current affairs of the world in his time should be viewed. The fact that he has not made any intellectual attempt to verify his filter and thus a key piece of his conception of the Jewish question beyond stating a popular canard in their support. Means that Leese's arguments and conclusions are automatically suspect and are liable to ready dismissal when we note how much evidence has been marshalled against the Protocols of Zion being what they purport to be.

The traditional argument against the Protocols of Zion by Jewish and pro-Jewish authors has been made on the grounds of plagiarism in so far as a significant number of key passages bear a striking resemblance to those found in a 19th century French book written by Maurice Joly. This they argue means that the Protocols of Zion are therefore not what they proclaim to be[25]. This argument is obviously problematic in so far as it doesn't discount a number of other equally likely possibilities if one looks at the evidence presented by the authors arguing against the Protocols of Zion[26].

A far more compelling argument mentioned by Cohn and one that has been recently corrected and updated (and proven beyond reasonable doubt in my opinion) by De Michelis[27] is that the Protocols of Zion in fact evolved from a series of prior Russian publications. This rather than accusations; founded or unfounded, of plagiarism makes a solid case against the Protocols of Zion being what they purport to be. In so far as that by demonstrating a documented continuance and evolution of the Protocols from anti-Jewish literature it indicates that the mind that created them was Slavic rather than Jewish[28]. This contrasts drastically with the traditional argument against the Protocols of Zion that was the only significant one current in Leese's time and we can forgive Leese somewhat for placing his faith in the Protocols of Zion (since the plagiarism argument is extremely flimsy in terms of actually disproving the Protocols of Zion being a conspiratorial document). However, this does not excuse Leese's not addressing this argument even if he felt that it had already been addressed in the extended edition of the Protocols of Zion issued by the Britons publishing house in 1934[29] and in *'The International Jew'* of Henry Ford.

This is a critical weakness in Leese's thought on Jews in that by basing his ideas on a controversial document. He has made his ideas highly conspiratorial rather than basing them on what could reasonably be considered a more cogent methodology in looking at Jews as a race[30]. Hence the basis of Leese's anti-Jewish thought is flawed and so, by logical inference, are his arguments. Although the research he conducted in regards to the facts and questions unrelated to a conspiracy of sorts may have value.

The main focus of his thought, as we have identified above, is an active and knowing conspiracy against the Aryan race; which Leese identified as being the Nordic sub-race (which was in-sync with the popular and academic literature on the subject at the time), on the part of the Jews. Leese's particular focus in this regard is the connection between Jewry, International (or High) Finance and Freemasonry (i.e. the Protocols of Zion). In this he views the Jews as being the central conspiratorial element who control the other two secondary conspiratorial elements through the strategic positioning of their racial kin in them to manipulate and exert direct/indirect control over non-Jewish elements within both these secondary conspiratorial elements.

In discussing his views Leese writes thus:

'I got a copy of the Protocols of the Elders of Zion, in which is concentrated the main outline of the Jewish Plot for World Domination.' [\[31\]](#)

He also writes in his pamphlet; 'Freemasonry', as follows:

'These documents [\[32\]](#) *outline the plan of the jewish for world domination and are obtainable from the I.F.L., price 1s. 4d., post free.'* [\[33\]](#)

Thus we see further that Leese's vision of the jews is based on the Protocols of Zion and most importantly that the jews are the controlling conspiratorial element. Leese argues the case in his pamphlet, 'Freemasonry', that Freemasonry is controlled by jews and that it is but a tool of the plan for world domination outlined in his view by the Protocols of Zion.

Leese writes thus:

'It was stated earlier (p. 10) of this pamphlet, that the Jews conceived the idea of conquering France by Freemasonry when they found that it could not be done by international wars.' [\[34\]](#)

And further that:

'It has already been shewn in this pamphlet that the basis of "Speculative" masonry, its symbolism and code of ethics, is Jewish Gnosticism [\[35\]](#) *. The question which arises is, where does the control of Freemasonry lie to-day, and how is it controlled? To the first part we unhesitatingly answer, in the B'nai B'rith, {Literal translation, Sons of the Covenant, the covenant being that of circumcision.* [\[36\]](#) *} and to the second, though the higher rites, especially the Rite of Mizraim.'* [\[37\]](#)

Leese then clarifies his argument concerning the Rite of Mizraim:

'The Rite of Mizraim, since it has been mentioned, deserves some explanation. It was founded in 1805 at Milan, and was introduced to France in 1816. Essentially Jewish, the rite had 90 degrees until it amalgamated with the Rite of Memphis in 1875, when the number was increased to 97. The Rite of Mizraim is principled notorious for the reputed fact that the Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion {These documents outline the plan of the jewish for world domination and are obtainable from the I.F.L., price 1s. 4d., post free.} were stolen from a Jewish Lodge of Mizraim in Paris in 1884 by Joseph Schorst, a Jew.' [\[38\]](#)

It is worth noting here that in between the above quotations Leese cites Protocol 11 of the Protocols of Zion as to what the purpose of the B'nai B'rith is. This quotation is to the effect that in Leese's view the B'nai B'rith are the controlling element used by the Elders of Zion (i.e. the leaders of the jews) to manipulate the gentile (or 'show') lodges to carry out the jewish plan. It also worth noting in passing that concerning the Protocols being stolen from a Jewish Lodge of Mizraim, Leese cites a bit of popular literature at the time, L. Fry's 'Waters Flowing Eastwards',

as his evidence for this assertion. This further evidences our above contention that a major criticism of Leese can be found in the sources he uses and trusts for his information.

Also, perhaps unsurprisingly, Leese brings up the Illuminati[39] in his argument when he states as follows:

‘It is most interesting to watch the development of Jewish influence in the preparation and consummation of the French Revolution of 1789; side by side one sees the growth of Illuminism among the Gentiles and Jews with a unique directive power wielded in Berlin by the Jews, Moses Mendelssohn (1726-86), grandfather of the famous composer, Naphtali Wessely (1725-1805), and the Jewish Bankers, Daniel Itzig, Friedlander, Meyer, Cerfbeer, and the Goldsmid Brothers in London. Jewish Illuminism was called Haskalah, and was head and directed by Moses Mendelsohn, who also inspired the leaders of Masonic Illuminism such as Adam Weishaupt, H. S. Reimarus, Lessing, Nicolai, Ch. Dohm, Mirabeau, and others. The Jew, Bernard Lazare, has himself written “There were Jews behind Weishaupt.” {“L’antisemitisme,” page 339.}’[40]

Thus we can say without reservation that Leese held Freemasonry to be a tool of the jews ruled by the jewish B’nai B’rith acting on the jewish plan outlined in the Protocols of Zion.

[1] Leese dubbed him a ‘kosher fascist’ and backed this up with the assertion that Mosley’s first wife had been a jewess.

[2] It is worth reading Sir Oswald Mosley’s autobiography for general orientation, although not a critical view, on his actions, ideas and politics. Oswald Mosley, 2006, *‘My Life’*, 1st Edition, Brockingday: London. A free to download e-book version of the book is available at the following address: <http://www.oswaldmosley.com/downloads/My%20Life.pdf>.

[3] Colin Jordan’s political ideas can be found in a relatively brief summary in Colin Jordan, 1993, *‘National Socialism: Vanguard of the Future: Selected writings of Colin Jordan’*, 1st Edition, Nordland Vorlag: Aalborg.

[4] With Jordan having been educated at Oxford and Leese being a retired vet; this is hardly surprising.

[5] William Joyce is well known for being a ‘traitor’ because he made news broadcasts and political commentary from Germany to England during World War II and also said many not so polite things about jews, the aristocracy, British parliamentarians and Winston Churchill. Joyce is better known by is ‘Lord Haw Haw’ despite not being an aristocrat and in fact being a Galway Irishman of American birth who fought with the Black and Tans against the IRA. He was also Oswald Mosley’s deputy in the mid-1930’s at the height of the British Union of Fascists in the United Kingdom and largely responsible for the anti-jewish attitude that characterised the B.U.F. at this time.

[6] An excellent, although not extensive, critique of Yockey’s (and to a limited extent Oswald Spengler’s) thought concerning the jews as well as his thoughts on the subject of race by Revilo Oliver can be found in: Francis Parker Yockey & Revilo Oliver, 2003, *‘The Enemy Of Europe/The Enemy Of Our Enemies’*, 2nd Edition, Liberty Bell Publications: York.

[7] Arnold Leese died in 1956 when Yockey was at the height of his activity having written and published *‘Imperium’* and a number of prominent articles concerning the jewish question in Europe at that time.

[8] Arnold Leese, 1938, *My Irrelevant Defence being Meditations Inside Gaol and Out on Jewish Ritual Murder*, 1st Edition, The I.F.L. Printing & Publishing Company: London.

[9] More often called the 'Blood Libel' by pro-jewish authors although this propagandistic term is certainly largely without merit since as has been shown recently by Elliot Horowitz in his 2007, *Reckless Rites: Purim and the legacy of Jewish Violence*, 1st Edition, Princeton University Press: Princeton, the companion charge of host desecration (often included in the same sentences attacking the 'blood libel' as an 'anti-Semitic hoax') is potentially a valid one and one cannot be so quick, as Jewish and philo-Semitic historians have been, to simply dismiss such charges. He also neatly demonstrated that a key argument as to the unfeasibility of the charge in terms of Jewish theology and practical activity is a nonsense and that Jews were perfectly capable (and indeed had some theological backing in doing so) of committing such crimes on religious grounds. Ariel Toaff in his 2007, *Blood Passover: European Jews and Ritual Murder*, Trans: Gian Marco Lucchese and Pietro Gianetti, 1st Edition, Societa editrice il Mulino: Bologna, went further and actually demonstrated to a quite satisfactory degree that some (please note this would be a clear minority within Jews but never-the-less it is highly significant in terms of the pro-Jewish argument that has been offered) Jews did commit ritual murder for Christian blood and that specifically the ritual murder case surrounding St. Simon of Trent in 1475 was an actual case of such a ritual murder event and not the anti-Semitic fantasy that Cecil Roth, Ronnie Po-Chia Hsia, Alan Dundes and others have made it out to be. Since Toaff's work has been effectively banned by Israeli authorities and organised Jewry; in particular as a result of the heavy agitation of the Anti-Defamation League, and all possible existent copies recalled it is extremely rare. However it has been put online both in the original and translated editions at the following address: <http://jrbooksonline.com/>.

[10] For example Leese's original arguments on the matter are heavily used in the recent Nationalist work on the matter: Philip de Vier, 2001, *Blood Ritual: An Investigative Report Examining a Certain Series of Cultic Murder Cases*, 1st Edition, National Vanguard Books: Hillsboro. Although I wouldn't recommend this particular book for a summary consultation on the subject of Jewish ritual murder rather the more academic work by the authors cited in n. 7 as well as the detractors to the claims are far more generally balanced and source-based in our opinion.

[11] Arnold Leese, 1940, *Gentile Folly: The Rothschilds*, 1st Edition, The I.F.L. Printing & Publishing Company: London.

[12] Arnold Leese, 1945, *The Jewish War of Survival*, 1st Edition, Self-Published: Guildford.

[13] For example: the 'Historical Review Press' in the United Kingdom. More information can be found at the following address: <http://ety.com/wisdomshop/shop.htm>.

[14] Arnold Leese, 1951, *Out Of Step: Events in the Two Lives of an Anti-Jewish Camel-Doctor*, 1st Edition, Self-Published: Guildford.

[15] Leese, *Out Of Step*, Op. Cit., p. 5.

[16] Ibid.

[17] These were also often of a conspiratorial nature in the vein of the infamous Nesta Webster whose works I have little doubt Leese had at least read. One such example is Lady Queenborough's (Edith Starr Miller), 1933, *Occult Theocracy*, 2 Vols., 1st Edition, Imprimerie F. Paillart: London, which Leese does cite.

[18] Leese, *Out of Step*, Op. Cit., pp. 50-51.

[19] As far as the concept of scientific research maybe applied to history. As it is usually a dubious claim made to increase the authority of what one is claiming rather than by following

standard historical research methodologies.

[20] Leese, 'Out of Step', Op. Cit., p. 50.

[21] 'The Fascist' circa 1935-36 acquired the hakenkreuz (or 'swastika') symbol on its front cover and Leese adopted National Socialist symbols for his 'Imperial Fascist League'. He also maintained contact with Julius Streicher, the Editor of the infamous anti-jewish 'Der Sturmer' magazine, through Streicher's son Lothar. Although how much the two of them actually corresponded has never been properly ascertained.

[22] Leese, 'Out of Step', Op. Cit., p. 50.

[23] This is an oft used conspiratorial canard used to justify theories as to what is going behind-the-scenes in the world today as well as dubious pieces of evidence that are hard to prove or disprove. It is a line of argument still pursued by many in anti-jewish circles, especially those ostensibly connected to the 'White Nationalist' 'movement', concerning the Protocols of Zion since it offers a line of thought that requires little intellectual activity from those maintaining it and cannot be really disproved without a substantial amount of knowledge or research by those opposing it. It is a quintessential example of the sheer intellectual laziness that in my opinion is almost pandemic within 'White Nationalism' and its associated anti-jewish thought.

[24] Nostradamus was born a jew.

[25] This is the basic argument of Norman Cohn, 1996, 'Warrant for Genocide: The Myth of the Jewish World Conspiracy and the Protocols of the Elders of Zion', 3rd Edition, Sherif: London, which is an oft cited work arguing against the Protocols' authenticity.

[26] Such as the possibility that if they were genuine these passages might have been inserted as a rhetorical flush or the author had recently read the book concerned and liked the flavour of what was written as a manner of explaining his or her meaning.

[27] Cesare De Michelis, Trans: Richard Newhouse, 2004, 'The Non-Existent Manuscript: A Study of the Protocols of the Sages of Zion', 2nd Edition, University of Nebraska Press: Lincoln.

[28] A careful reading of the Protocols of Zion and a healthy knowledge of the jews is enough to indicate that the author was a Slav rather than a jew. There are certain racial eccentricities, which could be expanded upon at great length, that make the thought of Slavs and jews distinguishable in literature.

[29] Victor Marsden, 1934, 'The Protocols of the Elders of Zion: With Preface and Explanatory Notes', 1st Edition, The Britons: London.

[30] There was a split within the experts on jewish question in the Third Reich as well; since most seem to have conceived the jews as a monolithic conspiracy but increasing the study of the jews began to enter a new phase, particularly among those experts attached or belonging to the SS, which conceived the jew correctly in my opinion as less of a conspiratorial being but rather as a race almost completely enthral to its own genetics and unable to rise out of its high risk activities which can be said to generate the more extreme anti-jewish responses such as pogroms.

[31] Leese, 'Out of Step', Op. Cit., p. 50.

[32] The Protocols of Zion.

[33] Arnold Leese, Circa 1936, 'Freemasonry', 1st Edition, The I.F.L. Printing & Publishing Company: London, p. 17.

[34] Ibid., p. 18.

[35] Leese saw Gnosticism as something verging on the satanic. Presumably taking his cue from Nesta Webster's, 1924, 'Secret Societies and Subversive Movements', reprinted by Omni: Palmdale, pp. 27-32, when Webster argues that Gnosticism is essentially jewish (specifically from the Cabbala) and anti-Christian. Leese being a devout Anglican Protestant presumably took

it to be something inspired by the forces of hell to subvert the true faith and the Aryan race.

[36] A Jewish organisation based on Freemasonry which until the 1970/80's highly elite in who it allowed to become members but after for this time, for reasons I cannot currently ascertain, it allowed a increase in the quantity of members whilst decreasing its qualitative requirement (and thus became far more populist rather elitist; although it is of course still only open to Jewish members [secular or otherwise]). The B'nai B'rith are the creators of the well known Anti-Defamation League (of B'nai B'rith) or ADL for short; although I cannot currently ascertain the strength of the link between the debased B'nai B'rith proper and the ADL we have to presume it is still strong.

[37] Leese, 'Freemasonry', Op. Cit., p. 17.

[38] Ibid.

[39] The Illuminati as a secret society and a conspiracy having then recently been popularised by Nesta Webster's, 1924, 'Secret Societies and Subversive Movements' which has been republished most recently by Omni: Palmdale.

[40] Leese, 'Freemasonry', Op. Cit., p. 19

Rabbinical Rule in the Middle Ages and Early Modern Central and Eastern Europe: Terror and Despotism (Part II)

Sunday, 31 August 2008

In the first part of this essay, we have introduced some of the aspects of rabbinical rule as it concerns Ashkenazi Jewry. We have discussed in particular the usurpation by the rabbis of Royal power in their passing of informal death sentences with which the medium was to be a lynching of the offending Jew. The particular offense we have discussed in this context was the 'informer' who we defined as a Jew seeking the outside legal arbitration on some matter from Gentile authorities with the power to redact or modify some decision or act by the rabbinical authorities who the monarch had invested with appropriate powers and trust to govern the Jewish community in such a way as for the best interests of the state and Jews[1].

We have touched briefly on the nature of the rabbinical councils in that they were highly corrupt organisations and although ostensibly fair to begin with it did not take long for them to become the legal organ of the personal interests of the powerful Jewish families in the community. This power was used to enforce those rabbinical family's personal power forming in essence a hereditary oligarchy backed up by a veritable library of Torah, Tanakh and Talmud-based learning, although the latter far more than the former two, which gave it spiritual sanction.

It is amusing to note here that today Jews and their sympathisers, especially of the Zionist persuasion, like to accuse Islam alone of being brutally ruled by corrupt hereditary alim, imams and ayatollahs. However, they hypocritically do not note that Judaism has the same device in operation to this day among many of its communities and historically this same device was in wide operation from even before the Prophet Mohammed and Jesus Christ came onto the earth[2].

Since we are talking of the corrupt and despotic nature of the rabbinical councils in central and

eastern Europe it is necessary for us to give some idea of how they functioned and what their structure was. Covering this will forward our thesis because it will show the powerful rule that each council exercised over their respective jewish communities. Thus when we come to demonstrate their corruption it will enable us to show just how widespread it was. As well as how the jews after having been trusted with such authority abused it in such a startling and systematic fashion.

Each jewish community was governed by a rabbinical council, which as it had administrative, judicial, religious and charitable functions formed a unit of government over the community itself. This unit of government was known as a Kahal[3] and it acted both as the representation of that particular jewish community and its governing body.

The Kahal was an elected body but with one particular undemocratic caveat in that it was elected by electors who were themselves elected by the members of the community[4]. This was however a sham as Kriwaczek records[5] in that regardless of the electors returned, and they would generally be the respected members of the community of the best rabbinical heritages and/or the heads of distinguished families, the result was the same. In that the Kahal's officers came from only a select few families and became de-facto hereditary family monopolies.

The actual system is described by Lew thus:

‘*The beadle*[6], in the presence of the Rabbi, put into a box cards bearing the names of all contributing members of the community[7]. Nine of the cards were then drawn, and those chosen had to take an oath to the effect that they would choose from among the members of the community five men well acquainted with its affairs.’[8]

This may look quite democratic but then the key to understanding this jewish practice is to comprehend the meaning of ‘*contributing members of the community*’. This might sound innocuous and seem to mean all jews attending the Synagogue or in the community. However: it does not. What a ‘contributing member of the community is: is a due paying member of the Synagogue. This means in practice that it is the head of the family voting for all the members in his family, which he has paid the Synagogue dues for all the members there-of.

This then means that the members of the community that all the contributing members, i.e. the heads of the families concerned, were becoming the electors, rather than other less distinguished jews, and then voting in the five elders who were ‘*well acquainted with its affairs*’, which would of course infer members of distinguished families either in terms of wealth or rabbinical lineage/learning.

It is worth noting that in the jewish community in both Sephardi and Ashkenazi worlds there has always been a larger disparity, than in gentile communities in which jews have co-existed with, between the rich and the poor. This disparity is more obvious in Ashkenazi spheres, because the Sephardi were largely an urban population while the Ashkenazi were until 19th century largely a rural population in eastern Europe but in central Europe they were largely an urban population.

It is thus obvious that if a jew was poor he would be unlikely, considering the general Ashkenazi

economic situation in eastern Europe in particular, to be a '*contributing member of the community*' and hence not able to be involved in the process of electing the elders of the community.

It is worth noting that here that Gluckel of Hameln again notes on many occasions in her '*Memoirs*' of just this. She often describes her fellow jews when she or her husband do business with them or when she meets or wishes to marry one of her children to them (successfully or not) that they have been Parnasim[\[9\]](#) or their father or grandfather have been[\[10\]](#). These as Gluckel tells us with great pride were rich jews and often had many thousands of thalers; there is no mention of Parnasim being poor itinerant rabbis. Rather these rabbis were of wealthy dynasties often both commercially successful as merchants, bankers and artisans and as Torah scholars (and as was often the case: rabbis).

Realising this subtle difference in meaning and that the historical context of the jews gives us a real feeling of the difference between what Lew's statement might seem to suggest and what it is actually describing. It thus becomes more evident how this process could become as corrupt and tyrannical as Kriwaczek describes it as[\[11\]](#). It also becomes evident about how this process could come very easily and quickly to be dominated by just a few families and hence become a series of de-facto hereditary positions occupied by the members of the same family over the generations.

The other members of the Kahal other than the Parnasim (or Rashim) were the Tuvim who acted as assessors at the court of the Voyevoda[\[12\]](#) in the case of Poland, but the ducal court or local administrative hub of other countries were also inhabited by these representatives of the local Kahals[\[13\]](#). The Tuvim went where the taxes were to be assessed and collected to act as the agents for the jewish community both in campaigning on the jewish communities behalf and to ostensibly act as royal officials (and loyal subjects).

There was also the more ordinary members of the Kahal and those that met the most frequently to perform their duties. It is often they who are referred to as 'the Kahal' en toto but because the Parnasim and Tuvim were also engaged in the self-government of the community we include them as members of the Kahal here. The ordinary members of the Kahal were split into three separate functions, which will be of interest to us.

These functions were as follows:

Charity Overseers.

Tax Assessors.

Inspectors or Supervisors of the religious and public welfare.

We can summarize these community roles as follows[\[14\]](#):

The Charity Overseers looked after the administration of the community and the synagogue. They also controlled all the charitable, social and religious organisations within the jewish community.

The Tax Assessors were responsible for drawing up an accurate list of all the tax payers of the community and make the requisite financial assessment of the contribution that was required from each tax payer.

The Inspectors or Supervisors of the religious and public welfare were responsible for supervising the preparation of food and drink so that they were prepared in line with kashrut law. They also controlled the sale of wine in towns and were duty bound to inspect the weights and measures being used by the jews under their jurisdiction. They also controlled the jewish night watchmen, supervised the jewish schools and took the responsibility for keeping the streets clean and free from undue noise (especially musicians playing at night).

In time these Kahals coalesced into a centralised body which Lew describes thus in the case of Poland[15]:

‘As our period advanced representatives of individual communities met for the purpose of discussing problems confronting the larger community. These gatherings eventually developed into the “Council of the Lands”.’[16]

Such a coalescing of interests into one larger body was not unusual among jewry and in England we find a similar coalescing of jewish interests, even between the rival Sephardi and Ashkenazi communities, into one communal body which then would represent jewish interests en toto to the government of the day and scheme to get what it wanted put into practice. Hyamson records it thus in the case of England with the London Committee of Deputies of British Jews (but known as the Jewish Board of Deputies)[17]:

‘As time passed, relations between the Community and the Government and other constituted authorities of the land developed and instances occurred of legislative proposals and other acts of the administration in which Anglo-Jewry was deeply interested. In other directions also English Sephardi interests spread. Political affairs continued to take their place in the agenda. So also did the interests and doings of foreign Jewries, primarily but never exclusively Sephardi Jewries. In some cases the approaches of London Jewry to the authorities related solely to the welfare of foreign Jewries. In yet another respect the thoughts and efforts of those who guided the fortunes of the London Sephardim passed outside their own immediate circle. This took the form of co-operation with the Ashkenazi branch of Anglo-Jewry which had by the middle of the eighteenth century grown to a position approaching in influence that of the Sephardim, apart from outstripping them in numbers.’[18]

This; along with other literature, tells us that communal jewish action and forming central bodies for the collection and use of the power both in self-government and influencing central and regional government exercised by jewry were common among the jewish communities of Europe. The Sephardi jewish communities[19] of south-western France; centred on Bordeaux and Saint-Esprit, like their Ashkenazi kin in central and eastern Europe and their Sephardi and Ashkenazi kin in England formed central representative organisations, which also acted as a government for the jews on behalf of the gentile authorities in the form of the hebera and sedaca[20] in 1699.

The difference between these western jewish forms of self-government and the representation of the community that they conducted above cited and the eastern forms of jewish self-government and representation of the community is in their actual power.

It might be suggested that it is a question of the mandate; and therefore the legal power, granted to the jewish communal organisations as to how despotic they became. However if we take Hyman's assertion that the Ashkenazi jews of Alsace-Lorraine were equally brutal with 'informers' as were the rabbinical councils of central and eastern Europe it would seem less a question of the mandate given but rather what the rabbis could get away with doing.

Hyman doesn't mention the lynching of 'informers' unsurprisingly; which is not to say it happened in Alsace-Lorraine but rather that we would be rather surprised if it did not, but does mention some of the other punishments mentioned by Kriwaczek and Lew in the form of 'excommunication', which was effectively a death sentence to a jew in terms of social, economic, political, religious and communal life[21]. The members of the Kahal would have certainly been involved in such a punishment for as we have described above, they held complete control of all the jewish organisations under their jurisdiction and could deprive a family of aid, synagogue worship, remove their children from jewish schools etc. They could have also increased their tax burden accordingly by prejudicially assessing them although they could not remove them from their houses since they did not have hazakah[22] under their jurisdiction. These powers along would have made it almost impossible for a jewish family of an 'informer' to live in the jewish community and would almost certainly drive them out of that community in a fairly short period of time.

Our discussion has also succeeded in bringing to light another potential reason as to why 'informers' were so harshly treated and condemned by the rabbis and the jewish community for their actions. In that if the Tuvim and tax assessors were to revise the real figures of jewish earnings and general wealth downwards then they would pay less tax and be wealthier. This would of course benefit the ruling clique more than the general jewish population under the rule of Kahal but there is the tantalizing possibility here that in addition to super-ceding the authority given to them by the monarch in enacting directly or indirectly the death penalty. The Kahal's were defrauding the state by giving in low tax assessments. This will be what we will be discussing in part III of this essay. Whether the jews were defrauding the state and enacted the legislation against 'informers' because they feared that their property might be confiscated by the crown in punishment for defrauding the monarch and the state of their rightful revenues.

[1] This attitude apparently went as far as Alsace-Lorraine (or the western edge, with the exception of the anomaly of the Parisian jews whose existence was not legally recognised and therefore were not allowed to form an autonomous community, of Ashkenazi jewry at this time); in the particular the city of Metz (which also had a small eastern European style yeshiva), as recorded by Paula Hyman, 1998, *The Jews of Modern France*, 1st Edition, University of California Press: Berkeley, p. 13.

[2] It could be argued that Christianity had the same institution for quite some time but this would be generally misguided in that most Christian high functionaries were a compromise between the state and the Church or in some cases actually directly picked by the state. This quite different from Judaism hereditary use of rabbinical position to create 'rabbinical lines' and

Islam's clerical reliance on ancestral authority, such as claiming relation to the Prophet Mohammed, to grant an individual more spiritual authority in the temporal world. Judaism has a similar system to Islam in this regard in so far as rabbis, rebbes and tzaddiks often claim or cite distinguished rabbinical ancestry for the reason as to why they are to be obeyed i.e. to increase their spiritual authority by heritage in the temporal world

[3] This term has often been confused with the communist 'Soviet' but they are quite different institutions despite some superficial similarities. This confusion has arisen from the article: 'Is the Jewish "Kahal" the Modern "Soviet"?' in Henry Ford's much reprinted 'The International Jew: The World's Foremost Problem'. The article in question is available at the following address: http://www.jrbooksonline.com/Intl_Jew_full_version/ij15.htm.

[4] Myer Lew, 1944, 'The Jews of Poland: Their Political, Economic, Social and Communal Life in the Sixteenth Century as reflected by the Works of Rabbi Moses Isserls', 1st Edition, Edward Goldston: London, p. 136.

[5] Paul Kriwaczek, 2006, 'Yiddish Civilisation: The Rise and Fall of a Forgotten Nation', 2nd Edition, Phoenix: London, pp. 253-254.

[6] I.e. The caretaker and/or administrator of the Synagogue.

[7] I.e. those paying their Synagogue dues; which were used to keep the Synagogue maintained, equipped and staffed.

[8] Lew, Op. Cit., p. 136.

[9] Elders of the community. These are the elders referred to by Lew and are sometimes referred to Rashim rather than Parnasim.

[10] For example see: 'The Memoirs of Gluckel of Hameln', Trans: Marvin Lowenthal, 1932, 1st Edition, Harper & Brothers: New York, p. 161, where Gluckel talks of Parnas Abraham Krumbach the father of her son-in-law Kossmann Cleve who was a wealthy man in his own right.

[11] Kriwaczek, Op. Cit, p. 253.

[12] Translated from the Polish: 'Military Commander', but from the end of the 14th century this office was turned into an administrative hub in each province in Poland. So that each province had its own Voyevoda and hence its own court of the Voyevoda to which the Tuvim acted as assessors. The Voyevoda was also a member of the Royal Council and exercised considerable influence at the Royal Court.

[13] Simon Dubnow, Trans: Israel Friedlander, 1916, 'History of the Jews in Russia and Poland', Vol. 1, 1st Edition, Jewish Publication Society: Philadelphia, p. 45.

[14] For more details see Lew, Op. Cit. pp. 138-140.

[15] More on this can be found in Anna Foa, Trans: Andrea Grover, 2000, 'The Jews of Europe after the Black Death', 1st Edition, University of California Press: Berkley, p. 187.

[16] Lew, Op. Cit., p. 134.

[17] This organisation is still one of considerable influence in the United Kingdom. More information about it can found at the following address: <http://www.boardofdeputies.org.uk/>.

[18] Albert Hyamson, 1951, 'The Sephardim of England: A History of the Spanish and Portuguese Jewish Community 1492-1951', 1st Edition, Methuen: London, p. 123.

[19] These were largely Marrano communities and in the fashion of the age were known as 'Portuguese' which was colloquial for Marrano jew usually a merchant by profession.

[20] Hyman, Op. Cit., p. 4.

[21] The only escape from this would have been conversion to Christianity which in itself brought physical hazards to the jew attempting to convert. Religious jews would often and still

do occasionally become physically violent at the prospect of an individual born into the Jewish race converting to another religion in particular Christianity which they tend to view as being an evil religion associated with Amalek's eternal war upon the Jews.

[22] Translated: '*Right of Residence*' or the contract by which a Jew or Jewish family could rent a dwelling from fellow Jews.

Some Brief Notes on Eustace Mullin's Quotation from Israel Cohen's 'A Racial Programme for the Twentieth Century'

Sunday, 7 September 2008

When Eustace Mullins used a quote that is alleged to come from a pamphlet/booklet/book published in 1912 in Britain by a Jewish communist author by the name of Israel Cohen. It is unlikely he had envisioned just how much this one quotation would be reprinted, repeated and would become the subject of such controversy.

Unfortunately the Wikipedia article on the actual quotation[1] is not one of the best that Wikipedia has ever produced[2]. The article contains a number of problematic arguments and assertions, which it suggests 'disprove' the book's existence and therefore suggest Mullins invented it (and the quotation). Now I actually agree in the absence of other evidence with the general conclusion given by Wikipedia in so far that the quotation does seem to have been invented by Mullins[3] from a non-existent work.

My reasons for this differ substantially from those given on Wikipedia. So to give the reader a serious anti-Semite's perspective on the issue I am going to explain why Wikipedia's arguments are not cogent and based, somewhat ironically, on unfounded premises. Unlike Jewish organisations, such as '*Honest Reporting*', I am not going to sit here and make hysterical accusations against Wikipedia for 'bias'[4], but rather assume that because the subject it is somewhat obscure and unlikely to generate much interest or further research on the part of Wikipedia's editors (so that even a badly constructed argument might seem cogent). It is unlikely that Wikipedia's editorial staff much care for something they have labelled, perhaps correctly, as the province of 'anti-Semites'. It is also worth stating that the arguments Wikipedia is using are not its own, but rather Representative Abraham Multer's arguments but by endorsing the arguments in the article[5] Wikipedia agrees with them.

The actual quotation as given correctly by Wikipedia is as follows:

'We must realize that our party's most powerful weapon is racial tensions. By propounding into the consciousness of the dark races that for centuries they have been oppressed by whites, we can mold them to the program of the Communist Party. In America we will aim for subtle victory. While inflaming the Negro minority against the whites, we will endeavor to instill in the whites a guilt complex for their exploitation of the Negroes. We will aid the Negroes to rise in prominence in every walk of life, in the professions and in the world of sports and entertainment. With this prestige, the Negro will be able to intermarry with the whites and begin a process which will deliver America to our cause.'

The Wikipedia article states as follows:

'These included the nonexistence of a [British Communist party](#) in [1912](#) (it was founded in only 1920).'

By stating this Multer shows his ignorance of the subject. When he argues that because there was not a British Community Party in 1912 and that because the author identifies the force as 'the Communist Party' in the quotation and therefore because the British Communist Party was not founded until 1920 he must therefore not be telling the truth. He is making a large cognitive leap without much evidence to do so that 'programme of the Communist Party' is to be taken in a purely literal sense. The British Communist Party indeed was founded some eight years later but a few years before Israel Cohen supposedly penned this work the socialist Labour party, which certainly included large numbers of communists (and would have been viewed at the time by them as the 'communist' party before a more particular split had occurred), had suddenly broken onto the scene of British politics and in short order eviscerated the old Liberal party. This sort of politicking by communists was exactly that espoused by Lenin in his 1905, *'Two Tactics of Social-Democracy'* [\[6\]](#). Where-in he advocated that the true 'champions of the proletariat' should temporarily ally with liberals and then get rid of them and then ally with socialists and be rid of them in time. Eventually; this strategy was only to leave the most 'socially radical', i.e. revolutionary, element to rule over the people in their best interest and therefore found the communist state.

So therefore we must find that Multer's objection, although potentially useful, is arguably unfounded because of the literalism with which he takes the passage from Israel Cohen rather than looking at the context of what Cohen might actually be referring to.

Multer's second and main objection is as follows:

'the nonexistence of a British Communist author named Israel Cohen'

This objection is also potentially unfounded for the simple reason that we don't know that there was not a Communist author of this name, perhaps even a nom-de-plume, living and writing in Britain at this point. There were certainly authors by this name publishing in Britain at the time [\[7\]](#), but whether they were Communists or not remains to be seen.

The method that Multer uses to demonstrate, in his opinion, Israel Cohen's non-existence is to state that this work cannot be found in the British Library's or the Library of Congress' catalogues of printed books. This can be said to hold some credibility since Mullins claims to have found Israel Cohen's work in a Zionist publication in the Library of Congress. However; what if the work itself was a printed pamphlet and was simply circulated by hand with a touch on the nose to say 'keep this to yourself' [\[8\]](#) rather than being sold on street corners [\[9\]](#). It is quite impossible to state that the British Library and the Library of Congress have copies of all the printed matter (as much as they would like to), especially booklets and pamphlets, which may or may not have been circulated privately.

Mullins explanation of where he found the pamphlet ‘*in a Zionist publication*’[\[10\]](#) would indicate such a situation in which he found this pamphlet or booklet inside another book. Presumably left there by another individual, who was doing research/reading and then left it in a book by accident, which Mullins then found and quoted some time later. There have also been other such cases where previously unknown books/works have been deliberately or accidentally left in a major library/archive only be discovered later[\[11\]](#).

Therefore although Multer’s objection can be said to be cogent, if in fact we are dealing with a book, since it is unlikely (although possible) something as sizeable as a book was missed by the Library of Congress or British Library catalogues but if we are dealing with a pamphlet or a booklet as seems more likely from both the title of the work and Mullins’ comments about where he found it then it is potentially based on unsound foundations.

That being said I will now briefly explain my two reasons for why I don’t believe Mullins quotation to be genuine:

Firstly, there is Mullins himself who has spent most of his life authoring work of a conspiratorial nature, and regardless of the objection that this doesn’t mean he is liar, it does throw doubt on his quotations if they cannot be tracked back to their original source. What I mean by this is simply that Mullins as a writer trying to prove the existence of certain conspiracies against America’s people, which are by their very nature very hard to evidence, needs to find evidence, which backs up the connections he makes. Since as I have said there is a great dearth in evidence by the nature of the subject and thesis of Mullins’ work there is therefore a great temptation to quote out-of-context or even make up quotations in order to prove that thesis (presumably similar to the ‘end justifies the mean’ conception). This consideration when we track back Mullins’ quotation and find no easily verifiable source for it (and Mullins doesn’t himself have a copy) means we are forced to wonder if Mullins has made the quotation up to suit his thesis and make his case stronger.

Secondly, the actual quotation itself is not written in the characteristic verbiage of jewry or in communist jargon (it reads for better or for worse like an Americanized excerpt from the ‘*Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*’). For example; if a communist jew had written it the likelihood, based on my own intense observation of jews, is that he or she would have used more circumspect language more belying an ostensible communist aim. The assumption being for the jew that fellow jews would understand the inferences in the jargon to indicate actual meaning and gentiles would merely understand it as it was written in terms of communist thinking. For example when Cohen talks of:

‘With this prestige, the Negro will be able to intermarry with the whites and begin a process which will deliver America to our cause.’

If he were a communist jew; I would expect that to be more subtle as Cohen himself states: ‘*In America we will aim for subtle victory*’, but where is the subtlety in what he has written? There is none. It is brash and open regardless of whether it was intended only for private consumption by a select audience it flies in the face of the jews in general to not use verbiage to cover negative intentions for others.

For example; a quote such as ‘*one gentile is not worth a jewish fingernail*’ can be defended by making the case that this is due to the spiritual nature of jews and therefore is simply religious (and this then disarms it partially; and can be taken to a fuller developing to disarm it more or less fully). This is how jews in fact act, because they are able with their unique racial mindset to understand the inferences and what is not said by their fellows (or to read between the lines so-to-speak). This is the essence of their Freudian mentality and one that is on display if you read a jewish or a Freudian biography of an individual with their placing of special meaning on otherwise inconsequential or not particularly relevant facts or suggestions to create a rather strange argument about the subject of the biography deriving from this inferences about what he was thinking and what his motivations were.

The quote from Israel Cohen remains both unproven and unexploded, but we have reasons as I have briefly outlined above to express grave doubts about its authenticity. The moral of the story being: if you are anti-jewish please do not use quotes such as this to ‘prove’ your case, because unless you have conclusive proof of their origins then you will firstly make the argument for your opponent easier in discrediting what you say, and secondly it will allow them to use what you say to ‘prove’ to others that anti-jewish thought is all ‘conspiracy theory, ‘lunacy’ and ‘irrationality’.

If you care about fighting jewish power and the jews as a subversive influence in society: please don’t use this quote.

[1] It can be found at the following address:

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/A_Racial_Program_for_the_Twentieth_Century [Accessed: 04/09/2008].

[2] Wikipedia’s content being user generated with few quality controls beyond other users who can claim but do not necessarily have expertise in these matters. This is part of the reason why Wikipedia’s content is not considered permissible as evidence in submissions made by university students to their alma mater. Another point to

[3] Which I would conjecture is not outside of his character since Mullins is a writer much taken with conspiratorial ideas and his written work has a very sensationalist flavour to it. Only one of Mullin’s many books is worth reading for any serious student of the jewish question and that is ‘*The Biological Jew*’, which is a small work comparing the jew to a biological parasite. Despite its vicious language the work is in its basis a cogent one, worth notice, study and being enlarged and improved upon.

[4] http://www.honestreporting.com/articles/45884734/critiques/new/Exposed_-_Anti-Israeli_Subversion_on_Wikipedia.asp [Accessed: 04/09/2008].

[5] Wikipedia declares it to be an ‘anti-Semitic hoax’ so therefore it is safe to presume that it endorses Multer’s arguments as they are the only counter arguments specifically cited.

[6] Available at the following address:

<http://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1905/tactics/index.htm>.

[7] For example: Israel Cohen, 1931, ‘*A Ghetto Gallery*’, 1st Edition, Edward Goldston: London.

[8] Similar perhaps to Victor Gollancz’s influential Left Book Club’s now famous statement on the front cover of its books: ‘*Not for sale to the public*’.

[9] Revolutionary manifestos though out history have been circulated by hand and by word of

mouth; for example in the case of the jews in the Bar-Kochva (or Bar-Kochba) rebellion against the Romans, which covered large amounts of territory geographically and involved many disparate communities. It can hardly be claimed this has suddenly changed in our contemporary world or that of Israel Cohen.

[10] I cannot find a copy of Mullin's original comments as to inform us as to whether it was inside a book or quoted in one. Presumably given the tone of his quoted remarks it is the former; which is the assumption that I am working from.

[11] Such as in the case of the '*Dossiers Secrets d'Henri Lobineau*', which was placed in the Bibliothèque nationale de France by Pierre Plantard and relates to the '*Priory of Sion*' hoax.

Dresden Burning's Xanga

Tuesday, 9 September 2008

Unfortunately a few weeks ago our friend Dresden Burning's 'Xanga' account was shut down due to Xanga claiming she had breached their Terms of Service. We would like to mention that Dresden Burning has contacted us and would like us to inform our readers that those responsible for making a barrage of complains to Xanga belong to Barack Obama's political camp and those backing them up with legal jargon and assorted claims to railroad Xanga into shutting down a long term paying customers account from some New York City jews who we don't wish to identify here.

The reason for this shut down seems to be that Dresden Burning posted a political cartoon of Obama, which wasn't entirely flattering to his ego and wasn't also very nice about jews. Can this be construed as 'hate' or 'encouraging discrimination'? Well perhaps it can yes but then so can a great many Xanga blogs, which are out there and obviously quite partisan in their leanings as well seeking to propagate 'hate' of the other side. The difference is apparently you can be rude about anyone in anyway other than of course if you offend the current American political messiah or the jews. The latter of course are far more important with jewess' like 'Atlas Shrugged'[1] feeling free to make things up about Barack Obama; like alleging he is in the pay of Iran (!?!), but such blogs like these aren't shut down but rather it is paid for long term customer like Dresden Burning who has had her account terminated without even being consulted in the matter.

Neither we nor Dresden Burning support or even like Barack Obama or for that matter John McCain but we are opposed to the double standards that prevail where jews are allowed to say whatever they want and gentiles are not. Such a double-standard on the part of Xanga is really quite disgusting and should be challenged even if it is futile to do so. Although as a company with a considerable number of jews at the top, one of whom attended an Anti-Defamation League conference/open forum discussing 'hate on the internet' as a panellist their actions should not be surprising but never-the-less they are disappointing.

So I think I can say this to all our friends and the jews who are reading: you won't stop us. Not now and not ever. The jews will be held responsible for their actions and the world at large will be reminded that jews deserve no special protection from criticism, exposure and punishment.

Dresden Burning of course will have a new blog up in due course when she returns from her travels in Europe.

[1] Yes, that really is a very bad pun on jewess Ayn Rand's book by a jewess who I think epitomises the dual terms of chutzpah and lunacy.

On Jewish 'Traitors'

Sunday, 14 September 2008

Recently, in a post on the 'White Nationalist' forum '*Vanguard News Network*'[1], a poster observed that there were 'jewish traitors' who 'got sick' of what jews were doing and told the world the truth about jews. He cited two particular instances: one of which was Benjamin Freedman and the other being Barry Goldwasser. Since Benjamin Freedman's testimony about his supposed involvement in a 'Zionist conspiracy' was given in the 1960's there have been few other cases of 'honest jews'. There were however other earlier cases, such as Maurice Samuel whose book '*You Gentiles*'[2], originally published in the early 1920's, is still read and cited by anti-jewish Nationalists today. Another example, published in 1934, is '*Jews Must Live*' by Samuel Roth[3], although later editions of this work had whole chapters expunged, where the jewish author pertains to tell the truth about jews.

Since these works are readily believed and oft-cited by 'White Nationalists'. I think some analysis and comments are in order on the subject of 'jewish traitors', or to put it more simply: jews who hold that there has been a conspiracy of sorts within their own kind to form a definite objective. In order to deal with this subject I am going to focus on each other author in turn analyzing their theses, assertions and potential motivations for the ease of the reader since this essay will be published in many parts hence making each part a self-contained analysis of each individual 'jewish traitor'.

However, before we start our analysis I think it is very important to make one thing clear in so far as in the transcript of Benjamin Freedman's '*A Jewish Defector Warns America*'[4] there is the assertion that Freedman is a 'former Jew'[5] with the implication that Freedman by converting to Catholicism, and condemning 'Zionists' in particular, has suddenly changed from jew to gentile. This is implicitly false as it presumes that being a jew is nothing more than being a Christian, but the fact remains that a jew is a race not a religion.

Being a follower of Judaism would make you a jew, but it does not necessarily make you a jew in terms of bloodline, which has a very heavy focus in Judaism although not so much of one to completely exclude converts but rather minimize them[6]. The jew who is of jewish bloodline is what one calls a jew in the biological sense, while a jew who is a religious convert is what one calls a follower of Judaism[7]. There is, of course, no prevention of a follower of Judaism being a jew by bloodline and no prevention of a jew by bloodline not being a follower of Judaism.

Thus when Benjamin Freedman, and the other authors we will mention below, are thought of, it

must be that they are thought of as jews by race. Regardless of what actual religion they follow, and thus we must disregard the comments made by the speaker introducing Freedman in regards to him being a *'former Jew'* [8]. Since when Freedman was born; he was born a jew and no amount of baptismal water, Eucharist or repentance can change that biological fact. Freedman would be more correctly labelled a baptised jew, specifically one apparently of the Catholic faith, and thus needs to be treated as such.

When the poster on the Vanguard News Network forum noted on these jewish 'traitors' he seemed to forget the fact that he was still dealing with jews and that what under normal circumstances coming from a jew would presumably make him suspicious and careful was treated as if it was automatically correct. This is presumably, because it appears to confirm some general truisms in certain parts of the Nationalist anti-jewish community. Freedman, for example, endorses the idea that the Ashkenazi jews are Khazars, and are not by definition the 'real jews' [9], which is a common argument used in the anti-jewish community, especially amongst those of the British Israel and Christian Identity religious sects [10]. The central thesis of his speech, *'A Jewish Defector Warns America'*, also plays to some general truisms in the anti-jewish community by imagining an organised jewish conspiracy centred around Zionism and Communism.

This suspension of critical inquiry as regarding a source that should rightly, by coherent racially-based anti-jewish principles, be one that is only used after careful study would seem to be, as stated above, because it confirms general truisms in the mainstream of anti-jewish thought, particularly of the Nationalist variety. Thus this evidence/jewish testimony is admitted as evidence by anti-jewish persons and groups without critical review, or research being done on the author or what he asserts to be true. What in fact should have been the case is that Benjamin Freedman, and other 'jewish traitors', should have been, and should be, regarded as jews first and foremost and their 'testimony' considered extremely suspect at the very least.

We have to ask the question of our own thought: should we just believe what 'jewish traitors' say, just because what they say might seem to confirm our own thought regarding the dynamics, successes and failures of the jews. The answer is simply: no. If jews are a race, which they are, then we must apply coherent racial principles to them in that anti-jewish thinkers conceive them, correctly I contend, as a legalistic, but quite self-centred, race of beings with an altruistic extreme ethnocentrism being ever present in their behaviour as a group and as individuals so they must be treated as such as a race.

This racial interpretation of jews, which acknowledges their common behaviours and attitudes as having a generally biological basis, forces us to ask further whether those who take 'jewish traitors' as evidence of their position have considered the possibility that this might be some form of jewish racial defence mechanism. In so far as MacDonald, to give one example, suggests that jews are very quick to get involved in political and/or intellectual movements as a form of evolutionary defence strategy or mechanism responding to the potential threat of anti-Semitism.

What larger anti-Semitic threat is there, especially in the early to mid twentieth century, was there than the largely Christian nationalist anti-Communist and anti-Semitic movements [11] when these 'jewish traitors' came forward?

It can thus be suggested, and potentially argued, that these ‘jewish traitors’ are actually behaving in pro-jewish manner in that they by getting involved in the anti-jewish movement, as Benjamin Freedman did, they are neutralising the anti-jewish thought and making it selective about jews. Since there will always be ‘that honest jew’ who deserves to be ‘the exception’[\[12\]](#). This participation in the anti-jewish movement can thus be posited as part of this evolutionary defence mechanism, because it allows some jews to survive since they have become ‘honest jews’ and are therefore not objectionable and therefore have a higher probability of survival than their racial kin. This strategy can be said to be similar to that used by jews in dark age and medieval Europe where jews converted to Christianity, sincerely or otherwise, in order to ensure their racial survival as well as increase their influence[\[13\]](#).

This line of argument certainly calls into question the validity of the testimony of ‘jewish traitors’, and the perspective they bring as a key source. Although regardless of whether the jew concerned is acting out of personal or racial interest. His or her testimony/evidence should be considered, but rather than basing an argument on it. Anti-jewish individuals and groups should be looking at it as a piece of confirmatory evidence for a thesis, but also one that needs to be used in conjunction with other more authoritative and hopefully indicative pieces of evidence. The possibility that the ‘jewish traitor’ is doing this for his and her own race’s benefit should be kept in the uppermost of our thoughts when their testimony/evidence is considered. In order that we should not ascribe undue weight to their words, even if they seem to confirm anti-jewish theses, and keep a careful balance on the side of truth and objectivity.

What perhaps is more alarming is that if you consider jews in a conspiratorial light, which personally I generally oppose[\[14\]](#), there is the consideration that the ‘jewish traitor’ in question could in fact be deliberately misleading you and giving you false information. If you consider jews in this light, because of this consideration it would be best if you did not in fact use ‘jewish traitor’ testimony at all. Since a secret organisation, which is supposedly as ubiquitous as this theory makes jewry out to be, would certainly wish to prevent its opponents having a realistic idea of its workings and lead them off on the wrong track so their opposition to jewry can be nullified.

Thus if you as an anti-jewish individual or group are working from the Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion as your lens for understanding jewry then you cannot actually use ‘jewish traitor’ testimony/evidence with any coherency or accuracy, because you cannot prove or even make an educated guess as to whether the jew is telling the truth or deliberately lying to you. Where-as if you have adopted a racist-based lens for understanding jewry then you can use this kind of testimony/evidence, but only as confirmatory evidence noting any reservations you have about it or inaccuracies in it. In order to make sure that you are not endorsing the testimony wholesale, since even the smallest provable error in such testimony can allow pro-jewish individuals and groups to claim that this nullifies any value it might have. Since they will then assert that it contains ‘misstatements’ and therefore is historically inaccurate. Because of this attitude it is important to maintain scepticism of ‘jewish traitors’ testimony/evidence, not because of the value of the opinions of pro-jewish individuals and groups, but because as anti-jewish individuals and groups. We must hold ourselves to a very high factual standard, and the aggressive defence of the facts combined with high dissemination capacity media outlets is the

best propaganda that money can buy against the jews[15].

If a jew says something we disagree with then to many it would just be 'jewish lies'[16], but if a jew says something we agree with then to many of these same people it would be 'jewish testimony' or 'insider testimony'. This isn't to say that jews don't lie or that testimony by jews isn't useful or valid, but rather using as the basis of whether you disagree or agree with what a jew says as to whether you accept or reject the source is quite absurd.

Each source regardless of what it appears to evidence needs to be careful examined and critiqued regardless of whether the ideas within it seem to be correct or incorrect. This is because if you have a source that disagrees with your interpretation or thesis then you have to justify why you do not put faith in it (and vice versa), and sometimes we have to acknowledge that what we may think is a cogent thesis is not so, because of evidence that we were not aware of contradicts it or the evidence that has been used is not as factually sound as had been thought.

What is required is for anti-jewish individuals and groups to suspend belief and look at all forms of evidence, whether they agree with what the evidence may say or whether they disagree with it. What matters is that the thesis offered has to be based on a sound factual and interpretative basis, and as far as is practicable all lines of inquiry and evidence should be considered in order to give a critical perspective.

If we simply take these so-called 'jewish traitors' word for what they assert is the truth of the matter. Then we would do no better than taking Alan Dershowitz's word for it that Israel, and jews in general, are in essence perfect and hold themselves to such a high standard that gentiles, like us, really don't compare. If we think about it surely pro-Israel and pro-jewish individuals and groups do exactly the same as anti-jewish individuals and groups when they seize upon pro-jewish or disarming testimony to 'prove' their case.

However; rather than explain their case pro-Israel and pro-jewish individuals and groups dismiss evidence and testimony that does not fit their thesis or does not seem cogent to them as 'biased', 'anti-Semitic' and/or 'self-hating'[17]. Anti-jewish individuals and groups of course invert this so if something does not fit your thesis or does not seem cogent it is 'jewish lies' or the more colloquial term; deriving from George Orwell's *'1984'*, 'jew speak'. This cannot be held to be in any way satisfactory with anti-jewish individuals and groups acting as no better, and dare I say perhaps worse, than the Alan Dershowitz's of this world and then expecting to convince people with the case that represent.

There-in dwells the crux of this general issue surrounding 'jewish traitors' in so far that they remain jews, which ever way you try to cut the issue. If you cannot trust one jew to tell the negative truism about jews then if you are a racist then you cannot, while applying the coherent principles there-of, trust one jew to tell a positive truism about jews. Simply put: a jew is a jew is a jew.

Since we now must acknowledge that a jew should be subject to the same light of searching criticism and analysis of their evidence regardless of whether they are pro or anti a particular anti-jewish thesis. We can now proceed to analysing the first of these 'jewish traitors'[18], Marcus Eli Ravage, to give their testimony and evidence to the world.

[1] This can be found at the following address: www.vnnforum.com and the main index page can be found at www.vanguardnewsnetwork.com.

[2] Maurice Samuel, 1924, *'You Gentiles'*, 1st Edition: Harcourt, Brace & Company: New York.

[3] Samuel Roth, 1934, *'Jews Must Live'*, 1st Edition, The Golden Hind Press: New York. An unexpurgated edition of this can be found at the following address:

<http://www.jrbooksonline.com/roth.htm>.

[4] Benjamin Freedman, 1961, *'A Jewish Defector Warns America'*. This can be read at the following address: <http://www.sweetliberty.org/issues/israel/freedman.htm>. The recording of this speech can be found at the following address: <http://www.benjaminfreedman.net/>. Since I have been unable to find a hard copy of this speech I cannot refer to specific pages so I will merely note where I am citing Freedman.

[5] To be precise the wording is as follows: *'Mr. Freedman is a former Jew, and I mean a FORMER Jew. He has fought the Communist world conspiracy tooth and nail, and stands today as a leading American patriot.'*

[6] I am of course working to the orthodox standard as the largest generalised denomination of jewry in the world at the present time. There are stricter halakhic definitions used by the ultra-orthodox and Hasidic groups/sects and looser ones used by the Reform, Reconstructed and Conservative denominations. It should be noted that unless you are jewish on the matrilineal side then you may not be considered a true jew by many jews; the exception being for those of the priest bloodline on the patrilineal side whereby you may be a true jew because that is transmitted by the father rather than the mother in this exception in Judaic law.

[7] Judaism gets round the bloodline injunction here by declaring that the convert in question was born with *'the soul of a jew'* or *'a jewish soul'*.

[8] Freedman, Op. Cit.

[9] Freedman also covers his thesis in this regard in his pamphlet/booklet: *'Facts are Facts'*. The Khazarian origins question deserves long treatment because it is such a common argument made by anti-jewish authors that is unfortunately large a specious one in my opinion based largely on reading the case made on *'Khazaria.org'* and Arthur Koestler's book *'The Thirteenth Tribe'*. I have mentioned this point here because Freedman touches on it in his address, *'A Jewish Defector Warns America'*, and felt that it needed to be explained why I will not be addressing this particular question in detail.

[10] These sects believe that the true Israelites of the Old Testament were the Aryans and that the jews as we know them today are not the 'true jews', but rather satanic imposters. The problem with this thesis of course is the presence of the Sephardi and other forms of jew whom cannot even be argued to have been of Khazarian origin.

[11] Such as William Dudley Pelley's 'Silverhirts' and Father Charles Coughlin's followers were openly anti-jewish. The Paul Reveres, a large and growing popular anti-Communist movement in the 1930's, were also subtly anti-jewish until they were (very ironically) destroyed by a massive split led by Elizabeth Dilling (later an well regarded, but not very scholarly, anti-jewish author), because of the 'immorality' and 'bigotry' of this subtle anti-jewish stance. For some comments on this point please see Revilo Oliver's 1966 speech: *'Self Preservation'*. This is available at the following address: <http://www.revilo-oliver.com/>.

[12] This is similar to the argument that there is always 'a remorseful paedophile' or 'a negro genius' and that therefore the exception supposedly disproves the rule. This argument is quite obviously false and much like with jews one does not consider the exception as disproving the

rule and much as one is prosecuted for being a paedophile then one is also to be prosecuted for being a jew.

[13] See for example: Anna Foa, Trans: Andrea Grover, 2000, *'The Jews of Europe after the Black Death'*, 1st Edition, University of California Press: Berkley, p. 195.

[14] What I am talking of here is a general conspiracy in which the majority if not all jews are involved, which is the assumption inherent in many anti-jewish works. This is the sort of conspiracy envisioned by the Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion and later anti-jewish works, which have used it as a lens to analyze the jewish question.

[15] Jews, especially of the Ashkenazi variety, specialise in passive-aggressive tactics using misstatement, quoting out of context, character assassination and defamatory accusation as their main weapons couched in the language of supposed objectivity.

[16] Presumably deriving from the title of Martin Luther's infamous (and my opinion still very cogent) work on the jews: *'On the Jews and Their Lies'*. The full text of the infamous volume can be found at the following address: <http://www.humanitas-international.org/showcase/chronography/documents/luther-jews.htm>. Unfortunately the *'Liberty Bell'* edition (Dr. Martin Luther, Trans. Anon.. (Reילו Oliver or Charles Weber?), 2004, *'The Jews And Their Lies'*, 1st Edition, Liberty Bell Publications: York) has removed most of the reasoning (there-in most of the text itself) behind what Luther argued, even if it is complex theology combined with personal observations about jews, *'Liberty Bell's'* editors removal of the reasoning from the text and leaving just introduction, summaries and conclusions from Luther's writing deprives *'On the Jews and Their Lies'* of nearly all of its real value as an anti-jewish work. Just leaving pertinent bits for approving quotation rather than the more important analysis of Luther's thought concerning jews.

[17] They also outright lie, misrepresent evidence, plagiarise and are guilty of a myriad of different forms of intellectual dishonesty, which unfortunately can also be said of many anti-jewish individuals and groups. For a summary of this in the case of Alan Dershowitz then I would suggest Norman Finkelstein's, 2005, *'Beyond Chutzpah: On the Misuse of Anti-Semitism and the Abuse of History'*, 1st Edition, Verso: London.

[18] They are considered in no particular order.

Some Brief Comments to Incogman

Tuesday, 16 September 2008

'Incogman' has reposted on his blog[1] some lengthy excerpts from an article by one, Gilad Atzmon[2], whom we can presume is a jew, on the subject of a book, by one Shlomo Sand, a jewish historian, which purports to show that jews are not a people. Therefore, as Atzmon's argument clearly implies, the jews are not a race [i.e. a nation], but are merely a religion based on a false mythos that they are in fact an exclusive biological group [i.e. the Chosen of Ha-Shem]. Of course, the jews should now recognise this and because there is no such thing as race (perhaps there is no such thing as dog breeds too; has anyone told the Kennel Club?) we should all learn to get over our religious differences and bigotry and live in one large cloud cuckoo land.

Of course, I am being sarcastic here, but the point I am making here is that Incogman's [presumed ideological] premises as a 'White Nationalist' are such that he should know to be

careful when citing 'anti-racist' and essentially Israeli leftist works on the subject of the origins of Jewry. Since remember Incogman should be starting out from the biological premise that race not only exists, but is in fact key to the understanding of the world that he sees around him. Atzmon and it would appear Sand are operating on an entirely different logical axis starting from the premise that denies not only race but the biological origin of the nation state (i.e. by calling it a 'collective mistake' [3]) and Incogman should have noted this before he posted his article. Since it brings into doubt Sand's conclusion would be anything but the Jews were never a race; especially since Sand is a dedicated opponent of Zionism.

Incogman should remember before posting this kind of material, as I have noted in my opening comments of '*On Jewish 'Traitors'*' [4], to check the context in which it is being written. In this case firstly Atzmon's article is clearly very partisan in its opposition to Jewish nationalism and judging from what he quotes from Sand. Sand seems to be of that general persuasion as well. Secondly, Incogman has to remember that there are vicious debates going on inside Israel and the Diaspora, and indeed have been going on inside Jewry since the 19th century, about the future of the Jews and how resolve the Jewish question in their own way. Sand is merely an extension of this and Incogman should not lose sight of this since Sand's work can easily be questioned and to an extent refuted (from what I've seen of it from Atzmon's article) with only a dip into the literature on Jewish history.

Atzmon's article and Sand's book is a continuance of that conflict and their opinions may not be correct, but he should also familiarize himself with responses to Sand such as Israel Bartel's review of Sand's book: '*Inventing an Invention*' [5]. Essentially Bartel points out that Sand is attacking a strawman that Sand has himself created; now whether this is a justified counter-argument or point to make I cannot say not having read Sand's book and nor being an expert in the area of Jewish racial biology personally. However, I can say what Atzmon quotes of Sand's work makes me think he might be right as some of the quotes are quite obviously to a student of the Jewish question, such as myself, quite obviously wrong. Remember Incogman that Jews lie reflexively (especially when they have a cause: a brief search on Sand has revealed him to be a dedicated opponent of Zionism, which could and seems to (in my opinion of what I've seen so far) taint his work much as pro-Zionist bias taints the work of Alan Dershowitz) and that to believe one just because he or she confirms your side of the argument without other reading around the subject in general is tantamount to hypocrisy and being no better than people like John Hagee.

However, Atzmon does make recite some of the arguments that he thinks pertinent that were made by Sand in his book and it would be well to provide some answers from a National Socialist perspective to Sand. Since Sand is calling into question some of the basic tenants of the National Socialist stance on the Jewish question he deserves to be answered with at least some commentary about why his arguments of specific interest are wrong. Incogman's argument that Atzmon's article and Sand's book reinforce his contention that the Ashkenazi Jews are essentially Khazars and not the Jews of Palestine also deserves a response. SC will thus respond in two further parts: one looking at Atzmon's and Sand's points of interest in regard to Jewish history and the other looking at Incogman's assertions regarding the Khazars and their relation to the Ashkenazim. I don't suggest what I will write will cover things in any real detail but rather explain in summary why Atzmon and Sand are wrong and why Incogman's claims are not

cogent nor even valid points of argument for anybody claiming to be a Racist to make[6]. We will attempt to have these responses done by the end of next week [26/09/2008] but at the very least the first response will have been written and posted by that date.

So therefore Semitic Controversies throws down the gauntlet to Incogman and his fellow believers. En garde!

[1] <http://incogman.wordpress.com/2008/09/05/the-wandering-who/> [Accessed: 16/09/2008].

[2] The full article is available at the following address:

<http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article20675.htm> [Accessed: 16/09/2008].

[3] Ibid. To be precise: *'Professor Shlomo Sand, opens his remarkable study of Jewish nationalism quoting Karl W. Deutsch: 'A nation is a group of people united by a common mistake regarding its origin and a collective hostility towards its neighbours.'*

[4] The full article can be found at the following address:

<http://semiticcontroversies.blogspot.com/2008/09/on-jewish-traitors.html>.

[5] Such as the review published by the Israeli left-wing daily Haaretz, which can be found at the following address: <http://www.haaretz.com/hasen/spages/999386.html> [Accessed: 16/09/2008].

[6] My arguments against Incogman are nothing personal to him (and are not based on personal enmity), but rather are using him and his arguments as an example as to why claims that the jews aren't the 'real jews' are rather silly at best.

The Design of a Conspiracy: The Anti-Jewish Thought of Arnold Leese (Part II)

Friday, 19 September 2008

Leese also often expounds on a second secondary conspiratorial element in his thesis on jewish power, which he names as international or high finance. It should be noted that the argument about international or high finance was an old one even then and is still common currency in anti-jewish circles to this present day. Its modern origins lie as far as I can tell in France in the anti-Semitic movement of the 1880's[1] and the life's work of Eduard Drumont[2]. This argument has been taken by some, such as Chesler[3], to mean that what is being alleged is that jews control the banking system writ large. This however is incorrect since what high finance refers to is the argument that jews through their control of and/or influence on the investment banks and houses of credit can manipulate governments to their will.

Leese argued in relation to high finance, that it was heavily infiltrated and staffed with jews, and that it was largely a jewish creation that came into being with the rise to power of the Warburgs, Schiffs and Rothschilds in financial circles[4]. With the increasing amount of speculative mercantile undertakings and the rise of the stock exchange (and all the legal and financial mechanism there-in) this lead to a proliferation of wealth, which ultimately benefitted the jewish bankers in particular, because of their network of jews around the capitals and mercantile cities of Europe and in the new world[5].

In Leese's book, '*Gentile Folly: The Rothschilds*', he spends three short chapters expounding upon the connections between the gentile establishment, and the gentile members of high finance, and the Rothschild family. This is a key part of Leese's thesis regarding jews, in that Leese viewed the control of money, and wealth in general, as being key to jewish control. Since Leese viewed the control of large amounts of money and wealth to be the key to power in his contemporary world[8] and with this he envisioned the jewish members of high finance kept control of their underlings[9] and perhaps more importantly this control a tool that the Elders of Zion used in their strategy against the world. The classic example of this, that Leese himself cites, can be found in the revolution in Russia where it is asserted, correctly I might add, that the revolution itself was considerably financed by prominent Wall Street names, and mostly by jewish bankers there-of[10]. Leese also sees jewish money, i.e. the influence of high finance, which is controlled by the jews, as being responsible for providing the substantial material clout required to influence and intimidate governments, the media, powerful private individuals, the Churches and organisations in general into doing as the Elders of Zion wished[11].

This material clout was also used, according to Leese, to silence real opposition (i.e. Leese, the Imperial Fascist League, William Joyce, The National Socialist League, The Britons etc[12]) and to build up false alternatives, which Leese identified strongly as Sir Oswald Mosley and his Blackshirts[13], by funding them and supporting them through the Press[14].

Leese writes as follows concerning this use and operation of jewish high finance in relation to his own efforts with the Imperial Fascist League:

'I had underestimated the power of Jewish money; the fact was that influential people would at once lose their influence as soon as it was known that they were anti-Jewish.' [15]

This particular passage refers to Leese's assumption when he originally formed the Imperial Fascist League that he could garner support from amongst subtly anti-jewish members of establishment circles and failing in this assumption Leese rationalised it above. We can say this statement from Leese does likely have some truth in it, but what Leese may not have discerned is that his strong anti-jewish sentiment may have repelled the anti-jewish members of the establishment due the social stigma, rather than monetary or political penalty, of associating with Leese's quite extreme, in the context of the British politics at that time, group, which was openly pro-Third Reich as well avidly anti-jewish[18].

Although this failure to attract many anti-jewish establishment figures to the Imperial Fascist League has to be seen within the context of the period when there were many different competing anti-jewish and anti-communist organisations to the Imperial Fascist League. Thus its lack of success is not in itself surprising, but Leese's rationalisation offers a look into his thinking regarding the jewish conspiracy he saw around him[19].

This connexion between the jews of Wall Street and the jews of Kremlin was held by Leese, and was again a widely held convention in this time, to be the unfolding of the world wide jewish conspiracy against the world that the Protocols of Zion seemed to for-tell. The combination of what seemed to be two completely different and incompatible systems of capitalism and communism could only in their mind be explained by the common element of a heavy jewish

presence in both the bankrollers and the bankrolled in the Menshevik and then the Bolshevik revolutions of 1917[20]. This bridge between two ostensibly very opposed ideologies that Leese saw, to an extent correctly, in the jews was he argued only possible if you saw it as a conspiracy between two sets of jews whom were being directed by a central force, which Leese identifies as the ‘*Sanhedrin*’ meaning the Elders of Zion.

Thus like Leese’s views on the subject of the Freemasons where he typifies Freemasons as being a series of gentile (or show) lodges under the effective control of the B’nai B’rith lodges using Protocol 11[21] of the Protocols of Zion as his guide. Leese characterises international or high finance as being an institution dominated by jewish leaders and key players, but with a significant number of gentiles within it[22]. Leese, however, maintains that these gentiles by virtue of their willingness to inordinately exploit the fellow members of their own race to the clear majority of the folk’s detriment are also enemies and that they behave as jews and therefore should be treated as such[23].

Leese writes as follows regarding this control that:

‘As we knew that the League of Nations was entirely sponsored by the Jews to ensure future wars, we used their platform to get wide publicity for expose of the organised Jewish Money Power or Sanhedrin.’ [24]

Leese’s vision of jewish power, as we have shown above and is excellently summarised in the above quote from Leese, is a very conspiratorial one, but in order to explain Leese’s thought correctly. We should explain how this jewish conspiracy worked in Leese’s opinion. Since it is not enough to merely state it is conspiratorial and critique it as a general point but rather to look at Leese’s arguments and inferences so as to discern how he envisioned the structure of the conspiracy against, which he spent so many years fighting.

Leese very specifically, as we have discussed above, believed that the Protocols of Zion formed a definite plan on which jewry was operating. Hence as the Protocols of Zion were in Leese’s opinion a genuine document, he believed that there was indeed a council of the Elders of Zion somewhere in the world. Leese, like many other anti-jewish people of his time, styles this shadowy group as a/the Grand Sanhedrin[25]. Ostensibly this seems to be modelled on the idea that Napoleon Bonaparte brought to Europe when he organised a Grand Sanhedrin of the jews in Paris to discuss their relation to the revolutionary French government[26].

What Leese does not discuss in his work is the essential problem between the objectives of the Elders of Zion being achieved by Bolshevism and Zionism; both highly secular movements. Both, of which, he views as having been created to give the jewish race domination over part of the earth where they can then prosper and enslave the rest of the gentiles. His referring to jewish religious rites, such as the Kol Nidre on Yom Kippur, as an active party of the jewish conspiracy and the Elders of Zion as the Great Sanhedrin creates a problem that he himself did not appreciate.

In so far that jewish orthodoxy in general opposed the Zionist movement because it tried to return Zion before the jewish messiah had come to lead the jews back to it[27]. Thus jewish

orthodoxy viewed Zionism as an aberration[28] until Zionism was successful, and then with the gradual death of old rabbis and torah scholars who knew only the Diaspora. The newer rabbis and torah scholars took a different stance on Israel with it being permissible to live in Zion until the messiah returns to lead the jews to rule over the gentiles of the world.

Bolshevism, or more generally communism, was wholly secular and was perceived as a threat to the frum way of life in many jewish circles for the simple reason that Communism did and does reject religion[29] as a tool of the 'ruling classes', which will make the so-called 'proletariat' more passive and allow it to tolerate being economically exploited by said rulers. That the rabbis had ruled over the jews since medieval times in eastern Europe with an iron theologically-based fist and this secular ideology, which was perhaps unsurprisingly something of a fashion among Ashkenazi jews of this time, and hence perceived communism, and especially bolshevism (the realised variant of the former), as a direct threat to their authority.

Thus this presents us with a very real problem with Leese's interpretation of the structure of this conspiracy and jewish power in that if there are Elders of Zion and they follow the Judaic religion then why would they organise jewish movements with which numerous rabbis disagreed and were often attacked by. Thus the Elders of Zion cannot be a Sanhedrin of sorts; because they cannot be religious because they have organised very secular jewish intellectual movements to achieve their objectives, which fundamentally goes against the rabbinical creed of making sure every jew as a member of Ha-Shem's 'chosen people' are observant and preferably frum. This thus puts the idea of a/the Sanhedrin being the Elders of Zion into grave doubt because they are going against their own religious principles and against thus against the historical source of rabbinical power over their fellow jews.

The origin of this mistaken association of jewish religious orthodoxy with two secular jewish movements comes from the standard jewish arguments of the time, which appear to have got mixed up in their condemnation of jews. In that during the change in anti-jewish thought from an ostensibly religious base[30] to a racial (i.e. scientific and secular) base the anti-Judaic arguments, particularly those regarding the Talmud[31], were kept while the ostensive basis of the thought was changed. Since the new racial basis conceived jews as a racio-ethnic group and anti-Judaism was only part of anti-jewish thought, rather than the clear majority of it as it had been before the innovation of racial anti-Semitism. It unfortunately led to a state of intellectual confusion where anti-Judaism arguments were being used against secular jews and this opened up anti-jewish argument to being attacked as simplistic and having some of its assertions debunked, because of the mistaken association of religious jewish thought with secular jewish thought[32].

As with any major change in thought there was and indeed are those who are simply anti-Judaism rather than anti-jewish. This meant that to these individuals and groups the new anti-jewish thought had to be retranslated back into anti-Judaic thought creating, through a process of ideological synthesis, an unsound understanding of the relations between jews and Judaism. This mistaken association is found through Leese's writing where he uses thought from different groups with international jewry, so-called, to justify his arguments.

An alternative thesis, which might also be advanced for Leese's opinion for his writing, since he

doesn't make it entirely clear how he pictures this shadowy central group and how it is comprised, is that this group of the Elders of Zion was (and is presumably still is) made up of Zionists. This thesis, which was current in Leese's time, having been suggested in Henry Ford's 'The International Jew' and was recently reiterated in Revilo Oliver's 1990 article, 'Those Awful Protocols', was simply an equation of the second Zionist congress in Basel with the meeting suggested in the Protocols of Zion. The Protocols themselves have been suggested as a general document for the delegates to acquaint themselves with the situation and as a secret summary of issues described behind closed doors.

Leese himself doesn't make it clear here either what the dynamics of this in his view are but neither can it be argued to hold any coherent position. Since the Protocols refer almost exclusively to the situation in Russia rather than Europe and in particular the Ottoman Empire (who held Palestine)[33] and the British Empire (who evinced a willingness to offer the jews land for a jewish state in Africa)[34]. This mismatch indicates quite drastically that the Elders of Zion could not have been the second Zionist congress in Basel. We can also note further that Leese viewed communism and bolshevism as being the design of the Elders of Zion and this being so provides even great problem since Zionism and Communism/Bolshevism were declared opponents of one another for the adherence of the jews.

A communist pamphlet published in 1949 in North America targeted at jews declared that:

'Most contemptible of all is the present attempt to distort the role of the Soviet Union in the establishment of the state of Israel. Not only have the Woltmans and the Schwartzes of the Times tried to make the Soviet Union's opposition to Zionism appear as anti-Semitism, they have also tried to make it appear as though the Soviet Union were anti-Israel.'

Arthur Ruppin, a prominent jewish sociologist and Zionist (and a contemporary of Leese's), mentioned this antagonism in his book: 'The Jews in the Modern World' when he was discussing the trends in Diaspora jewry in 1934. Ruppin observed that communist and Zionist jews were mainly working among the same demographic (i.e. the young Ashkenazi jews), in the same geographic areas (i.e. eastern Europe and in the inner city ghettos of western Europe) and were competing solutions (i.e. the communists had their own jewish homeland, while the Zionists were demanding Palestine be ceded to them)[37].

Therefore our objection to Leese's identification of the Elders of Zion as either a Zionist body or a council of high-ranking rabbis is substantiated. Since both Zionism and communism were hostile to one another and were in active competition with each other (and nothing has been brought forward to our knowledge to show that they worked together in any substantive and sustained manner, which would have to be proven for this to even be considered [and it has not of yet been proven]). Both were secular not religious movements, which incurred the wrath and active opposition of the religious authorities at the time [who therefore cannot have been controlling them, because having created them they would not then oppose them and try desperately not to get young jews to join them]. Therefore identification of the Elders of Zion as Zionists or rabbis cannot be held to be valid.

Having discussed and offered a critique for the identify of the Elders of Zion suggested in

Leese's written work then we must also think about how Leese conceives the Elders in terms of how they are controlling this conspiracy.

[1] On this point see Albert Lindemann's, 1997, *'Esau's Tears: Modern Anti-Semitism and the Rise of the Jews'*, 1st Edition, Cambridge University Press: New York and Leon Poliakov's, Trans: Miriam Kochan, 2003, [1968/Trans: 1975], *'The History of Anti-Semitism: From Voltaire to Wagner'*, Vol. III, 1st Edition, University of Pennsylvania Press: Philadelphia.

[2] Drumont's much republished 1886, *'La France Juive'* is a classic of anti-jewish literature but is seldom known in the English speaking world due its never having been published to my knowledge in English. Revilo Oliver is possibly the last major anti-jewish author to refer to it in his published work. Drumont is most famous for being one of the most prolific anti-jewish authors and publishers in all history certainly outstripped Julius Streicher both in quantity and quality of his own work and that which he published. He is also famous for being a leading anti-Dreyfusard during the trial of the jew Albert Dreyfus in France for treason.

[3] Phyllis Chesler, 2005, *'The New Anti-Semitism: The Current Crisis and What We Must Do About It'*, 2nd Edition, Wiley: San Francisco. Chesler doesn't argue against Leese specifically, it is doubtful she even knows of Leese's existence, but never-the-less she, in her 'debunk' of the argument, claims by virtue of her wording and the evidence she uses that international finance equates 'banks' in general (when it does not).

[4] See Leese, *'Gentile Folly: The Rothschilds'*, Op. Cit., p. 41.

[5] Leese identified this, as was common in anti-jewish thought (and not an unjust or untruthful line of thought if somewhat crude) at the time, as family networks made up of the major jewish bankers who used their children to start banking houses in different countries in order to take advantage of political conditions and to provide better safeguards against losses of assets. The prototype for this was identified as the Rothschild family originally of Frankfurt, but it was applied to other major families as well. This particular argument is something I shall come back to here on Semitic Controversies because it has much merit but is crude when used to only explain jewish behaviour in terms of high finance, because it ignores the near universality of this behaviour among jews who could afford to do so and its ancient origins (and that it is a mercantile not a financial operation per se and was adapted to the latter only from the 18th century onwards in any significant organised form). Two stereotypical anti-jewish views on this matter can be found in George Knupffer's, 1986, *'The Struggle for World Power: Revolution and Counter-Revolution'*, 4th Edition, Noontide Press: California, pp. 18-27, and George Armstrong, 1986, [1940], *'Rothschild Money Trust'*, 1st Edition, Omni: Palmdale.

[6] Leese, *'Gentile Folly: The Rothschilds'*, Op. Cit., pp. 42-52.

[7] For the most balanced treatment of the much debated rise of the Rothschilds that I have yet come across please see Count Corti's, Trans: Brian and Beatrix Lunn, 1928, *'The Rise of the House of Rothschild'*, 1st Edition, Gollancz: London.

[8] A view that has much to recommend it, but is used to make many false allusions to the further (which is incorrect) that money is the motivation for 'elite' actions, but has to be noted with several caveats for it to not be ascribed undue power and centrality to motivation for policy etc.

[9] Leese, *'Out of Step'*, Op. Cit., p. 53.

[10] Arnold Leese, 1939, *'Bolshevism is Jewish'*, 1st Edition, The I.F.L. Printing & Publishing Company: London.

[11] For example see his pamphlets: Arnold Leese, Circa 1938, *'Money No Mystery'*, 1st Edition,

The I.F.L. Printing & Publishing Company: London and Arnold Leese, 1939, *'Jewish Press Control'*, 1st Edition, The I.F.L. Printing & Publishing Company: London.

[12] Mary Kenny in her biography of William Joyce mentions some of these ardently anti-jewish groups. See Mary Kenny, 2003, *'Germany Calling: A Biography of William Joyce Lord Haw Haw'*, 1st Edition, New Island: Dublin, p. 119.

[13] For example Leese refers negatively to Sir Oswald Mosley and his Blackshirts (who imitated Benito Mussolini rather than Adolf Hitler; the latter being the anti-jewish one of the two while in the former case there were many jewish members of Mussolini's fascist party including some very prominent members both of the jewish community and the party itself.) and accused Mosley as being a gentile tool of the jewish conspiracy against Britain. Linking Mosley to the jewish conspiracy was done through Mosley's first wife. Who, Leese maintains, was jewish (Arnold Leese, Circa 1946-50, *'Our Jewish Aristocracy: A Revelation'*, 4th Edition, Self-Published: Guildford. The entry under *'Hereditary Title Holders Who Married Jewish Women'* is as follows: *'Sir O. Mosley married as 1st wife, granddaughter of Jew Levi Zeigler Leiter.'*) and therefore considering Mosley's status as a former sitting politician and his sudden conversion to fascism as well as his own personal lack of anti-jewish thought. Mosley must, in Leese's opinion, be a tool of the jewish Elders of Zion because his Union of British Fascists was well financed and populist in its orientation thus attracting support, subscriptions and attention away from the real opposition who were really, rather than just slightly, anti-jewish.

[14] For example: Lord Rothermere's support for the British Union of Fascists in the first few years of its existence through his daily paper: *'The Daily Mail'* (see Kenny, Op. Cit., p. 122). This isn't directly cited by Leese, but it is indirectly made as an argument when Leese includes a large entry under *'The Daily Mail'* in Leese's pamphlet *'Jewish Press Control'*. Leese, *'Jewish Press Control'*, Op. Cit.

[15] Leese, *'Out of Step'*, Op. Cit., p. 53.

[16] They also may not have wished to come under the scrutiny of the security services, which were increasingly throughout the 1930's paying increasing attention to fascists and National Socialists in Britain, although some are thought to have sympathised with the basic programme of both these ideologies.

[17] Leese pays tribute to Adolf Hitler and the Third Reich and summarises his views on the origins of the second world war in his book: *'The Jewish War of Survival'*. See Leese, *'The Jewish War of Survival'*, Op. Cit..

[18] One has to admire Leese for his dedication to research on the jewish question regardless of whether he enjoyed his research or not; he did work hard and produce a lot of material (some of which has value today)

[19] Also well shown by Leese's milking the law suits taken out against him by jews and by the British government. See Arnold Leese, 1939, *'Rex versus Leese'*, 1st Edition, The I.F.L. Printing & Publishing Company: London.

[20] For an alternative view please see Antony Sutton, 1981, *'Wall Street and the Bolshevik Revolution'*, 1st Edition, Veritas: Morley, Appendix 2, pp. 185-189. Sutton also nicely points out (and explains) that capitalism isn't necessarily the ideological enemy of communism despite what might seem to be the case. Since communism creates state monopolies and monopolist capitalists would view these as an opportunity to corner the whole market in ventures in potential alliance with communist authorities.

[21] Marsden, Op. Cit., pp. 179-181.

[22] For example: *'We knew that the Jews, assisted by the Freemasons, were resolved to destroy*

Hitler before he destroyed them; all the chief vehicles of propaganda were in their hands, and all the money too.' (Leese, *'Out of Step'*, Op. Cit. p. 61)

[23] I have developed a similar concept to this in the 'spiritual jew' and will publish an essay explaining the concept and a methodology for comprehending and identifying spiritual jews.

[24] Leese, *'Out of Step'*, Op. Cit., p. 51.

[25] Ibid.

[26] See Simon Schwarzfuchs, 1984, *'Napoleon, the Jews and the Sanhedrin'*, 2nd Edition, Oxford University Press: Oxford.

[27] Even largely fairly secular liberal jews were hard line anti-Zionists. For example see Harriet Pass Freidenreich, 1991, *'The Jewish Politics of Vienna, 1918 – 1938'*, 1st Edition, Indiana University Press: Bloomington, p. 47.

[28] Ibid, p. 48

[29] Although ironically, and extremely hypocritically, not atheism which is and was a religion (a theism maintaining that God does not exist) and became the state religion in the USSR.

[30] Although in actuality the anti-jewish thought of this time was couched in religious terminology and thought of as such. It can be argued with considerable justification that anti-jewish thought was explicitly racial for at the least the reign of the Visigoths in North Africa and the Iberian Peninsula but out of cognitive necessity couched in religious terminology. The latter providing the lens through which racial feelings could be expressed and justified in terms of religious belief, which in the absence of an understanding of biology, chemistry and physics was all that could be used to anchor internal intrinsic feelings and an instinctual understanding of racial with intellectual authority.

[31] For example: August Roehling in his 1871, *'Der Talmudjude'* (Muenster) largely copied the critique of the Talmud given by Johann Andreas Eisenmenger's, 1700, *'Entdecktes Judenthum'* (Frankfort). Such copying of critique, in this case without attribution, no doubt heavily contributed to the problems in interpretation that I have noted in Leese's thought regarding the Protocols since incorrect interpretations were introduced in these kinds of often read, which then conflicted with other evidence and had to be reconciled (leading to unsound theories being purported).

[32] Most so-called 'debunking' arguments of the 'jewish world conspiracy' inevitably centre on this mismatch. Since it allows the author, or authors, to claim ignorance on the part of their anti-jewish opponents and be somewhat intellectually lazy by dismissing anti-jewish arguments as so much 'conspiracy theory', or 'woo' as it is known as in skeptic social circles.

[33] This was the favoured possibility of Theodor Herzl the founder of Zionism and the majority of the Zionist cause being a return to Palestine proper.

[34] This was the favoured possibility of a minority of jewish Zionists, notably the author Israel Zangwill, who argued for a more pragmatic approach to where the new jewish homeland should be.

[35] Moses Miller, 1949, *'Soviet "Anti-Semitism": The Big Lie!'*, 1st Edition, Jewish Life: New York, pp. 26-27.

[36] For a similar jewish communist opinion please see I. Rennap, 1942, *'Anti-Semitism and the Jewish Question'*, 1st Edition, Lawrence & Wishart: London, pp. 67-86.

[37] Arthur Ruppin, 1934, *'The Jews in the Modern World'*, 1st Edition, MacMillan: London, pp. 236-242.

A Jewish 9/11 Debacle: The Odigo, Missing Jews and Related Claims

Friday, 19 September 2008

It should not come as a surprise to anyone, ie those who are familiar with the colourful and innovative plethora of claims surrounding the terrorist attack on US soil on September 11th 2001, that amongst the numerous rumours there exists a rich flora there-of about Jewish involvement and foreknowledge. In this article I will discuss a few of the latter ones; foreknowledge/warnings to Jewish people.

One of the more persistent ones in my own experience is the Odigo one. Odigo Inc was a company situated in New York with offices in Israel as well at the time^[1] and were known for their instant messenger service "Odigo Messenger". In an interview done between Alex Jones^[2] and Matthew Tartaglia^[3] the former states that Odigo received threats or warnings about an attack and that the workers in Israel then proceeded to warn their Jewish co-workers in New York.

Now, the article hinted to is the one which first appeared in the Haaretz^[4]. A quote from the article in question gives a somewhat different rendering than the one Alex Jones managed to extrapolate from this story:

"Odigo, the instant messaging service, says that two of its workers received messages two hours before the Twin Towers attack on September 11 predicting the attack would happen, and the company has been cooperating with Israeli and American law enforcement, including the FBI, in trying to find the original sender of the message predicting the attack. Micha Macover, CEO of the company, said the two workers received the messages and immediately after the terror attack informed the company's management, which immediately contacted the Israeli security services, which brought in the FBI. "I have no idea why the message was sent to these two workers, who don't know the sender. It may just have been someone who was joking and turned out they accidentally got it right. And I don't know if our information was useful in any of the arrests the FBI has made," said Macover. Odigo is a U.S.-based company whose headquarters are in New York, with offices in Herzliya.

...

Odigo usually zealously protects the privacy of its registered users, said Macover, but in this case the company took the initiative to provide the law enforcement services with the originating Internet Presence address of the message, so the FBI could track down the Internet Service Provider, and the actual sender of the original message."

In another news article it is reported that the Vice President of Odigo's Sales and Marketing said in an interview that there were no specifics mentioned in the messages (as in what kind of an attack or what targets were involved) yet due to their timing he had to regard them as a threat.^[5]

There is no evidence given anywhere to suggest that the two workers or even the company had realised the impact of this message before the planes flew into the World Trade Centers, no one was warned prior to the attack because there was no knowledge of what it meant, if it indeed meant anything at all. The workers told their management about the received messages after they had

been told about the 9/11 attack from where the management alerted the local Israeli security services which then contacted the FBI. What good would a warning, not heeded prior to the attack, not containing any specifics, to two unrelated workers busy in their cubicals do? In light of the absence of actual proof stating otherwise and with nothing more than the erroneous extrapolations made by Alex Jones sans any evidence, we are forced to let this tidbit rest in the bin along with the usual daily leftovers of internet rumours.

Another similar claim that floats around the truther[\[6\]](#) camp, although not one of the more common ones, is the "No jews died in the WTC attacks" or "Hardly any jews died in the WTC attacks" and they are part of adding to the convergent argument that jews thereby either helped to assist the 9/11 attack or were the masterminds thereof.

These tend, naturally, to be more popular for the ardent hardline truthers on race-nationalist forums such as Stormfront or Vanguard National Network[\[7\]](#), [\[8\]](#). Accompanied with these is the quite popular claim that 4,000 jews were missing from work in the WTC area and that this provides further evidence that the jews were not only forewarned but complicit in the terrorist attack.

Let's begin with the question of jewish wtc-victims. While only one Israeli died in the WTC attacks and the fact that the number of actual jewish victims is hard to estimate, since no records of ethnic or religious adherence is kept over the WTC victims, there are varying estimates yet many corroborative lists of actual names of the victims which would indicate that the number lands somewhere between 200-400. Here follows a pertinent quote on these matters:

"A total of 2,071 occupants of the World Trade Center died on September 11, among the 2,749 victims of the WTC attacks. According to an article in the October 11, 2001, Wall Street Journal, roughly 1,700 people had listed the religion of a person missing in the WTC attacks; approximately 10% were Jewish. A later article, in the September 5, 2002, Jewish Week, states, "based on the list of names, biographical information compiled by The New York Times, and information from records at the Medical Examiner's Office, there were at least 400 victims either confirmed or strongly believed to be Jewish." This would be approximately 15% of the total victims of the WTC attacks. A partial list of 390 Cantor Fitzgerald employees who died (out of 658 in the company) lists 49 Jewish memorial services, which is between 12% and 13%.

This 10-15% estimate of Jewish fatalities tracks closely with the percentage of Jews living in the New York area. According to the 2002 American Jewish Year Book, 9% of the population of New York State, where 64% of the WTC victims lived, is Jewish. A 2002 study estimated that New York City's population was 12% Jewish. Forty-three percent of the WTC victims lived in New York City. Thus, the number of Jewish victims correlates very closely with the number of Jewish residents in New York. If 4,000 Jews had not reported for work on September 11, the number of Jewish victims would have been much lower than 10-15%."[\[9\]](#)

The complete list of all victims related to the 9/11 attack is available at this link[\[10\]](#).

The previously mentioned claim on the 4,000 jews not showing up from is also talked about in the same article:

"Vague conspiracy theories blaming Israel began to appear within 24 hours of the attacks. Syria's government-owned Al Thawra newspaper may have been the first newspaper to make the "4,000 Jews" claim. According to U.S. embassy reporting, its September 15th edition falsely claimed "four thousand Jews were absent from their work on the day of the explosions."

The 4,000 figure apparently came from an article entitled "Hundreds of Israelis missing in WTC attack" which appeared in the September 12th internet edition of the Jerusalem Post. It stated, "The Foreign Ministry in Jerusalem has so far received the names of 4,000 Israelis believed to have been in the areas of the World Trade Center and the Pentagon at the time of the attacks."

Unknown conspiracy theorists apparently seized upon the 4,000 figure, transforming it into the false claim that 4,000 Jews did not report for work at the World Trade Center on September 11."

The origin of this particular myth is, as noted above, from the article in the Jerusalem Post which didn't talk about jews who didn't show up for work but an estimate on how many of them were in the New York area at the time of the attack yet whose whereabouts were unknown in the turmoil of the attack where friends and families of the missing people had inquired about them through the local authorities, as this quote explains from a subsequent article[\[11\]](#):

"The Foreign Ministry in Jerusalem has so far received the names of 4,000 Israelis believed to have been in the areas of the World Trade Center and the Pentagon at the time of the attack. The list is made up of people who have not yet made contact with friends or family, Army Radio reported. Telephone connections between Israel and the New York City and Washington, D.C. areas has been sporadic and unreliable since the multiple attacks yesterday."

The key words here are *"the list is made up of people who have not yet made contact with friends or family"* and please note that this was in the direct afterman, some 16 hours, after the planes had flown into the buildings. There is nothing especially noteworthy about this and it certainly does not provide evidence to the claim that 4,000 jews or Israelis were warned and stayed home from work on September 11th 2001. In the UK a help hotline was set up almost immediately after the attack and was quickly swamped with some 20,000 calls from people inquiring about relatives and friends possibly caught in the middle of the WTC chaos as this article from The Guardian writes:

"Staff at a bureau to help the relatives and friends of people feared caught up in the attacks have been doubled to cope with thousands of calls. The telephone hotline (020- 7008 0000) has received more than 20,000 calls."[\[12\]](#)

For those interested in acquiring more information about these erroneous rumours; an excellent exposé of just about every off-shot claim concerning the myths about missing jews and israelis and how this allegedly proof of a conspiracy is given by this thoroughly referenced article; *"The Case of the Missing 4000 Israelis"*[\[13\]](#). An excerpt thereof explains the following:

"To begin with, one should point out the distinction between Israelis and Jews. Most Israelis are Jewish (although there is a significant Arab minority, among others), but most Jews are not

Israeli. For instance, there are slightly more Jewish-Americans than Israeli Jews. (There are also more Anglo-Americans than Anglo-Britons. The US is a big country).

Having said that, the fact that 4000 Israelis worked at the WTC is rather unbelievable, to put it mildly. There were about 50,000 workers at the WTC overall, spread out over about 300 companies[\[14\]](#)*. Of these companies, only 2 were Israeli owned (ZIM Israel Navigation company and ClearForest. Incidentally, some ClearForest staff - who were Israeli - did show up to work on Sep 11)*[\[15\]](#)*. Also, bear in mind that the entire population of Israel is only about 6 million, compared to roughly 60 million for the UK and 280 million for the US. Having 4000 Israelis working at the WTC is about as believable as having 40,000 UK citizens working at the WTC. (Update, Aug 27, 2004: the number of Israeli-born residents of NYC was 21,288 as of 2000, or about 0.27% of the population of New York; multiplying this by the final WTC toll of 2602 would correspond to 7 Israeli deaths. Thanks to wikipedia for this information).*

(On the other hand, it is fairly believable that among the 50,000 employees at the WTC, about 4,000 of them are Jewish. The state of New York is about 9% Jewish. But despite the headline, the body of the Al-Manar article refers clearly to Israelis, rather than Jews). Incidentally, the number of Jewish victims of the WTC attack has been estimated at 400-500.”

As a curiosa there were 68 british, 6 cubans, 17 germans, 8 russians and 7 irishmen who died due to the 9/11 incident, therefor by the critiqued truther-logic of this article (that no jews or not enough jews died hence partial evidence of foreknowledge or more) we could make a case against a british-cuba-german-russian-irish agenda of complicit nature. However, as I do not wish to have my brain arrested for vagrancy or for obstruction of logic, I'll refrain from pursuing such an obvious melon of a theory, as people in general should drop these equally ridiculous claims.

The final accusation I will be addressing in this article is about an Israeli company (well, 49% owned by the Israeli Government) located in the WTC's which moved out a few weeks prior to the WTC attack. Now this is a claim I've seen purported here and there across discussion forums and truther sites on this matter, as a reference I believe an article by the well known (infamous?) truther Christopher Bollyn[\[16\]](#).

Now, the basic claims made is that not only did they move out just before the 9/11 attack, but broke their lease while doing so, thereby somehow making the fast and sudden move-out of the WTC North Tower suspicious and too much of a coincidence for people like Bollyn. I have a problem with the idea that this proves anything since I, unlike Bollyn, have little problem with NOT listening to my arse for facts.

I am not sure where Bollyn got the idea that the lease was broken, to my knowledge the lease expired before the 9/11 attack and according to this article[\[17\]](#), the ZIM-American's lease expired on September 1 in 2001. The majority of the company's workers had relocated prior to the attack yet a few remained:

”More than 200 workers at Zim Israel Navigation Company counted themselves lucky Tuesday, having been moved out of their World Trade Center offices by the company just two weeks ago.

At the same time, Israeli company ClearForest, whose international headquarters were located in the 47th floor of One World Trade Center, reported that none of its staff was hurt when the building collapsed. "When we watched the pictures, we felt so lucky," Zim spokesperson Dan Nadler said. "Our entire US operations were run out of the 16th floor."[\[18\]](#)

This makes Bollyn's case increasingly unconvincing and, well, simply wrong. It doesn't help with the foreknowledge bit very much. Yet, let's move on still. Was the move out of the blue? A sudden case of relocating need since they had, according to Bollyn, been forewarned?

"In a statement to the Virginia shipping community, Shaul Cohen-Mintz, President of Zim-American Israeli Navigation Co., Inc. said it was a most successful move to a brand new building that is designed for Zim's specific needs. Initial planning for this move began as part of a Go Forward Plan initiated almost two years ago. Most managerial and key personnel have been relocated to Virginia to ensure continuity of service and a smooth transition."[\[19\]](#)

While it a claim can be conjured up that since this statement was made after the attack, they could have stated anything. The problem is that nothing of substance indicates foreknowledge, also the burden of proof is not on those proving there was no foreknowledge but on those who claim that they had been forewarned. So far none of the given claims have been able to prove anything to that end. Another thing to consider is that in the WTC buildings had some 430 companies[\[20\]](#) and it would not be anything but commonplace to find a number of companies moving in and another number of companies moving out of the buildings each year. Furthermore, as mentioned in the second above article, another Israeli company called "ClearForest" remained in the WTC's. It is indeed strange that, if we look at the collective image of these conspiracy claims, two workers from Odigo in Israel were warned a couple of hours before the attack, the ClearForest company received no warning whatsoever and Zim-American got a warning to move out several months prior to the attack.

No, it just doesn't make any coherent sense and it certainly does not provide any substance to the claim of general Jewish/Israeli foreknowledge. Therefore, in light of the substantial lack of evidence for any of these claims, which I've discussed in this article, we should do well to leave these spurious rumours and myths outside of the realm of facts and inside the trash can of "not so good arguments against Jewry".

[\[1\]](#) Today it no longer exists, it got shut down by in 2004 by the new owners Comverse Technology.

[\[2\]](#) Alex Jones is a well known and self-marketing freelance journalist who has made documentaries and several websites dedicated to purport many different conspiratorial theories, especially those involving 9/11 and it having been orchestrated by the US Government unto its people. The interview mentioned is found here;
<http://www.prisonplanet.com/articles/march2005/300305newrevelations.htm>

[\[3\]](#) A rescue worker who, after experiencing failing health due his time working in the smoldering aftermath at Ground Zero, came to regard 9/11 as a deed architected by the US Government.

[\[4\]](#) <http://www.haaretz.com/hasen/pages/ShArt.jhtml?itemNo=77744&contrassID=/has%5C>

[\[5\]](#) http://www.fpp.co.uk/online/01/09/WTC_Odigo2.html

[6] "Truther" is an oft used nickname for the people whose beliefs are that the US Government orchestrated the 9/11 attack and furthermore commonly purport the WTC DCT (World Trade Center Controlled-Demolition Theory), ie that they were brought down by explosives planted there by the US Government.

[7] <http://www.stormfront.org/forum/showpost.php?p=847704&postcount=7>

[8] <http://www.vnnforum.com/showpost.php?p=841441&postcount=1213>

[10]

http://www.september11victims.com/september11victims/COUNTRY_CITIZENSHIP.html.

[11] Jerusalem Post. Thousands of Israelis missing near WTC, Pentagon. September 12, 2001

[12] <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2001/sep/15/september11.usa8>

[13] http://www.nocturne.org/~terry/wtc_4000_Israeli.html

[14] <http://www.newyorkrelief.com/Tenants.cfm>

[15] <http://www.jpost.com/Editions/2001/09/13/News/News.34749.html>

[16] <http://www.fpp.co.uk/online/02/09/AmericanFreePress0902.html>

[17] <http://www.israelnewsagency.com/israel911september91104.html>

[18] "Zim Workers Saved by Cost-Cutting", The Jerusalem Post, September 13, 2001. Link:

<http://s3.amazonaws.com/911timeline/2001/jerusalem091301.html>

[19] "ZIM NY HEAD OFFICE MISSED WORLD TRADE CENTRE EXPLOSION", The Gleaner, September 18, 2001, Copyright 2001 Financial Times Information, All rights reserved, Global News Wire

[20] <http://edition.cnn.com/SPECIALS/2001/trade.center/tenants1.html>

Response to Incogman (Part I)

Wednesday, 24 September 2008

In this response, for the sake of brevity, I am going to answer some particular assertions made by Gilad Atzmon's article citing Shlomo Sand's book as his authority. In this, it should be noted that, I have not read Sand's book and none of his academic work has come to my attention previously in my own studies of jewish history. Hence, by virtue of this, I am unaware of what proofs Sand's is using to support his rather strange claims, but I will provide an answer to them as far as I am able at the present time.

Readers should also note that I am responding here to Atzmon, and in effect Sand, as a dedicated anti-Semite and a National Socialist. I am responding to what I perceive as misconceptions of the jewish question, which is linked closely with my work and research on the jewish question in general.

Atzmon writes:

'In his book, Sand manages to prove beyond any reasonable doubt that the Jewish people never existed as a 'nation-race', they never shared a common origin. Instead they are a colourful mix of groups that at various stages in history adopted the Jewish religion.

In case you follow Sand's line of thinking and happen to ask yourself, "when was the Jewish People invented?" Sand's answer is rather simple. "At a certain stage in the 19th century, intellectuals of Jewish origin in Germany, influenced by the folk character of German nationalism, took upon themselves the task of inventing a people 'retrospectively,' out of a thirst to create a modern Jewish people." [2]

Accordingly, the 'Jewish people' is a 'made up' notion consisting of a fictional and imaginary past with very little to back it up forensically, historically or textually.'

And:

"No population remains pure over a period of thousands of years" says Sand. [12] "But the chances that the Palestinians are descendants of the ancient Judaic people are much greater than the chances that you or I are its descendents"

This seems to be a very strange assertion to make by any historian specialising in Jewish history (or even general history). Since Jews are a race and a nation^[1] (which is proven in point by their genetic similarity to one another as well as their genetic distance from their host population)^[2], but there is a caveat there as there usually is when dealing with racial science.

In that Jews, because of the nature of their history comprise several different groups: the two best known are the Ashkenazi (or Jews from Central and Eastern Europe)^[3] and the Sephardi (Jews from the Iberian Peninsula and North Africa) of which the two are quite different in appearance to one another (and have historically had mutual racial antagonism to each other), but genetically are closer than their relation to their host populations^[4].

The fact is simply that no serious or well-regarded historian has ever denied that Jews, if you take a very broad overview of the term, are comprised of many different, or 'colourful' as Atzmon puts it, groups, but the caveat is that there are only two large groups within the Jewish community for the majority of its history. These are the Sephardi and the Ashkenazi and they are heavily related as has been pointed to by the wealth of genetic data on the subject.

Atzmon's (and presumably Sand's if Atzmon has given us a faithful rendering) logic is, to put it bluntly, flawed since he presumes that because you have a plethora of Jewish sub-racial groups (which are largely linked biologically as part of the same race)^[5], that often are quite different in terms of physical appearance, this must mean that Jews are not a race biologically speaking. This essentially presumes race equates colour and that sub-race equates ethnicity, which it does not^[6].

The key point here is the caveat mentioned above, that the only two Jewish groups of significance are the Sephardi and Ashkenazi who have made up the clear majority of the Jewish population for most of the last two millennia. With both groups having been formed from Jews who were in a Diaspora around the Roman Empire (who came originally from Palestine and from the various Jewish communities around the Mediterranean created during Alexander's conquests^[7] and the subsequent breakup of his empire into several smaller self-contained Greek empires; of particular notice being the Seleucid Empire; the Jews were not very active seekers of converts at this point

although they did create religious cults for gentiles based on Judaism the gentiles concerned were never ‘jews’): the Sephardi, from jews in the Iberian Peninsula and North Africa, and the Ashkenazi from jews residing in France moving eastward with the Franks and then moving into Eastern Europe in large numbers during and after the black plague wracked Europe in the 14th century (see n. 9).

The genetics confirm, rather than debunk (which is what we would expect if Atzmon’s and Sand’s argument held true), what historians have long presumed and argued (from what we have of the historical record) to be the case in that the jews as we know them today are directly related to in varying degrees (for the example the Ethiopian jews, or the Falasha, are the least descended from these origins, because they were the offspring of mixed marriages between jews and negroes as well as converts) the likely ancient Israelite population. If Atzmon’s and Sand’s arguments were true then we would expect to see these jewish populations showing different origins dependent on their history, but because they radiated around original Semitic genetic material, which shows close relation to different jewish groups and the Palestinian Arabs as it happens, with different amounts of material from host societies. It would indicate that the contemporary jews have a common Semitic origin. Since the jews of today are also closely related genetically to the resident Palestinian Arabs of today this would mean if the ancestral Israelite population is ‘more likely’ to be the ancestors of today’s Palestinian Arabs, as Sand contends, then they are also the ancestors of today’s jewish Diaspora (see n. 10).

Were jews originally an unmixed population?

This in itself seems quite unlikely, even given the standard biblical account of early jewish history and the jewish sojourn in the desert along with the antics of the kings of Israel (and likely by their people as well). For example: 2 Samuel 11:3-4 tells us of Uriah the Hittite and his wife Bathsheba, who we may presume are both Hittite^[8] [since Bathsheba is arguably an Indo-European name, but there is also the quite likely possibly she was a Canaanite (which still makes her non-jewish and also one of the tribes that Ha-Shem ordered the jews to exterminate^[9]), and who David then took as his wife^[10], after having Uriah killed, and with her had Solomon^[11].

It is also true to say that non-jewish groups were also incorporated into the Israelite Kingdom (the Galileans for example) and, in time, became part of the Israelite racial biology (since they were no longer technically considered ‘foreign’, but likely would not have been married into by Judean jews who considered them somewhat dubious for having been so recently pagans [and therefore not jews in the strictest sense: i.e. the biological]).

All this might seem to preclude that jews are who they say they are, because they are not a ‘pure race’ and therefore can’t be seen as having been descending from the supposedly pure Israelites. However, when we consider that any race, by the biological principles of evolution, evolved from some other race, organism or life-form. Then we realise that Atzmon’s and Sand’s argument that there is no such thing as a ‘pure race’ is a, deliberate (I would suggest), misnomer on their part.

The concept of a ‘pure race’ has nothing to do with their not being of evolved origins (i.e. the mystical creation of man in Adam rather than evolution: in this Atzmon and Sand are confusing

Judaism and Jewish secular nationalism. Their argument relies essentially on the presumption that Jewish secular nationalism and Jewish history envisions a creation of a race, which is absolutely pure but then debased itself by mixing with gentiles [which is what the Tanakh suggests, but is not part of the actual creed of Jewish secular nationalism or mainstream Jewish history]), but rather that the people concerned have consistently kept to endogamy and even then it is not required that the whole of the group (which is what Atzmon and Sand are disingenuously using as a *reductio ad absurdum* combining Judaic theology and Jewish secular nationalism to do so: i.e. the whole race must be pure for it to be a pure race) has been endogamous, rather than the more accurate thesis that a pure race equates a significant portion of the race having endogamous.

This latter more reasonable thesis of what a 'pure race', in fact, refers to. This also fits in nicely with the Jewish evolutionary strategy and Jewish history. In so far that to gain racial and individual advantage Jews have mixed with their hosts in order to gain a foothold within society^[12], but this mixing has not been wholesale and there have always been a large segment of Jewry who remain unmixed even in western European countries where 'liberal' ideas as to 'religious tolerance' came to the fore early in the 18th century. This is true even in ostensibly non-Jewish households, such as those of the Marrano Jews^[13]; Jewish endogamy was largely preserved despite their 'loss' of their ability to practice their Judaic religion. Even today Israel acts as a place where Jew marries Jew, and as such is a genetic reservoir for Jewish racial biology, despite the increasing polarisation within the Diaspora of those Jews who mix sexually with gentiles and those who condemn the practice^[14].

Therefore the Jews do in fact fulfil the requirements of being a 'pure race' historically and the population genetics of Jews prove this continuum. Atzmon and Sand have had to resort to being disingenuous in order to make their argument for the simple reason that the evidence is against them and with standard Jewish historiography in this regard.

Atzmon writes:

'It is an established fact that not a single Jewish history text had been written between the 1st century and early 19th century. The fact that Judaism is based on a religious historical myth may have something to do with it. An adequate scrutiny of the Jewish past was never a primary concern within the Rabbinical tradition. One of the reasons is probably the lack of a need of such a methodical effort. For the Jew who lived during ancient times and the Middle Ages, there was enough in the Bible to answer most relevant questions having to do with day-to-day life, Jewish meaning and fate. As Shlomo Sand puts it, "a secular chronological time was foreign to the 'Diaspora time' that was shaped by the anticipation for the coming of the Messiah".'

This, to put it bluntly, is a complete fabrication. There were Jewish historical texts written and published (note Atzmon says 'written' not 'published' as if history could establish as fact that no Jew wrote a history text for nearly two millennia) during this time. What Sand is completely confused, if Atzmon has given us a faithful rendering of his argument, is that in Eastern Europe, notably Poland, the rabbinical authorities forbade non-Talmudic study and therefore to facilitate this they stopped forbade the writing of history books.

However history books were written by Ashkenazi jews for Ashkenazi jews for example Glueckel of Hameln's memoirs[15] (from the 16th century in Germany, but also recording jewish life in France, the Low Countries and Poland) were of an Ashkenazi jewess written for her children and their children. That is a history book for it records her life and times unless of course Atzmon and Sand would tell us that this does not count, because it wasn't published. But then it certainly meets and explodes Atzmon's claims that no book on jewish history was written in this period and that jews needed nothing more than the Tanakh for their history lessons.

For if Glueckel wrote her memoirs, and they are certainly a written history of her life and times, then it can reasonably be said to be likely that other reasonably financially secure jews may also have done so and these personal writings have not survived the passing years or are tucked away yet to be discovered.

Atzmon also forgets that a lot of jewish lore is oral and not written and the writing of books was an expedient adopted by jews from the gentiles as a way to protect the traditions, culture and religious lore of the jews from the possibility of the destruction of the jews (as for example before and during the Bar-Kochba revolt in the 2nd century[16]). Writing books is also difficult and time-consuming and it cannot be simply presumed because the ghetto authorities forbade the writing and publishing of books not related to jewish lore that these didn't in fact have a place in jewish society at that period (even if an unofficial one).

It could also be argued that, in fact, the rabbinical responsa are indirectly jewish history texts for what they given are large amounts of detail as to the day-to-day running of the community and when interfaced with contemporary gentile accounts and jewish records give a clear picture of the community. This is in fact part of the methodology often used to reconstruct jewish history in Eastern Europe and there is no reason to presume that because the rabbinical courts decided history was not ostensibly to be studied that they had something to hide (which is what Atzmon's and Sand's argument openly implies).

This is almost classical Freudian reasoning in that the jews are supposed to have known they had something to hide and therefore were in denial about their history, but yet having not had any history books published (but if they don't it, it is all part of their denial due to an organised conspiracy among historians of jewish history[17]). How could they on Atzmon's logic have known they had something to hide and therefore be in denial about? The answer is simply that Atzmon's and therefore presumably Sand's implied contention does not hold water, because it is simply not the case and nor is there any evidence as far as I can see to support such a contention[18].

Atzmon writes:

'As one would expect, Sand approves the largely accepted assumption that the Judaicised Khazars constituted the main origins of the Jewish communities in Eastern Europe, which he calls the Yiddish Nation.'*

This is an out and out falsehood. The origin of the Ashkenazi is not '*largely accepted*' to be in

the main Khazaria for a multitude of reasons, in fact that origin is largely rejected in academic opinion, including the problem that if the Khazars equate the origin of the majority of the Ashkenazi then where is the evidence of the large east-to-west migration of the jews. This argument points out, rather astutely, that Khazar origins are not likely because jews are known to have been evidence in following Charlemagne into Germany from France. As well as that they were also in evidence in the Teutonic Knights campaigns, i.e. the Baltic Crusades[19], against the Slavs and later came to Poland seeking refuge in large numbers after the popular anti-jewish campaigns arose against them in Germany and Eastern France during and after the bubonic plague took its terrible toll on Europe[20]. These jews were the ancestors of the Ashkenazi jews of today and came via the Diaspora brought about by the Macedon Empire of Alexander the Great and the cosmopolitan Roman Empire from Palestine and the Middle East[21].

Another rather apt point to note is that the Khazars had only been jews, in terms of religion, from the time of their conversion till the fall of the Khazarian empire for approximately two hundred years. The Khazar origin argument presumes that after their conquest a large number of the Khazars doggedly held onto their religion regardless of what was done to them that they had only quite recently converted to. This seems unlikely given that the reason the Khazars converted in the first place was, because their monarch had decided it should be so, rather than it being a popular mass-conversion.

The Khazarian people converted because they were forced to and hence would likely not have had a rigid attachment to the Judaic religion, however also of note is the Khazarian people likely also kept many of their original beliefs in more low key form. Such beliefs also persisted in West European Christendom, Slavic Christendom and Byzantine Christendom where it was not uncommon for priests to venerate pre-Christian fertility goddesses and water sprites etc (adding a Christian twist to these rituals, of course) as well as worshipping God in the celebration of the sacraments. It is also generally asserted by academic authors that there were a multitude of other religions actively practising in Khazaria; including Nestorian Christians, Islam, Norse, Finnic and Slavic pagans, Zoroastrians etc. Therefore it is likely that when the Khazarian empire fell to the Rus it simply followed its own precedent and adopted the new rulers religion or fell back on its older beliefs.

Unless Atzmon or Sand has new very compelling evidence, which I very much doubt, their argument concerning the Khazars is a nonsensical one and one that in addition to being rejected by historians has also been more or less completely exploded by genetic data linking the Ashkenazi closely with Semitic origins shared with the Arabs.

[1] Jews are technically a unique sub-race in that they are a derivative of different biological backgrounds, which have their common feature in their Semitic racial heritage and a series of traits, both tangible and intangible, that they have in common.

[2] Jews invariably tend to chop and change the definition of what they are claiming to be. between the following general postulates: religion, culture and/or race, usually in order to deflect criticism, but the basic assumptions jews make is that they are a biological and not simply a religious group. Conversion is difficult and one has to prove that one has been born with a 'jewish soul' in order to progress.

[3] Who trace their origins in the main to jews migrating from the West in the wake of the black

plague and the anti-jewish riots in the Holy Roman Empire in the 14th century (who came from modern day France probably through the Low Countries; the Ashkenazi jewish community in Metz being a leftover example of this). These jews settled in Poland (with the permission of Caspian the Great), which then in time after the fall of the Polish-Lithuanian dual monarchy was absorbed into the Russian Empire of Catherine the Great in the 18th century. Catherine then instituted the Pale of Settlement for the jews, which ostensibly (although not in actuality) kept them at arms length from the Russian interior. By the time of Catherine the Great the jews had greatly multiplied in number and hence the origins of her innovative policy against them by keeping them confined in a particular geographic area. See for example: Simon Dubnov, Trans: Moshe Spiegel, 1967, *'History of the Jews'*, 5 Vols., 1st Edition, New Brunswick: New York and Henry Milman, 1902, [1829], *'History of the Jews'*, 2 Vols., 1st Edition, E. P. Dutton: New York.

[4] See for example Doron Behar, et al, 2003, *'Multiple Origins of Ashkenazi Levites: Y Chromosome Evidence for Both Near-Eastern and European Ancestries'*, American Journal of Human Genetics, Vol. 73, No. 4, pp. 768-779 and Science Daily's May 9th 2000 article; *'Jews Are The Genetic Brothers of Palestinians, Syrians and Lebanese'*, and January 17th 2006 article; *'Nearly Half Of Ashkenazi Jews Descended From Four 'Founding Mothers''*. These are available at the following respective addresses:

<http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2000/05/000509003653.htm> &

<http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2006/01/060117083446.htm> [Accessed: 21/09/2008].

[5] In terms of the jews this should really be sub-sub-race or sub-racial types.

[6] For a far more detailed exposition of race as a requirement in biology and how race and sub-race are identified (as well as a beautifully written demolition of 'anti-racist' arguments) please see John Baker, 1974, *'Race'*, 1st Edition, Oxford University Press: Oxford.

[7] Fuller mentions that there may have been a pre-Alexander jewish community around the Mediterranean basin in passing in his John Fuller, 1958, *'The Generalship of Alexander the Great'*, 1st Edition, Eyre & Spottiswoode: London. I have not yet found any literature confirming or denying this assertion.

[8] On the Hittites please see: Trevor Bryce, 2005, *'The Kingdom of the Hittites'*, 1st Edition, Oxford University Press: Oxford.

[9] Deut. 7:1-2 & 20:16-18.

[10] Also see 1 Chronicles 3:5 and 1 Kings 1:11-31.

[11] For another allusion to the racially-mixed basis for Israelite jewry please see Ezra 10:9-10, 1 Kings 11:29-40 and the jewish tribal god, 'Ha-Shem's', commandment in Deut. 7:3 that Israelites (read: jews) should not have 'foreign wives' i.e. jews should not take to wife any, but jewesses [except when they had 'legally' captured them and then they could do what they wanted with them (presumably force them to genuflect before the jewish god and then pretend they were jewesses)] (see Deut. 21:10-14). Paul (or Saul: 'the jew of Tarsus') modified this doctrine to be more acceptable to gentiles [I mean who in their right mind wants to marry a jewess in all seriousness?] in 1 Cor. 7:12-16 and 2 Cor. 6:14-18.

[12] Since the most effective foothold is one that is biological and since jews have been, and are, a people prone to extremes of avarice they also have had, and do have, the ability to provide substantial financial incentives to get their children married into good, but usually poor, families of formerly excellent breeding and high social standing.

[13] Jews forcibly converted to Christianity, usually Catholicism, who then observed jewish rituals in private and displayed an unrestrained hatred of all things Christian and gentile when allowed. They largely adopted the trade name, 'the Portuguese', and many references in texts

from all over Europe attest to their widespread presence, especially in the rich trading ports of Flanders and the Netherlands (and later England).

[14] See for example Bernard Wasserstein, 1997, *'Vanishing Diaspora: The Jews In Europe Since 1945'*, 2nd Edition, Penguin: London.

[15] *'The Memoirs of Glueckel of Hameln'*, Trans: Marvin Lowenthal, 1932, 1st Edition, Harper & Brothers: New York. This edition is not complete but rather an abridged edition taking out some of the not very important sideline musing of Glueckel on subjects such as jewish literature, poetry and the Tanakh.

[16] See John Allegro, 1971, *'The Chosen People: A Study of Jewish History from the time of the Exile until the Revolt of Bar Kocheba'*, 1st Edition, Hodder and Stoughton: London, especially pp. 229-232 & 243- 249.

[17] You can argue that jews have airbrushed out any negative aspects to their history and have consistently understated what the sources state about it, as Horowitz did in his 2007, *'Reckless Rites: Purim and the Legacy of Jewish Violence'*, 1st Edition, Princeton University Press: Princeton, has superbly argued, and this I would very much agree with as the evidence bears this out (and it fits the jewish racial character). However to posit that the jews are not really the jews and that there is a big conspiracy of historians to cover this up is rather absurd.

[18] I will of course check Sand's claims when I can get hold of a copy of Sand's book and then I will be able to produce more specific arguments as to why Sand is wrong since unfortunately Atzmon is very general in his summation (which is to be expected) of Sand's points and the evidence that underpins them.

[19] See Eric Christiansen, 1997, *'The Northern Crusades'*, 1st Edition, Penguin: London.

[20] See Barbara Tuchman, 1978, *'A Distant Mirror: The Calamitous Fourteenth Century'*, 1st Edition, Alfred A. Knopf: New York.

[21] See Allegro, Op. Cit., pp. 243-245.

In Brief: A Righteous Jew?

Thursday, 25 September 2008

Recently I became aware of a new term having been coined on the Stormfront 'White Nationalist' forum. This term is *'Righteous Jew'*, and has been used to describe jews, such as Benjamin Freedman who confirm their opinions. I have covered the problems of quoting such jews in my article, *'On Jewish "Traitors"'*[1], but this deserves a brief mention for the simple lunacy of it.

People who rant and rave about *'Jewspeak'* [2], especially using this term to attack one of the members of Semitic Controversies (who they allege is a jew (!?!)), and then promptly use a term that has obviously been derived directly from *'righteous gentile'* (which translated from the hebrew literally would be: *'righteous among the nations'*) used in connexion to those who 'saved jews' from the 'holocaust'[3]. Now to accuse people of *'Jewspeak'*, and then to transliterate a term used by jews to laud philo-Semitic gentiles, and claim it as your own. Is an absolutely stark piece of hypocrisy and almost stereotypically jewish chutzpah[4].

This is the sort of idiocy that Semitic Controversies exists to find, expose and explode. If you

want to critique jews, at least do so without acting like a jew yourself[5]. If you want to create terms then don't look to jews to create them for you, but rather look to the higher quality older anti-jewish literature that is out there, which has a wealth of terminology for just about everything to do with jews from their kvetching to their disruption of anti-jewish movements (and is severely underused as a reference/starting point).

[1] Available at the following address: <http://semiticcontroversies.blogspot.com/2008/09/on-jewish-traitors.html>.

[2] Whilst acting and pontificating like they knew what they were talking about and had spent the last 50 years or so engaged in precise academic study on the subject. In fact; their arguments are in the main recycled rhetoric from earlier far better authors who did original research into the matters at hand.

[3] Similar to the term, '*Jewish Supremacism*', created by David Duke, being derived directly from 'White Supremacism', which is a term used, largely by jews, liberals and Marxists, to attack anybody of European descent (and 'white skin') who has expressed any dislike of the presence or the behaviour of non-European 'minorities' as a group or series of groups. Both are vapid terms with little, even in terms of rhetoric, value to recommend them.

[4] Since the term would be quietly literally '*Jewspeak*' having been transliterated from an oft used jewish concept.

[5] We are going to begin policing the idiocy that is almost pandemic in the anti-jewish movement a little here on SC with our: '*In Brief*' comments, by pointing out idiotic terms and arguments which don't deserve or require much analysis.

Film Review: 'Max'

Saturday, 27 September 2008

'Max'[1] is a film, which deals with what many would consider controversial subject matter. It details the fictional story of a rich jewish 'modern art' dealer and enthusiast, Rothman, and his relationship with a Reichswehr corporal named Adolf Hitler. The film is very much centred on the origin of Hitler's beliefs, which would later lead to him becoming the legendary leader of the Third Reich.

It is important to note that while the story is itself fictional it is based on various claims concerning the origin of Hitler's thought and in particular that which relates to jews. 'Max' begins by portraying Hitler as a struggling artist desperate in the aftermath of the First World War to get into a career concerning the world of art. Rothman being an art dealer that Hitler sees as an opportunity to get exhibited and known. Throughout the film we are reminded that Hitler is just desperate for recognition in the world of art and Rothman throughout plays the role of the tender mentor whom is taking a world of time, trouble and economy to help this struggling young soldier realise his dreams.

Of course, the sub-text of all this is that Rothman is trying to push Hitler into producing 'modern art'. Hitler's works of art seen in the film are of beautiful real life sketches and watercolours, usually of animals, landscapes and architecture, which are very pleasing to the eye, but Rothman,

with the jewish preference for the unnatural and the 'avant-garde', wants Hitler to produce 'modern art' for him. He does not want Hitler to present him with high quality sketches and watercolours. Rather he wants, in typically Freudian [ergo jewish] style, Hitler to 'unleash what is inside' onto canvas.

Eventually Hitler, after many scenes of disappointment and rage (designed to give the impression of Hitler as being mentally unstable or ill, which was certainly not the case), produces a series of sketches, which predict the uniforms, symbols, architecture and achievements of the Third Reich: one of the autobahn, one of the later SS uniform etc. Rothman is enthralled by these pictures, since they to him represent '*a future world*', he promises Hitler a showing after seeing these works. He tells Hitler to meet him that evening to iron out the details and prepare the show. However before he is to meet Rothman: Hitler has something else to do. He has a speech, for Hitler has already discovered he has a great gift for oratory, to give on behalf of the fledgling NSDAP to an audience in a hall; sponsored by the Reichswehr.

This brings us on the other major theme of the film; 'Max', that of the origin of Hitler's thought especially as regards jews. Hitler is at first portrayed as encountering racial anti-Semitism during a special course that he is talked into by an army officer concerned with dealing with the menace of the communists and the left in general. The recruits to this program, of which Hitler is but one, are shown watching a special puppet show for their edification and enlightenment which is a very basic; almost primitive, espousal of the concept of superior and inferior races using the jews as the prime example of the inferior and the Aryan as the example of the Germanic superior race. The impression conveyed to the audience [i.e. the recruits to this Reichswehr program], as well as those viewing the film, is supposed to be one of humour and to wit the recruits all laugh; apart from Hitler. Who is depicted sitting still and then shouting at the other recruits to '*shut up*', because he wants to listen. The implication made by 'Max' here being that while all the other recruits took it as comic puppet show: Hitler took it seriously. This impression given to the viewer of the roots of Hitler's weltanschauung and National Socialism by this sleight of hand on the part of 'Max' is obviously one of '*pop culture gone bad*'.

This is taken further throughout the film with an important speech made by the army officer in charge of said program where he tells the now graduates; of this program, that they are in their speeches to blame anybody they like for the ills of Germany, but the central goal is he asserts is to declare that '*Germany did not lose the war*'. This scene seems to have been calculated to give the [false] impression that Hitler's anti-jewish thought was based on 'blaming the jews' for things 'they didn't do'. This subtle impression is, as would be expected of a film about Adolf Hitler, false for the simple reason that if one reads Hitler's speeches and writings^[2] as well as '*Mein Kampf*'^[3] and '*Zweites Buch*'^[4] then it, becomes apparent that Hitler is reasoning from observation of the jews and performed his analysis based on what he saw as well as what he had read.

This is confirmed by the next scene, where we find Hitler giving a speech to an ad hoc crowd about alien elements, i.e. the jews, being responsible for the loss of the war and the misfortunes which Germany has suffered since 1918. What is of note in particular about this is that Rothman is also present this time less as a 'modern art' dealer, but rather in the pose of a valiant ex-soldier; in the cavalry, who lost his right arm for Germany standing around with a group of

soldiers acting as their superior officer. Rothman after noting what Hitler is saying to the crowd about jews tells his soldiers; that is just the same old stuff and is nothing new. The sub-text of this is again that the root of Hitler's anti-jewish thought was based on 'blaming the jews' for things that 'they didn't do'. Since what is being subtly asked is how could Hitler verbally attack this heroic jew who ostensibly lost an arm for Germany [and that anti-Semitism is based on lies]? Or as contemporary jewish; and philo-Semitic, writers on 'anti-Semitism' declare [without sufficient evidence for doing so]: the 'delusions', 'prejudices' and 'fantasies' of the anti-Semite are superimposed onto real jews and the real jews never put a step wrong, but get irrationally blamed for everything[5]. This alleged irrationality, combined with allusions to mental instability/illness, one of the key emphases, which is placed upon Hitler, by the film: 'Max'.

The origin of this 'irrationality' is hinted at in the film, in so far as Rothman takes the rather shy Hitler out to have a chat with his female 'friends' one of whom is his mistress, it is suggested she is not a jew but rather a German. Hitler here is portrayed as completely unable to deal with women and to be very obviously inadequate around them; almost 'asexual' as all we are told he does is 'talk and rant about politics' while the lecherous jew, Rothman, canoodles up to his mistress and the other lady whom he has brought along.

This is likely a play to the typical jewish pattern of thought; Freudian and non-Freudian, in regards to Hitler in that he did what he did because he was sexually inadequate and by statement or implication was 'a sexual deviant' of some sort. This is especially notable in the portrayal of the ostensibly suave and charming jew, Rothman, compared with the portrayal of the difficult and mentally unstable Hitler.

This open contrast is meant to play up the delusion that Hitler had an inferiority complex around women and hence 'projected' this onto jews in line with the arguments alleging jews deflowering Aryan maidens to debase their blood[6]. When, in fact, Hitler was well known to confident and suave himself not having a shortage of desirable ladies, often of aristocratic heritage, wishing to help him and desiring him in both a loving and sexual manner[7]. If you wish to read some of the more disgusting ideas about this as discussed from a jewish racial perspective then I suggest reading Ron Rosenbaum's, 'Explaining Hitler'[8], which covers just about every libellous claim made about him and his motivations with explicit focus on the sexual theories there-in[9]. This effective slander against Hitler purported by 'Max' is however very much with a purpose since it demonizes and dehumanizes Hitler to the audience making him a form of comical monster that can be laughed and jeered at from the safety of one's own living room as well subtly give the audience the message that only such sad figures as the Hitler projected in 'Max' are anti-Semites.

We find then a scene where Hitler has gone to Rothman to receive Rothman's latest rebuke about his fine art and 'encouragement' to sketch/paint 'modern art' where Rothman declares to Hitler about how anti-jewish arguments are all lies and how jews are just as German as any other German. The Hitler of 'Max' does not respond; rather he meekly takes the abuse that Rothman throws at him because of his stated ideas with the implication to the audience that as above Hitler's anti-jewish thought is irrational and in essence 'pop culture gone bad'. This is yet again a subtle allusion on the part of 'Max' to Hitler's thought being undesirable, because few people like to think of themselves as 'following the trend' (although the clear majority of minds do so), and if Hitler has created a bad trend then they don't wish to follow in his footsteps and make his

mistake (which is clearly alluded in the film as being his anti-Semitism).

This leads us again to the NSDAP speech before Hitler's meet up with Rothman. Here we begin to see a very specific intention behind the plot, when Hitler walks in to the hall. He states to those organising the speech that this will be 'the last one', because he is going to be a great artist when Rothman exhibits his drawings for the future state. Hitler's speech is what the producers likely consider to be 'extremely anti-Semitic', even though it is not particularly so in my personal opinion, and causes a number of drunken Kriegsmarine sailors, although the film does not tell us why there are a number of Kriegsmarine sailors in uniform in Munich, to get so passionately inflamed about the pernicious jewish influence on Germany at the time they go out looking to beat up and potentially murder a jew or some jews.

These sailors surprise Rothman who is returning from the Synagogue having 'found religion' [Judaism] (i.e. it is implied that this is the root of his jewishness rather than his race) again for reasons the film does not make clear and proceed to kill him in a long beating. Rothman, of course, does not keep his meeting with Hitler, and the implication at the end of 'Max' is that Hitler then continues with his politics, and becomes the Leader of Germany in 1933 and the rest as they say is history.

This is an extremely stereotypical jewish allusion, in so far that, by implying that Hitler only did what he did, which supposedly includes the as yet unproven 'holocaust'. The film 'Max' is trying to define Hitler's through loathing for jews as both utterly irrational and as coming from his disappointed aspirations as an artist[10]. Ergo if his anti-jewish speech had not been made then he would have had a chance to fulfil his artistic ambitions. Hence the jews make themselves responsible, for not showing Hitler how wonderful they were, and not responsible, since it was Hitler who in 'Max' causes his own failure as an artist, at the same time for the entire of Hitler's later actions, while maintaining their status as the perpetual and eternal victim of supposedly 'irrational' and 'jealous' claims made about them. However at the same time, the jews claim absolute ownership of their 'holocaust' and tacitly suggest that the persecution and mass murder of jews comes about because jews are not allowed to have their way with other races [i.e. since Rothman was not allowed to help the aspiring Hitler it caused the deaths of tens of millions in World War II]. Thus we must conclude, as perhaps might seem rather obvious, that the film 'Max' is nothing, but a Syrian orgy of jewish egoism, nepotism and unnatural sexual obsessions, all disguised under dramatic license as 'realistic pseudo-history'.

'Max' itself is not a particularly good film to watch, and gets rather tedious at times, but if you wish to study the jew, and how the jew influences and manipulates, in terms of propaganda and ideological warfare, the nations and countries they inhabit in the Diaspora, then 'Max' is an excellent part of any course of study. To this end I recommend that every individual and group who wishes to study the jewish mind and perverseness of its logic and 'interpretation' should study 'Max' to gain an idea of how the mind of the jew actually works.

[1] For more information see: <http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0290210/> [Accessed: 27/09/2008].

[2] A reasonably representative selection of these can be read in Max Domarus, Ed: Patrick Romane, 2007, 'The Essential Hitler: Speeches and Commentary', 1st Edition, Bolchazy-

Carducci: Wauconda.

[3] Adolf Hitler, Trans: James Murphy 1939, '*Mein Kampf*', 1st Edition (Unexpurgated), Hurst and Blackett: London.

[4] Adolf Hitler, Ed: Gerhard Weinberg, 2003, [1928], '*Hitler's Second Book: The Unpublished Sequel to Mein Kampf*', 1st Edition, Enigma: New York.

[5] See for example: Sidney Osborne's, 1939, '*Germany and Her Jews*', 1st Edition, Soncino Press: London, Cecil Roth's, 1943, '*The Jewish Contribution to Civilisation*', 2nd Edition, East and West Library: London, Dennis Prager and Joseph Telushkin's, 1983, '*Why the Jews?: The Reason for Anti-Semitism*', 1st Edition, Simon & Schuster: New York, Benjamin Ginsberg's, 1993, '*The Fatal Embrace: Jews and the State*', 1st Edition, University of Chicago Press: Chicago and Walter Laqueur's, 2008, '*The Changing Face of Anti-Semitism: From Ancient Times to the Present Day*', 1st Edition, Oxford University Press: Oxford, for a reasonable sampling of this point of view.

[6] With some justification although the reality was not always as lurid as some authors made out. Never-the-less this allegation as far as I have able to ascertain is based on a certain phenomenon relating to jews in general, and jewish males in particular, where-by if a member of the opposite sex refuses their advances they turn very abusive and sometimes physically violent, because of their ingrained belief that as the 'Chosen of Ha-Shem' they are entitled to whatever they wish and nobody should ever say no to them. Freud would call this ones 'inner child', but we can just simply state it is just how jews are as a race.

[7] These ladies are described best in Cris Whetton's, 2004, '*Hitler's Fortune*', 1st Edition, Pen & Sword: Barnsley, which is written from an avidly anti-Hitler and anti-National Socialist point of view, but never-the-less factually describes what the evidence suggests about Hitler's finances and situation (and necessarily the ladies who were partly responsible for it as well as their relationship to Adolf Hitler).

[8] Ron Rosenbaum, 1998, '*Explaining Hitler: The Search for the Origins of his Evil*', 1st Edition, MacMillan: London.

[9] These 'theories', if one can rightly call them that, range from having one testicle and being obsessed with excrement to the propaganda lie that Hitler himself had jewish blood (occasionally alleged as being from a Rothschild). These theories were largely continued due to the pre-eminence of psycho-analytic theory, a-la Freudianism, after World War II and due to this a need to find (and as it transpired: invent) deviancy in Hitler's background, which drives him into psychosis due to self-hatred and denial. None of these theories are today considered factually accurate or even particularly valid to explain Adolf Hitler from a non-National Socialist point of view.

[10] Hence the logic goes something like this: self-loathing causes inner denial causes externalisation/projection causes 'extreme right wing politics' plus increased anti-Semitism causes 'holocaust'.

In Brief: 'Jew Watch'

Tuesday, 30 September 2008

'*Jew Watch*'[1] is a website that has been around the internet from quite sometime. Its proprietor is one Mr. Frank Weltner, a certified English teacher and librarian, who has gained some

notoriety as a result of this website. It will not be our function here in this, *'In Brief'*, to completely dissect Mr. Weltner's thought, or his website, in any exhaustive or comprehensive fashion. However: I would like to offer some frank comments as to the uses, or should I say general uselessness of his site, and its associated resources regarding the jewish question.

I don't wish to discourage people from setting up useful information or encyclopaedic websites on this most important of issues, but a little policing is also in order. For the simple reason that websites, such as *'Jew Watch'*, habitually purport bad, incorrect and misleading information on this subject as being accurate, scholarly or even objective criticism. I don't suggest all of Mr. Weltner's information is wrong, some of it is reasonably accurate (usually with some reservations and caveats), but an issue more important within the jewish question than perhaps any other area of study is the context and retaining a critical viewpoint at all times when dealing with philo-Semitic and anti-Semitic materials. It is all too easy, because of the complexity of the topic and its sub-areas of study to make mistakes and to build castles in the sky based trusting bad or incorrect information.

By that we mean that if one does not check the context of a quote and/or provide an argument as to why that quote means what you are asserting or suggesting it means. It will often lead, unless one checks the sources directly, to misinterpretation, which then can become embedded ideologically over time. One such example of this is Talmudic quotes: with a series of books having been written on the Talmud purporting to be quotes from them. However many of these quotes are taken completely out of context, are wholly invented and in other cases they are simply a minority opinion expressed in the form of response to the majority opinion. Thus making it a simple matter for a jewish graduate from a Yeshiva to counter such quotes and interpretations by checking them and giving some interpretative counterpoints, which can often explode the anti-jewish argument on the Talmud. This isn't to say one can't make an excellent argument against the Talmud and Judaism in general, but rather that to do so you have to know and have studied in great detail what you are talking about as well as being intellectually honest.

A critical mindset is also necessary for the above reason, but more importantly, because if one is to judge the jews rationally. Then one has to be as sceptical about what they themselves say as what their erstwhile enemies say. It is no use to simply assume that what is critical of jews is good. If one is to assume that everything negative that is said about jews is generally correct. Then one falls into the same trap that philo-Semitic individuals fall into by ascribing everything that is generally good about jews to them, but ignoring and/or dismissing that which is critical or negative.

The importance of this balance in anti-jewish thought and websites is absolutely paramount. Since as purveyors of often very unpopular information: each argument or source presented must be as water-tight as possible. All weak sources and unconfirmed material should be excluded or marked as such in order to inform readers that this is the case. If you do not do this and you include any and all negative information, which can be construed about jews then you alienate most if not all of the potential readership, because you are playing into the 'debunks' that are proffering by jewish organisation such as the Anti-Defamation League^[2]. The reader will naturally assume that the general view currently held in Western Europe, North America and Oceania, i.e. that purported by jewish organisations, is the correct one. Since that view is the one

that is endorsed by the figures and positions of authority in the present epoch.

'*Jew Watch*' is a site that is particularly guilty of not making a water-tight case, often oversimplifying and misrepresenting the jewish question to a most unfortunate degree. Viewing it from the perspective of a dedicated anti-Semite it almost makes weep, it is that bad and that is in itself unforgivable for to rescue the folk from the jews we need to be intellectually honest and well informed in our critique against our greatest enemy: the jews. Over the course of time Semitic Controversies will be conducting an extensive review of '*Jew Watch*' and pointing out some of the inaccuracies and problems with the information there-in. We will also where it is appropriate give new arguments that could be made against jews upon the same lines, but which are factually correct and are much harder for a jew to oppose. We will of course forward links to our commentary and responsa to Mr. Weltner who, of course, has the right to respond and we will post any responses we receive as well as our reply to them.

[1] This is available at the following address: <http://www.jewwatch.com/>.

[2] More about them can be read on their website, which is at the following address: <http://www.adl.org/>.

Response to Incogman (Part II)

Thursday, 2 October 2008

Incogman's invoking of Shlomo Sand's work, via Gilad Atzmon's article, which we have addressed the main points of in Part I, takes place in a large article where he claims to be evidencing that, in fact, the Ashkenazi jews are in fact descended from the Khazars[1]. This is particularly interesting since it would seem to be invoked, largely because it justifies his claims rather than because he thinks it is accurate. This is suggested by Incogman's own sourcing whereby he reproduces an article written by 'CelticSicilian' who digs up unrelated quotes from non-authorities (such as H. G. Wells[2]) and from older singular authorities (not citing other literature to prove this is the correct modern interpretation) to prove some of his underlying assumptions. The underlying assumption Incogman is using is that biblical history, as represented specifically in this case in the Old Testament with particular focus on the Torah, is ipso facto absolutely accurate (presumably because it is the word of God it is the truth[3]).

He then proceeds to make an argument that the Ashkenazi jews were in fact the Khazars. It is these I am going to concentrate on here since the arguments as to theology and biblical history require separate treatment as part of a larger article concerning the arguments that the jews are not the real Israelites in terms of the Christian Identity/British Identity movements, of which Incogman seems to have some acquaintance[4]. I am also going to ignore the question of Jesus' origins, because that is a detailed question it itself, but we must presume that since Jesus was of God that he was not of man[5]. It is also quite irrelevant as to the connexion between the Israelites and modern jewry and if considered would only add firstly validity to the claim that Jesus was a jew, which he was not, and secondly would introduce unnecessary emotive content into the intellectual equation.

Incogman's claims, via the medium of 'CelticSicilian's' article, are as follows:

'Modern Ashkenazi (or Yiddish) Jews are, in fact, primarily descended from a Turkic people, known as the Khazars, who converted to Judaism in the late 9th Century AD and the Jewish Edomites who converted to, or rather created, Judaism hundreds of years before. According to some genetic tests, 60% of Jewish DNA is Central Asian Turkic. The remaining 40% is of Semitic, specifically Edomite, origin.'

This is a pretty strange assertion as I have covered in my response to Atzmon and Sand in Part I as jews are certainly of majority Semitic ancestry. I must confess that I cannot find the un-cited study[6] where '60% of Jewish DNA', note that the sample is not mentioned so this could literally mean anything for example the sample concerned was from Dagestan mountain jews [who might be classed as Ashkenazim, but are in fact not], which would explain the result if this study is in fact genuine[7], and find the notion itself rather likely. It is also somewhat bemusing to ask how does 'CelticSicilian' know that that the '40% of Semitic origin' is from Edom?

Surely the genetic tests do not prove or likely even suggest a direct parallel between Edomites and all the Semitic genetic material in this presumed study. This would be rather a revelation since such a simple analysis of 60% Turkic and 40% Edomite would go against both the genetic literature on origin of the jews (see n. 10 in Part I) and the historical literature as well[8]. To further point this out I will quote verbatim Wolfe and Zolitor's conclusion on the question of 'genetic proof' for the Ashkenazi jews being the descendents of Khazars:

'The greatest evidence against a significant Khazar ancestry for Ashkenazic Jews is DNA testing. Data shows that the predominant origin of Ashkenazic Jews has been the Middle East. This indicates that the role of the native-born Khazars as a source of Ashkenazic Jews was minor. However, there is some genetic evidence that characteristics of some Ashkenazic Jews are shared by Armenians and Turks, and Jews from the Balkans. The documentary and archeological evidence for a Khazar origin is stronger in Hungary and the Ukraine. Still, the sources I have examined seem to show that the influence of the Khazarian Jews in those areas, no matter how large or small, was overwhelmed by the emigration of western Jews.

Another reason for the slight DNA differences in some Ashkenazic Jews may be intermarriage. Jews converted and intermarried with others in ancient Israel, in the Roman Empire and in Medieval Europe. There is no reason to think that it did not occur in Central Asia as well. Jews from Crimea and the Byzantine Empire, who may have originated in the Middle East intermarried with the Turks. Genetic tests show that intermarriage occurred far less with Jews than in the population as a whole, and in certain groups, like the Kohanim, it happened very little at all. This infrequent intermarriage could well have been enough to account for any genetic marker differences.'[9]

Due to this, and the lack of a citation of a study or studies where this was conclusively proven and preferably stated as a conclusion. As well as our own lack of success in finding such a scholarly article via the usual mediums. We must skeptically state that 'CelticSicilian's' contention holds no water and that genetically speaking, as well as historically speaking, there is no proof that the Ashkenazi jews are primarily, even significantly, descended from the Khazars.

‘CelticSicilian’ then asserts as follows:

‘At the fall of the Roman Empire, the Edomite Jews became scattered over all of Europe, with the majority settling down in the Turco-Mongolian (Khazaric) area of Russia, where they intermarried with the heathen Khazars who had converted en masse to Judaism. They are called Ashkenazi, and make up at least 90% of modern Jewry. Every Israeli Prime Minister has come from this heathen background. Which means their ancestors never walked the hills of Palestine. The only Jews with Abrahamic blood flowing in their veins come from the Sephardic Jews, whose lineage can be traced back to Esau/Edom.’

In the above ‘CelticSicilian’ suggests that it was at the fall of the Roman Empire that the Edomite jews left Palestine en masse. Settling in Khazaria the Edomite jews became the subjects of Khazaria’s monarch and presumably either convert him or have previously converted him to Judaism. He then suggests that this Edomite jewry inter-married, i.e. racially-mixed, with the Turkic Khazars and became absorbed into the population of Khazaria. ‘CelticSicilian’ then also identifies the Sephardim (and presumably the Mizrahi[\[10\]](#)) as being likewise of Edom. However: these assertions present us with numerous problems both logically and in terms of what is known about and generally accepted in jewish history. We will mention, for the sake of brevity, two of the more obvious ones.

Logically ‘CelticSicilian’ fails to take into account that if the Sephardim are also of this so-called Edomite jewry. Then how can the Sephardim be *‘the only Jews with Abrahamic blood flow in their veins’*? Since quite obviously if the Ashkenazim are only part jewish, but are descended from the Edomites through interbreeding with Turkic Khazars then that would mean that they too have *‘Abrahamic blood flowing their veins’* although obviously that blood would generally be impure. Therefore ‘CelticSicilian’ contradicts himself in his own assertions at the end of his own paragraph since he hasn’t specified, or even implied, that he is using purity as a benchmark for whether one has ‘Abrahamic blood’ or not.

Another issue in terms of logic and the actual history involved here is that if the *‘Edomite Jews, became scattered over all Europe’* after the fall of the Roman Empire, rather than before the Roman Empire became a world power, then it brings us into problems with how the Sephardim can be Edomite jewry. For if the Edomite jews were scattered after the Roman Empire fell then what of the Sephardi who are known to have inhabited the Iberian peninsula in significant numbers in the earliest days of Roman domination there as well as those jews who lived around the Mediterranean.

Does this reconcile with ‘CelticSicilian’s’ assertion about the Edomite Jews scattering all over Europe? Not in the slightest: for ‘CelticSicilian’ seems to suggest that the Diaspora was created in the death throws of the Roman Empire[\[11\]](#) rather than before it and then was re-enforced with the official, although not actual, expulsion of the jews from Judea, in the wake of several major failed revolts, by the Roman Emperor Hadrian[\[12\]](#). The simple fact of the matter is that the jews already had a considerable Diaspora during the Roman Empire itself, which owed direct allegiance to the temple in Jerusalem and the jewish religious leaders (and had to obey them due to the power these leaders exercised over them)[\[13\]](#). Therefore this so-called Edomite jewry was

recognized as fellow jewry by the religious leaders in Jerusalem and were treated as such. We may presume that 'CelticSicilian' believes that these leaders were in fact Israelites and not so-called Edomite jews. After all if they are not then it leaves his own theory and assertions in tatters for then the change from Israelite to Edomite jewry occurred much earlier and during Biblical times rather than after the fall of the (pagan) Roman Empire.

Therefore we may conclude from our, of necessity, brief discussion of 'CelticSicilians' historical timeframe that what he asserts cannot be reasonably argued as having been the case and also that it contains many considerable internal contradictions that have presumably come about as part of a need to support a pre-supposed position, rather than deducing a position from the available evidence and literature.

'CelticSicilian', then having made series of assertions we have quoted and answered above, moves on to provide evidence for his position and this he supplies by providing a series of quotations, which he asserts prove his case. I have removed the quote from H. G. Wells as this is not, in my view, proof of anything, because Wells had no specialism in the area (outlined in n. 2) and the meaning of the quote itself seemed to be altered the sign, ..., being used to signify bodies of text not quoted in between the quotations. I have unable to find a copy of this particular edition of Wells' work so I have been unable to confirm my suspicion of 'CelticSicilian's' falsification of the meaning of the text in order to support his own argument. However: it seems quite plausible to suggest that it has been done. When all other considerations such as further potential and actual falsifications and misrepresentations that I have outlined below, and the quoting of Wells' to begin with (rather than authorities on Biblical history).

The first quote that 'CelticSicilian' cites is as follows:

"Hasdai ibn Shaprut, who was foreign minister to Abd-al-Rahman, Sultan of Cordova, in his letter to King Joseph of the Chazars (about 960 AD) ... speaks of the tradition according to which the Chazars once dwelt near the Seir Mountains [The 'Seir Mountains' are none other than the original land of Esau-Edom - 'Thus dwelt Esau in Mount Seir: Esau is Edom' (Genesis 36:8). Seir was a mountain range sought of the Dead Sea and was also known as the 'land of Edom' (Genesis 36:21). The Seir mountains were the home of the Edomites for nearly a millennium (The Edomites arrived in Edom or Seir at the end of the 14th and beginning of the 13th century B.C. Encyclopedia Judaica, Vol. 6, p. 372) Thus we have it from Jewish sources that the Khazars originally 'dwell near the Seir Mountains' so are racially of Edomite stock. But how and when did Edomites get to Khazaria? There is evidence that in the 6th century BC, some of the Edomites fled their homeland of Seir and migrated north, 'After the fall of Jerusalem, in 586 BC, the Edomites began to press northward (Ezekiel 36:5)."

(The New Westminster Dictionary of the Bible, ed. by Henry S. Gehman, The Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1970, p. 418}]." (The Jewish Encyclopedia, Vol. IV, (1905), p. 3).'

This quote at first sight seems quite plausible. In that it seems to suggest what 'CelticSicilian' is asserting to be true, but we must first notice that at the end of the quotation it states: *'There is evidence that in the 6th century BC, some of the Edomites fled their homeland of Seir and migrated north, 'After the fall of Jerusalem, in 586 BC, the Edomites began to press northward*

(*Ezekiel 36:5*)". It seems when reading this that the passage continues, probably with a small discussion of counter evidence or noting that the theory itself is possible, but not really accepted, further and that 'CelticSicilian' has not quoted the later, because it contradicts his basic premise and therefore it seems likely that again 'CelticSicilian' is misrepresenting the quotations that he is making.

It is also worth noting that this quotation is taken from a 1970 dictionary on the Bible. This is important to note, because this was three years after Koestler's work, *'The Thirteenth Tribe'*, was published and was still causing considerable controversy in academic circles interested in the Jewish question, Byzantine, Russian, Ukrainian, Islamic and early Christian history. Thus we can suggest that, because of the time of publishing the idea that the Khazars could have been a 'lost tribe' of Israel of Edomites, and that Ashkenazi Jewry might in fact be descended from them, was still current and highly controversial. Although it should be noted that Koestler was not the first proponent of the theory that the Khazars were the biological wellspring for Ashkenazi Jewry: what he added to the theory was the 'lost tribe' twist whereby the Edomite Jews had migrated to Khazaria before or after it became officially a Jewish state. Hence we can suggest further that 'CelticSicilian' is further misrepresenting the source and the literature in general by not noting the connexion between the publication of Koestler's work and the publication of the above quote in a work shortly after. This is especially of note, because he hasn't used anything else more modern where perhaps the interpretation that the quote seems to suggest is discounted, because of further research.

As for the quote itself there are substantial problems: since it hinges on the testimony of Hasdai ibn Shaprut[\[14\]](#), but in this I am of the opinion that 'CelticSicilian' is misquoting his source again. For the characteristic, ..., appears next to where Hasdai ibn Shaprut is supposed to be writing to the King of the Chazars (Khazars), Joseph, per 'CelticSicilian's' quotation of his source, and yet is telling him that the Chazars once dwelt near the Seir Mountains (!?!). Hasdai ibn Shaprut has not written to the King before and is writing to ask whether he is a member of a lost tribe of Israel and to whether the Chazars are of the same origin as the Sephardim of then Muslim Spain[\[15\]](#). I haven't read ibn Shaprut's writings, but even if one presumes he is somehow referring to their status as a Lost Tribe surely, because he is using the Sephardim as a reference point, he would presume their origins to be from the Sepharad as they did[\[16\]](#).

However when Joseph writes back to ibn Shaprut he tells the latter the requested information concerning the Khazars origins, which of course he would date to some biblical reference point for otherwise how would the Khazarian Jews gain legitimacy as Jews unless they could date their origins within the Torah. The emphasis put on this singular piece of evidence by *'The New Westminster Dictionary of the Bible'* is not very justifiable given the evidential context, but is understandable when we take into account how soon after Koestler's work was published that this reference work was written and published.

Therefore we must conclude that this evidence does not support 'CelticSicilian's' premises and that a further consultation with more modern literature or an engagement with the primary literature would be necessary for him to attempt to prove his position.

'CelticSicilian' then quotes as follows:

“*Edom is in Modern Jewry.*”

(*The Jewish Encyclopedia*, 1925 edition, vol. 5, p. 41)’

I have also unfortunately been unable to find a complete copy of the 1925 edition of ‘*The Jewish Encyclopedia*’ to confirm my suspicion of ‘CelticSicilian’s’ falsification of meaning with this quote. ‘CelticSicilian’s’ argument is that Edom is the origin of all jewry, but that the Turkic Khazars due to the mass conversion of the Khazarian people to Judaism and the subsequent destruction of Khazaria became the well spring of the most populous element in modern jewry: the Ashkenazim.

‘CelticSicilian’ is using the quote in order to prove the above thesis that modern jewry are the descendents of the Edomites and not the Israelites. However: the key to the meaning of the quote is in the ‘*is in*’ rather than ‘*is*’. If the quote read: ‘*Edom is Modern Jewry*’. Then the quote would support ‘CelticSicilian’s’ general argument, but because it reads ‘*Edom is in Modern Jewry*’ it does not on the face of it seem to (without having access to the context it is impossible for me to definitely say one way or the other). ‘*Edom is in Modern Jewry*’ on the other hand would imply that Edomite genetic material forms part of the genetic heritage of modern jewry rather than the single source of their Semitic ancestry. I cannot imagine any other likely use of such a statement in the context of jewish heritage, which would seem to suggest anything like that, which ‘CelticSicilian’ claims it does.

Although we cannot say for sure we must consider this quote to be extremely dubious, especially because of its brevity, lack of its original context and that it even on the face of it doesn’t suggest support for ‘CelticSicilian’s’ assertions or argument. Therefore we may suggest that ‘CelticSicilian’ is again guilty of misrepresenting the meaning of the quotes he is using to falsely bolster his case.

‘CelticSicilian’ then quotes as follows:

“... *the large majority of surviving Jews in the world of Eastern European, and thus perhaps mainly of Khazar origin. If so, this would mean that their ancestors came not from the Jordan but from the Volga, not from Canaan, but from the Caucasus...and that genetically they are more closely related to the Hun, Uigur and Magyar tribes than to the seed of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob.*”

(*Arthur Koestler, The Thirteenth Tribe, Random House, 1967, p. 17*).’

A quotation from Arthur Koestler if one is trying to prove a Khazarian origin of the Ashkenazi jews is almost de rigueur, but although Koestler is indeed a valid source who makes an intellectual case. His views have long been considered debunked by academe. What is important to say here is that if we merely going to match literature there is Arthur Koestler, and presumably Shlomo Sand, on one side against essentially all specialists in Khazaria, as well as those specializing in general jewish history, who are currently working in the area. Thus there is little opportunity for Koestler to be correct given that his arguments have been categorically addressed

and debunked, while no substantial counter-arguments have been given. This isn't to say that Koestler's thesis might not be right, but rather on the evidence he presented, it is wrong, and there has been no significant new evidence in terms of history. Although the argument on genetics of the jews is potentially more rewarding to a Khazarian thesis, the evidence is at present largely misrepresented by pro-Khazarian origin authors[17].

I have pointed out and addressed some of the problems with Koestler's general thesis in Part I, but suffice to say unless 'CelticSicilian' has some new evidence, likely new to historiography, or some spectacular insights to offer then Koestler has to be considered debunked (although still a valid text to be cited in connection to Khazaria for some of the insights he offers).

CelticSicilian then quotes the below as proof that the jews are in fact the Edomites:

'Strictly speaking, it is incorrect to call an ancient Israelite a 'Jew' or to call a contemporary Jew an 'Israelite' or a 'Hebrew.'''

(The Jewish Almanac, Compiled and Edited by Richard Siegel and Carl Rheins (New York: Bantam Books, 1980) p. 3.)'

Now obviously this seems on the face of it to distance modern jewry from the Israelites of the Old Testament, however as we have noted before jews tend to chop and change definitions of what a jew is readily in order to make their defense easier (depending on what they are arguing against). 'CelticSicilian' is doing the same thing; the key is both in the text he quotes and in the wording used in the quote itself. The work 'CelticSicilian' is citing, 'The Jewish Almanac', is referring to jews as a religion; in fact the work is predicated on jews being a culture and a religion rather than a race (which is how 'CelticSicilian' is using it). Hence the use of it as a proof of Edomite racial origins is a falsification of its meaning, which if we include the other quotes above that have been subject to similar distortions forms a deliberate and disturbing pattern.

We are given a clue in the wording, '*strictly speaking*', because what is being referred to here is Judaism in ancient Israel was very different to the Judaism of today and even the contents of the Torah and Tanakh were open to question. Where-as in Judaism today they are fixed and accepted as canon by jews around the world. Also without the large quantity of responsa literature that characterizes Judaism today as well as the later sages who some jews follow and others don't (for example: Baal Shem Tov in the case of Hasidic jews) as well as the more general sages (such as Rashi, Maimonides etc) that nearly all jews defer to. Judaism is not the same religion and 'CelticSicilian' is right to refer to early Judaism as being primarily Mosaic or based around the figure of Moses, because Judaism at the time of the monarchs of Israel and that which we know today are radically different in the majority of respects with only a small number of basic beliefs in common to create the necessary theological continuum.

However he also misses out a crucial element in that Judaism was not the only religion in Judea and Israel at this time. Rather some scholars have challenged this view and argued that there was significant amount of pre-jewish ancestral beliefs in the area with a plethora of tribal deities and so forth[18]. It also worth noting that the Shekhina[19], as adopted by early Judaism, is quite

literally ‘God’s wife’[\[20\]](#), and therefore we can demonstrate with just one interesting piece of the puzzle that the meaning I have given, i.e. that the quote is about religion rather than race, is a valid one. Since the Shekhina played a key role in early Judaism and in the Judaism of the time of the monarchs of Israel it is further easy to demonstrate that both ‘CelticSicilian’s’ quote is bogus and that his entire argument as to the racial difference between the Israelites and modern jewry is completely suspect as well as his honesty.

Hence we must conclude that Incogman’s argument as he has presented it on his blog, as well as on the ‘White Nationalist’ internet forum, Stormfront, on, which he has used many of the arguments that we have addressed, is invalid and that the sources he has quoted and reproduced are sometimes mistaken, other times badly informed and perhaps most worrying of all: dishonest.

Semitic Controversies therefore has thrown down its corrective gauntlet to Incogman. If we are incorrect please correct us, but please do not carry on repeating the same old tired arguments that we have addressed above and in Part I. It does not bode well if you cannot answer counter-arguments made on a summary level as we have done above for the sake of brevity. We shall wait for your response Incogman, and we expect as you pertain to be an honest researcher into the jewish question, and have freely confessed your opinions on the issues dealt with above, that you at least answer us or concede.

[\[1\]](#) This can be found at the following address: <http://incogman.wordpress.com/2008/04/24/the-jews-who-are-not-the-ancient-israelites/>.

[\[2\]](#) Since when was H. G. Wells an authority on either biblical theology or jewish history? It is rather like quoting Ian Rankin as an authority on Christian theology and European history: vapid and in intellectual terms pointless. It does however show that ‘CelticSicilian’ is scraping around for ‘evidence’ for his assertions and H. G. Wells being a well known author, as well as a socialist ironically, likely is being by him as a veil of authority over his comments.

[\[3\]](#) In fact, whatever way you look at it. It is the word of jews with or without divine inspiration (and since man is an imperfect device (and has free will: which God would have to stop for) the word of God cannot be held to be the words of the Bible), although the Gnostic Gospels are far less jewish [since their authors were generally not jewish], the standard Bible is the word of God according to the jews.

[\[4\]](#) Since ‘CelticSicilian’ is the moniker of a follower of Christian Identity and by reproducing and lauding ‘CelticSicilian’s’ article and general views he implies that he has an acquaintance with the reason for ‘CelticSicilian’s’ views.

[\[5\]](#) Since if he was caused to be born by the Blessed Virgin Mary by God then he must be only of God rather than simply a case of (artificial) insemination as is presumed by ‘CelticSicilian’s’ argument. I.e. God by nature of his status, and unless one wants to engage in nonsensical anthropomorphism, didn’t have intercourse with the virgin but rather caused the baby Jesus to grow within her womb. There is a considerable, but subtle, difference between the two views and both have considerable consequences (i.e. in my stipulation: Jesus was God in anthropomorphic form and in ‘CelticSicilian’s’: Jesus was half-God and half-Man [therefore it is necessary to come up with complicated reasoning as to his racial background]).

[\[6\]](#) A study is implied by the wording of ‘*some genetic tests*’, but potentially that could be me being over optimistic.

[7] I have my doubts about the authenticity of this study, or studies, since I and another member of the Semitic Controversies team have searched a number of journal databases and the internet for such a study, but cannot find one, which found what is described. Also notably this study is apparently not cited on 'Khazaria.com', which would be the case if in fact it was real since 'Khazaria.com', run by author Kevin Alan Brook, is a major internet proponent of the Ashkenazi equals Khazar theory, which presumably 'CelticSicilian' has consulted. This can be consulted at the following address: <http://www.khazaria.com/>.

[8] It would also horrendously simplify all current scholarly literature on the issue.

[9] Peter Wolfe and Jeff Zolitor, 2002, 'The Khazars', Canadian Jewish Outlook. This is available at the following address: <http://www.csjo.org/pages/essays/essaykhazars.htm> [Accessed: 30/09/2008].

[10] This term refers to jews of North Africa and the Middle East. I haven't before now separated the Sephardim from the Mizrahi in my writing, because of the close social, economic, political, cultural, religious and martial links between the two parts of jewry. They are also often lumped together in terms of differentiating between the Ashkenazi synagogue ritual and that of other jews represented by the Sephardim (whose lead they generally follow).

[11] A pertinent question would be; which fall of the Roman Empire is he talking about: the fall of the Western Roman Empire (?), the fall of the pagan Roman Empire (?), the fall of the Byzantine Empire (?), or the fall of the Holy Roman Empire? I will presume here that 'CelticSicilian' means the fall of the pagan Roman Empire which is commonly dated to the 5th century AD.

[12] For example: William Morrison, 1890, 'The Jews under Roman Rule', 2nd Edition, G. P. Putnam & Sons: New York, pp. 197-206 and Allegro, Op. Cit, pp. 244-247.

[13] Allegro, Op. Cit., pp. 243-249.

[14] On Hasdai ibn Shaprut's interactions with the Khazars see: Yitzhak Baer, Trans: Louis Schoffman, 1961, 'A History of the Jews in Christian Spain', Vol. I, 1st Edition, Jewish Publication Society of America: Philadelphia, pp. 29-30.

[15] Wolfe and Zolitor, Op. Cit.

[16] See for example: Baer, Op. Cit, pp. 4-7.

[17] For example 'Khazaria.com' cites a number of genetic studies, which have shown significant infusions of Turkic/Slavic genetic material, but other wider studies have countered this assertion, suggesting that although there is an infusion of Turkic genetic material it isn't significant enough to broach a Khazarian thesis for the origin of the Ashkenazi. Especially since other potential hypotheses, such as interbreeding with a Turkic people, such as the Golden Horde, could have produced exactly the same effect and would be more likely in terms of significance.

[18] See Othmar Keel and Christoph Uehlinger, 1998, 'Gods, Goddesses, and Images of God in Ancient Israel', 1st Edition, T & T Clark: Edinburgh.

[19] Formerly the Mesopotamian goddess Ishtar.

[20] See William Dever, 2005, 'Did God Have A Wife?: Archaeology and Folk Religion in Ancient Israel', 1st Edition, Eerdmans: Grand Rapids. A review of this work can be found at the following address: <http://semiticcontroversies.blogspot.com/2008/06/book-review-did-god-have-wife.html>.

A Judeo-Bolshevik Debacle

Sunday, 5 October 2008

Readers of past and contemporary mainstream books, articles and various papers on what is today classed as "anti-semitic literature" will no doubt have come across the arguments of how the rise of the Bolsheviks and subsequent rule of communist Soviet was notably headed by jewish men of power. This article will deal with some of the misinformation or otherwise inaccurate claims concerning, "Judeo-Bolshevism", in particular some lists given by an oft used source on this matter, the british journalist Robert Wilton[1], who provided the West to a great extent with the imagery of a predominantly jewish Bolshevik government.

Let's begin with Wilton's list on the Central Committee of the Bolshevik Government 1918, which he reported consisted of three russians and nine jews:

"Bronstein (Trotsky), Apfelbaum (Zinoviev), Lurie (Larine), Uritsky, Volodarski, Rosenfeld (Kamenev), Smidovich, Sverdlov (Yankel), and Nakhamkes (Steklov). The three Russians were: Ulyanov (Lenin), Krylenko, and Lunacharsky." [\[2\]](#)

This is a problematic rendering for several reasons, let's start with the fact that Lurie, Nakhamkes, Smidovitch, and Volodarski weren't even in the Central Committee anytime between 1917-1922. Furthermore, for reasons due to the material presented by Wilton being demonstrably incorrect, his list doesn't include Stalin, it doesn't list Berzin nor Smilga either or Chubar, Manuilsky or Bukharin either.

The composition of the Central Committee in 1918 was:

"TsK: Members: Artem F. A., Buharin N. I. (Russian), Vladimirkij M. F. (Russian), Dzerzhinskij F. E. (Pole), Zinovjev G. E. (Jew), Krestinskij N. N. (Ukrainian), Lashevich M. M., Lenin V. I. (Russian), Sverdlov Ja. M. (Jew), Smilga I. T., Sokol'nikov G. Ja. (Jew), Stalin I. V. (Georgian), Stasova E. D. (Russian), Trotskij L. D. (Jew), Shmidt V. V. (German)" [\[3\]](#).

Tsk stands for Tsentral'nyj Komitet (Central Committee), and as is given above, there were 4 jews out of 15 members, not 9 jews out of 12 members. If we count the ¼ jew Lenin then there were 5 out of 15. While a notable disproportionate jewish membership, one that would more than suffice if you're interested in showing notable jewish membership and influence, it still demonstrates the erroneous list of Wilton's. However, for arguments sake let us assume that Wilton might have referred to the prior composition of Central Committee, the pre-October Revolution body of 1917, if so then the latest one in 1917, prior to the Revolution, consisted of the following members:

"TsK: Members: Artem F. A., Berzin Ja. A., Bubnov A. S. (Russian), Buharin N. I. (Russian), Dzerzhinskij F. E. (Pole), Zinovjev G. E. (Jew), Kamenev L. B. (Jew), Kollontaj A. M., Krestinskij N. N. (Ukrainian), Lenin V. I. (Russian), Milyutin V. P. (Russian), Muranov M. K. (Ukrainian), Nogin V. P. (Russian), Rykov A. I. (Russian), Sverdlov Ja. M. (Jew), Smilga I. T., Sokol'nikov G. Ja. (Jew), Stalin I. V. (Georgian), Trotskij L. D. (Jew), Uritskij M. S. (Jew), Shaumyan S. G."

Here we have 21 members and of those there are six jews, or seven if you count Lenin. Wilton's list continues with more grossly erroneous names:

"The Soviet government, or 'Council of People's Commissars' (also known as the 'Sovnarkom') was made up of the following, Wilton reported:

Peoples Commissariat (Ministry) Name Nationality

Chairman V.I. Ulyanov (Lenin) Russian
Foreign Affairs G.V. Chicherin Russian
Nationalities J. Dzhugashvili [Stalin] Georgian
Agriculture Protian Armenian
Economic Council Lourie (Larin) Jew
Food Supply A.G. Schlikhter Jew
Army and Navy [Military] L.D. Bronstein (Trotsky) Jew
State Control K.I. Lander Jew
State Lands Kaufmann Jew
Works [Labor] V. Schmidt Jew
Social Relief E. Lilina (Knigissen) Jew
Education A. Lunacharsky Russian
Religion Spitzberg Jew
Interior Apfelbaum [Radomyslski] (Zinoviev) Jew
Hygiene Anvelt Jew
Finance I. E. Gukovs [and G. Sokolnikov] Jew
Press Voldarski [Goldstein] Jew
Elections M.S. Uritsky Jew
Justice I.Z. Shteinberg Jew
Refugees Fenigstein Jew
Refugees Savitch (Assistant) Jew
Refugees Zaslovski (Assistant) Jew

Out of these 22 "Sovnarkom" members, Wilton summed up, there were three Russians, one Georgian, one Armenian, and 17 Jews."

Since the Sovnarkom (or Council of People's Commissariat) changed over the years the above must be a list on the years prior to 1921 when Wilton's book (the edition, which included these lists) on the matter came out. Although it would've helped had he given the actual year since it seems his list simply chooses some who were first, and some who were commissars later on, attached with false listings etc. Hence one would then have to include a whole lot more commissars if one is to jump between dates, to be fair, i.e. a whole lot more non-jewish commissars[\[4\]](#) would be included.

The established Council was originally established with the following members:

"Chairman: V. I. Lenin (1/4 Russian, Tatar, German, Jewish)

Commissar of Agriculture: V. P. Milyutin (Russian)
Commissars of Army and Navy: V. A. Ovseyenko, N. V. Krylenko, P. V. Dybenko (Russians, Osveyenko was ethnic ukrainian)
Commissar of Commerce and Industry: V. P. Nogin (Russian)
Commissar of Education: A. V. Lunacharsky (Ukranian)
Commissar of Food: I. A. Teodorovich (Polish, not jewish)
Commissar of Foreign Affairs: L. D. Trotsky (jewish)
Commissar of Interior: A. I. Rykov (Russian)
Commissar of Justice: G. I. Oppokov (Russian)
Commissar of Labour: A. G. Shlyapnikov (Russian)
Commissar of Nationality Affairs: I. V. Stalin (Georgian)
Commissar of Post and Telegraphs: N. P. Avilov (Russian)
Commissar of Treasury: I. I. Skvortsov-Stepanov (Russian)”[\[5\]](#), [\[6\]](#), [\[7\]](#)

Let's consider the above list while I comment further on the names of Wilton's list. The first jew on his list is Larin (Ministry of the Economic Council). This is false, Larin was not a minister there-of or in any ministry with the word "Economy" in it. The ministers of Finance (giving Wilton the benefit of a doubt let us include it) and of the commissariat of Supreme Council of National Economy between 1917-1922 were:[\[8\]](#)

Finance: Ivan Skvortzov, Isidor Gukovski, Vjatcheslav Menzhinski and Nikolai Krestinski.

Supreme Council of National Economy: Valerian Obolenski followed by Aleksei Rykov.

The second jew in Wilton's list is A.G. Schlikhter (Ministry of Food, Food Supply). While I have not been able to confirm whether or not he was in fact jewish, he was indeed minister of Food but only between the 18th of December 1917 and January 1st 1918. The one succeeding him was Aleksandr Tsiurupa (Cyurupa) who became the new minister of Food on January 1st 1918 and acted as such for the following three years. It is worth mentioning that while Schlikhter didn't act as minister for very long, he continued to work as a senior official for the Commissariat of Food Supply and was, under Cyurupa, an ardent radicalist urging the powers that be to use their over arching grasp on the food supplies as a means to further the totalitarian mentality of, as he is cited to have stated, "organized revolutionary violence"[\[9\]](#).

The third jew on the list is Trotsky (Ministry of Military and Navy Affairs). Trotsky was indeed a jew and also Commissar (i.e. minister) of Military and Navy Affairs between March 1918 to July 1923. The ministers of this Commissariat between 1917-1922 were Nikolai Podovski who was succeeded by Leon Trotsky.

The fourth jew on the list is Karl Lander (Ministry of State Control). I haven't found any sources that would confirm Lander to have been jewish, only Latvian, and Wilton did not add footnotes or a bibliography to support his assertions of who was jewish and who wasn't. Nevertheless, Lander was Minister of State Control between 1918 to 1919, preceded by Eduard Essen and succeeded by Josef Stalin then Aleksandr Cyurupa.

The fifth one is Kaufmann (Ministry of State Lands). There was no Commissariat of State Lands

in Lenin's Council of the People's Commissariat. He is not found in any of the existing Commissariat-groups between 1917-1922 either.

The sixth one is Vasili Schmidt (Ministry of Labour) who's ethnicity is not given in any sources available apart from his name being of obvious German extraction. He was however indeed minister of said section, between late 1918 to mid 1923, preceded by Aleksandr Shlyapnikov.

The seventh one is one E. Lilina (Social Relief). First let me point out that there wasn't a Commissariat/Ministry of Social Relief, there was one called Ministry of Social Affairs. Furthermore, there seems to be no sign anywhere in any ministry of an E. Lilina or "*Knigissen*" as is the additional name given to her by Wilton. The ministers of Social Affairs (there was no Commissariat called "Social Relief") between 1917-1922 were Aleksandra Kollontai, Aleksandr Vinokurov, Miron Vladimirov and Nikolai Milyutin.

The eighth one on the list is A. (Anatoli Vasilyevich) Lunacharsky (Ministry of Education). He was minister of Education between 1917 to 1923. He wasn't jewish though and if anyone has proof to the contrary then they are welcome to submit it.

The ninth one is Spitzberg, no first name given (Ministry of Religion). There was no Commissariat called "*Religion*", or anything with that name in it, but even if we assume that the Commissariat went under a different title this Spitzberg isn't found elsewhere in any other ministry during or after the given period of the USSR's Sovnarkoms.

The tenth one is Zinoviev (Ministry of Interior). While undoubtedly one of the more influential jews in power during the early years of the Bolsheviks new government: he was never the Minister of Interior. The ministers of Interior between 1917 to 1922 were Aleksei Rykov, Grigori Petrovski and then Felix Dzershinsky.

The eleventh one on the list is Anvelt (Ministry of Hygiene). Again: there was no Ministry with the word "*Hygiene*" in it. The closest one would be the Ministry of Health but the minister of it between 1917-1922 was Nikolai Semashko, not Jaan Anvelt who wasn't part of the Sovnarkoms at any time. However, Anvelt headed the communist party of Estonia and the "*Council of The Commune of the Working People of Estonia*", which was a short-lived republic that existed in parts of Estonia.

The twelfth and thirteenth jews are I. E. Gukovs and G. Sokolnikov (Ministry of Finance). The latter is correct but I can not confirm the former's ethnicity to have been jewish. The ministers of Finance between 1917-1922 were Ivan Skvortzov, Isidor Gukovski, Vjatsheslav Menzhinski and Nikolai Krestinski.

The fourteenth one on the list is Voldarski [Goldstein](Ministry of Press). There was no "*Commissariat of Press*", the closest one would have to be the Commissariat of Post and Telegraphs or the Commissariat of Communication. In any case, Voldarski (Volodarsky) was not minister in any of the given Sovnarkom categorical groups. Although, he was the head of the Press Division of the Executive Committee (until he was killed in June 1918) and appointed member of the editorial board of the central newspaper, which he shared with Milyutin, Stalin,

Sokolnikov and Podvojsky.

Let me add though that this does not suggest jews not to have been a hefty part of the Bolshevik publication apparatus as the editorial board of the central newspaper et al had a large overrepresentation of jews until the mid 1920's.

"For example, M. Zarubeznyi, author of the 1925 Yearbook of the People's Commissariat for Foreign Affairs, has a special list in his publication, The Jews in the Kremlin, with the names and functions of various Jews in the Foreign Commissariat, and he notes that among the key figures in the literary and publishing section of the People's Commissariat he found "not one gentile."[\[10\]](#)

The fifteenth jew is M.S. Uritsky (Minister of Elections). There was no ministry of Elections and Uritsky was not a minister elsewhere either. Uritsky was appointed in charge of the Checka section in Petrograd, though the head (the actual minister) of this entire section was Alexi Rykov, succeeded by Petrovsky and then Felix Dzerzhinsky.

The sixteenth is I.Z. Shteinberg (Ministry of Justice). This is correct, Steinberg was jewish and acted as minister of Justice for a period of three months in late 1917 to early 1918. He was preceded by Afanasi Lomov (Oppokov), Pjotr Strutshka and succeeded by Pjotr Strutshka (again) and Dimitri Kurski.

The eighteenth, nineteenth and twentieth ones are Fenigstein, Savich and Zaslovski (Ministry of Refugees). Unfortunately for Wilton, and those using his sources there was no minister of Refugees, those issues would have been dealt by the Ministry of Interior or State Control, neither housed any of the formentioned in the ministry there-of, or as ministers in any of the other Sovnarkom-categories.

Ergo, the claim that out of 22 Sovnarkoms, there were 17 jews is entirely fabricated and not only is the list problematic since it does not list a specific year (we are forced to go by the 1917-1922 due to Wilton's list being from 1921). It also handpicks people from different times, and adds them up into one finite list, giving the impression of higher jewish participation. As I said earlier, for such a list to have been valid and accurate it would've had to include many other ministers as well, most of whom weren't jews. Also, to falsely attribute a position to a jew that either didn't exist, or at least didn't hold that given position, only adds to the fraudulent case that define Wilton's lists.

Of the several alleged ministers between 1917-1922 mentioned by Wilton. We can only confirm three to have been jewish ministers of said positions. If I give Wilton the benefit of a doubt that the ones of unconfirmed jewish ancestry were actual jews then we would have had 6 jews. The list would no longer include just 22 Sovnarkoms though, because as the names have been picked between the period of 1917 to 1921 there would be some 60-61 ministers in the entire list. While not as remarkable a jewish overrepresentation as Wilton's list suggests, there would still be a noteworthy disproportionate representation of jews there-of, and for those who wish to make a point or argument about it should preferably avoid Wilton's work as it is demonstrably inaccurate.

I do not wish to make this article too lengthy, but I'd like to add a few brief notes on a more contemporary source that in general does little but echo the irrational and incorrect methodology on detailing Jewish influence and presence in the USSR's echelons. For an overall figure of Jewish membership: there was a chart provided by US Senator William King.[\[11\]](#)

In a recent paper written by Michael A Hoffman II[\[12\]](#), you will find comparable musings and especially similar lists that incorrectly attributes "Jewish" ancestry to a given name or simply ascribes a position to the Jew which he didn't have. Let's go through a few assertions of this text.

"Olga Bronstein: officer, Soviet Cheka Secret Police, sister of Trotsky, wife of Kamenev."

She was not part of the Cheka at any time nor the NKVD, rather she was involved in various education and theater work like the TEO (Theater Division of which she headed) and then various positions in foreign policy sections until her date of her execution.[\[13\]](#)

"Matvei Berman and Naftaly Frenkel: founders, the Gulag death camp system."

Frenkel was not a founder, but a prisoner, of what was to be one of the first Gulag camps: Solovetsky. He did eventually, during his term there, rise to inmate overseer and a commanding position there was given to him. After a year he was released. Due to his ability to, despite its utter lack of humanitarian sentiment in this context, turn profit and order in the administration of the camp, he got on Stalin's good side.[\[14\]](#) Which is why he later was given the commanding position of the BAMlag camp, a horrible place of death, famine etc. A pertinent quote on Frenkel:

"Even if Frenkel did not invent every aspect of the system, he did find a way to turn a prison camp into an apparently profitable economic institution, and he did so at a time, in a place, and in a manner which may well have brought that idea to the attention of Stalin."[\[15\]](#)

Why make up titles and deeds for people that one could readily criticize six ways from Sunday for what they actually did? If anything it only serves as a willing sacrifice for the hungry debunkers and opposers of critique against Jewry or Jewish involvement.

Another claim by Hoffman:

"Miron Vovsi: general, Soviet Red Army."

This is almost painfully inaccurate and Hoffman should know better, or perhaps not given his tendency for repetition and regurgitations of blatantly false information like the above. Miron was not a general but a doctor, actually he was one of Stalin's own back-and-call doctors, brother of Mikhoels Vovsi who was killed by order of Stalin for his work in anti-fascist groups etc.

"David Dragonsky: general, Soviet Red Army, Hero of the Soviet Union."

Never heard of him. If he was a general then he would've been listed in official records. He is also not listed anywhere as a general[\[16\]](#), nor as an officer as far as I've been able to confirm.

Perhaps Hoffman got the name from somewhere else? Dragonsky, the surname, is an old G.I Joe action-figure toy:

"A former member of the Soviet Army, DRAGONSKY joined the OKTOBER GUARD as the team's mechanic, welder, and incendiary weapons specialist. He has combined all three skills to build custom-designed fire-blasting attachments for the team's vehicles. COBRA forces have been unpleasantly surprised to find themselves blasted by a wall of flames where just moments ago there was only an innocent-looking transport vehicle."[\[17\]](#)

"Mikhail Chazkelevich: general, Soviet Red Army."

No: he is nowhere to be found either.

"Solomon Mikhoels: commissar of Soviet propaganda."

First of all, he was not a commissar. He was the head of the '*Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee*', he also (under Lenin) helped create the Moscow Jewish Theater. He was an actor and also directed plays there which would naturally not be opposed to the established regime's agenda or policies, however it has been noted that criticism of the communist regime was interwoven in these plays and whether or not this is true, the aftermath speaks for itself.[\[18\]](#) Solomon dealt too much, in Stalin's view of things, with other jews and jewish societies that weren't down with the communism programme so to speak.[\[19\]](#), [\[20\]](#).

Stalin launched a form of campaign in 1948-1952 against what was called, "*rootless cosmopolitans*". The officially communist-supportive committee, "*Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee*", were targeted, members arrested or killed and charged with disloyalty and "political incorrectness". The 1949 the campaign had heavy use of Stalin's mass-media against the "*rootless cosmopolitans*". Also, on an event postly called "Night of Murdered Poets", fifteen yiddish writers were executed under the formentioned label of "*rootless*". During these events, Stalin had Solomon killed as well.[\[21\]](#)

"Nikolai Bukharin: Lenin's chief theorist."

Well: Bukharin was not a jew.

"Samuel Agursky: commissar."

He wasn't a commissar. He did however work for a few years as an editor the yiddish Bolshevik paper called "*The Free Worker*", which was sectioned under the Peoples Commissariat of National Affairs. There, he together with Stalin signed a decree to dissolve jewish religious organisations as they in their regard attracted enemies and promoted a non-worker spirit.[\[22\]](#) He was arrested in 1938 and a year later exiled to Khazakstan where he subsequently passed away.

"Ivan Maisky"

He was not jewish unless there are some verifications around I've been unable to find.

The jewish overrepresentation of the high positions of power in the USSR/Bolshevik apparatus was indeed notable in its early years, but after Lenin's death and Stalin's rise, the numbers decreases heavily from the mid 20's and onward as can be seen by previously mentioned sources and information but also in the make up of the Bolshevik's Politburo section:

"10 [23] Oct 1917 Andrei Bubnov, Grigory Zinoviev, Lev Kamenev, Vladimir Lenin, Grigory Sokolnikov, Joseph Stalin and Leon Trotsky elected members of the Political Bureau at the Central Committee meeting"

2 Russians, 4 Jews, 1 Georgian.

"16 March 1921 Zinoviev, Kamenev, Lenin, Stalin and Trotsky elected full members at the Central Committee plenum; Bukharin, Kalinin and Vyacheslav Molotov elected candidate members."

3 Jews, 1 Georgian, 4 Russians.

"1 January 1926 Bukharin, Kliment Voroshilov, Zinoviev, Kalinin, Molotov, Rykov, Stalin, Tomsy and Trotsky elected full members at the Central Committee plenum; Dzerzhinsky, Kamenev, Grigory Petrovsky, Rudzutak and Nikolai Uglanov elected candidate members"

8 Russians, 3 Jews, 1 Latvia, 1 Pole, 1 Georgian.

"23 October 1926 Trotsky and Kamenev relieved of duties at the joint plenum of the Central Committee and the Central Control Commission "

1 Jew, Kaganovich.

"19 December 1927 Bukharin, Voroshilov, Kalinin, Kuibyshev, Molotov, Rykov, Rudzutak, Stalin and Tomsy elected full members at the Central Committee plenum; Andreyev, Kaganovich, Kirov, Stanislav Kosior, Mikoyan, Petrovsky, Uglanov and Chubar elected candidate members"

1 Armenian, 1 Latvian, 1 Jew, 2 Ukrainians, 1 Georgian, 11 Russians.

"13 July 1930 Voroshilov, Kaganovich, Kalinin, Kirov, Kosior, Kuibyshev, Molotov, Rudzutak, Rykov and Stalin elected full members at the Central Committee plenum; Andreyev, Mikoyan, Petrovsky, Syrtsov and Chubar elected candidate members."

1 Armenian, 1 Georgian, 1 Jew, 1 Latvian, 2 Ukrainians, 9 Russians.

"10 February 1934 Andreyev, Voroshilov, Kaganovich, Kalinin, Kirov, Kosior, Kuibyshev, Molotov, Ordzhonikidze and Stalin elected full members at the Central Committee plenum; Mikoyan, Petrovsky, Pavel Postyshev, Rudzutak and Chubar elected candidate members"

2 Georgians, 1 Armenian, 1 Latvian, 2 Ukrainians, 1 Jew, 8 Russians. [23]

Or as Medvedev wrote:

"The myth of the non-Russian, or more narrowly, the Jewish character of the October Revolution and Soviet government first arose during the civil war. The White Guard press, and later the Russian emigre press were full of references to the "Kike-Bolshevik commissars" and the "Kike-Bolshevik Red Army." Even the London Times [Robert Wilton was the Times Correspondent -PM] wrote on March 5, 1919, that Jews held 75 percent of the leading positions in the RSFSR. The proceedings of the 439th and 469th sessions of the U.S. Senate contain the assertion that "in 1918 the Government in Petrograd consisted of 16 Russians and 371 Jews, with 265 of those Jews having come from New York." The story is still being told in many Russian emigre publications, though not in such fantastic form." [24]

This sort of bad research and relying on problematic sources is a real problem with the anti-semitic literature (in many cases: Eastern European/Slavic sources), there needs to be a yardstick set and a defined methodology of approaching critique of jewry and activities there-of in history. Passing around sources like Wilton and Hoffman who seem to name just about everyone in the old USSR as jewish does not help, but moreso tips the scale of critique to be used as cannon fodder for the ADL's of this world, giving them the justification for claiming critique of jews to be irrational and stupid. I implore those wanting to bring the actual figures of representation and the given functions of the representatives to curb their enthusiasm and simply go with what they can corroborate and confirm, beyond David Duke's "Jewish Supremacism", or similary myopic sources critiquing jews. It is time people stopped becoming willing buffoons and ideological renegades spouting, purporting and regurgitating any bit of information they can get their hands on just because it appears to be slanderous enough against jews and jewry.

Strive to be correct, coherent and factual . Recognize that as such your methodology should have few sweethearts. Since there is a fundamental difference between your preferred ideology and your applied method of scrutiny and research: the latter should not obey the former, but rather the case would ideally be the opposite.

[1] Wilton worked as a war-correspondent journalist stationed in western Russia on behalf of the british "The Times" before, during and some years after the October Revolution in 1917. The name-the-jew lists he composed on the new government's membership were included in the french edition of his "Last Days of the Romanovs" (1920), they were not included in the english editions at that time.

[2] Robert Wilton; "Les Derniers Jours des Romanoffs" (1921) cited in Mark Weber: "The Jewish Role In The Bolshevik Revolution", The Journal of Historical Review:

http://www.ihr.org/jhr/v14/v14n1p-4_Weber.html

[3] S. A. Mesyats, "Istoriya vysshykh organov KPSS", <http://holocaust.skeptik.net/misc/party.htm>

[4] "Commissar" is interchangeable with "minister", it was due to the latter being viewed as a bourgeois term that the former was applied.

[5] <http://www.marxists.org/glossary/orgs/c/o.htm>

[6] <http://www.terra.es/personal2/monolith/ussr.htm>

- [7] <http://www.terra.es/personal2/monolith/ussr2.htm>
- [8] <http://www.elisanet.fi/daglarsson/dokumentit/sov.htm#LENIN%202>
- [9] Bread and Butter Authority in Russia 1914-1921: <http://www.escholarship.org/editions/view?docId=ft796nb4mj&doc.view=content&chunk.id=d0e6288&toc.depth=1&anchor.id=0&brand=eschol>
- [10] M. Zarubezny, *'The Jews in the Kremlin'* (published in Russian), alef Publishing, Tel Aviv, Feb. 1989, No. 263, 26. http://officeexit.info/shop/images/TBR%20Sept_Oct%202008%20Small.pdf
- [11] "Conditions in Russia" http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Image:1924_Chart_-_Conditions_in_Russia.png
- [12] *'Judaic Communists: The Documentary Record'* (<http://www.revisionisthistory.org/communist.html>)
- [13] Robert Leach and Victor Borovsky. *"A History of Russian Theatre"*, Cambridge University Press, 1999
- [14] Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, *"The Gulag Archipelago"*, New York, 1973
- [15] Anne Applebaum, *"Gulag: A History of the Soviet Camps"*, Penguin Books, London, 2004, p. 51
- [16] http://www.generals.dk/nation/Soviet_Union/Dr.html
- [17] COMPLETE GUIDE TO G. I. JOE: A REAL AMERICAN HERO (<http://joes.propadeutic.com/2006.html>)
- [18] <http://www.joshuarubenstein.com/stalinsecret/intro.html>
- [19] <http://www.haaretz.com/hasen/spages/998756.html>
- [20] <http://english.pravda.ru/society/showbiz/11-01-2003/1760-mikhoels-0>
- [21] Stéphane Courtois, *"The Black Book of Communism: Crimes, Terror, Repression"*, Harvard University Press, 1999
- [22] <http://www.freearabvoice.org/books/marxismAndJewishQuestion/Lenin.htm>
- [23] <http://www.terra.es/personal2/monolith/ussr2.htm> , <http://holocaust.skeptik.net/misc/party.htm>
- [24] Roy Aleksandrovich Medvedev, *"Let History Judge"*, Trans. George Shriver, Columbia University Press, 1989, pp. 559-560

On Jewish 'Traitors': Marcus Eli Ravage

Tuesday, 7 October 2008

Marcus Eli Ravage wrote two articles of much interest to anti-jewish individuals and groups: *'A Real Case against the Jews'*[1] and *'Commissary to the Gentiles'*[2], both of which appeared in *'The Century Magazine'*. Both his articles do not make very pleasant reading in that they are written in a haughty and condescending tone, which is claimed as satire by pro-jewish individuals and groups and as boasting by anti-jewish individuals and groups.

Ravage is unusual among jews who are asserted to claim openly that jews do in fact run/control the world. Since his two articles are often read and used by anti-jewish individuals, especially during debates and 'information threads' on anti-jewish forums, but are rarely cited within the anti-jewish literature, even that of their contemporary time, beyond simple asserting that they

support such-and-such a conclusion (and even that is rare). It would seem the articles have been kept in the anti-jewish eyes, because of their being periodically reprinted by anti-jewish groups to furnish hostile testimony as to what in fact the jews are up to.

On the other side of the fence, in the world of pro-jewish individuals and groups Ravage's two articles have attracted even less attention perhaps, because they have been summarily dismissed as satire by said individuals and groups.

It is important to examine Ravage's two articles, because of their use on anti-jewish forums as supporting hostile testimony to a jewish conspiracy being in operation. Also, rather importantly, despite the generalities of Ravage's assertions and claims, they can in fact be somewhat investigated being as they relate to general history and specifically Christianity. This makes them rather unusual in terms of 'jewish traitor' testimony, because the majority of this testimony/evidence is from apparently friendly witnesses who write quite disarmingly about what they suggest the jewish conspiracy is but whom often write about their own 'special knowledge' as having been an insider within the conspiracy itself and have 'seen the light'.

Ravage on the other hand writes in an abrasive, often quite sarcastic manner and is obviously trying to write against anti-Semitism by declaring how 'irrational' it is using Christianity as the medium to declare that jews have dominated the world through Christianity and that if there is, and indeed was, a jewish conspiracy in operation then that is the conspiracy at work, because he claims it is much more fundamental to civilisation than whether a jewish magnate controls this newspaper, that radio station or the bank over the street.

Ravage's articles on anti-Semitism should not be surprising since he wrote from what I can discover a great many articles on jews as they related to the United States and especially on recent jewish immigrants to the United States[3]. They are written in the spirit of defence of the community, which jews are rather well known. We can only presume from this that the two articles in Century Magazine are a continuation of this mindset and raison d'être rather than something written out of the blue as so many anti-jewish individuals and groups seem to. The reasoning behind their being written is indirectly given to us in the text of '*A Real Case against the Jews*' when Ravage states as follows:

'We shirk our patriotic duty in wartime because we are pacifists by nature and tradition, and we are the arch-plotters of universal wars and the chief beneficiaries of those wars (see the late Dearborn Independent, passim, and The Protocols of the Elders of Zion)'. [4]

What Ravage is indirectly saying here is that he is writing to defend his people against the charges laid against them in '*The Dearborn Independent*' and in '*The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*', but what Ravage fears hear is not really anti-Semitism per se, but rather that anti-Semitism is being purported by captains of American industry in particular Henry Ford. Whose book, '*The International Jew: The World's Foremost Problem*' [5] is both made up of articles taken from his newspaper, '*The Dearborn Independent*' [6], and that both '*The Dearborn Independent*' and '*The International Jew*' take their description of the jewish question largely from '*The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*'. This allusion to these two specific publications combined with his use of Christianity as a medium for his attack on anti-Semitism, suggest that these articles are in

response to Henry Ford's, '*The International Jew*'. For in Vol. IV of '*The International Jew*' Henry Ford includes a very particular appeal to gentiles[7], by which he means of course Christians[8], as well as a direct appeal to the jews[9], which may or may not, but in my opinion it is likely, have served as basis for Ravage's two articles.

We may further see this in Ravage's anti-jewish themes that he maintains throughout both articles in so far as we find all of them prominently included in '*The International Jew*' and although they are all staples of anti-jewish thought at the time '*The International Jew*' is the only work where all these accusations are brought together at the time (and was also the object of recent nationwide controversy in the United States at the time). Hence we can conclude that, '*The International Jew*', was likely what Ravage was using as the representative work of the anti-jewish thought he uses in his two articles.

In essence Ravage can be said to be in fear of exactly the '*top*' and '*bottom*' social combination against the jews that Benjamin Ginsberg described in his theory of why anti-Semitism was acted upon in some countries/nations and not in the case of others[10]. Ironically Ginsberg's use of an archetypal country where this has not been the case is the United States[11], but certainly such a combination would be familiar to Ashkenazi jews, particularly those formerly of the Russian Empire, where open and sometimes violent anti-jewish activity was the province of both the nobility and the peasantry[12]. This is best illustrated in the quasi-hysterical, but at the same time snide, tone of the articles, which although obviously written to try and give a satirical counter to anti-jewish accusations, are written in an emotionally disturbed state as when one writes about something that one feels potentially threatens one's own well being.

Ravage being very strongly committed to the preservation and furtherance of his race, as evidenced by his other articles, such as those published in Harper's Magazine, would likely view such a combination of captains of industry, such as Henry Ford, with the working men and the peasantry[13] as a direct threat to both his race's well being and his own. He would also likely have seen such a combination as a barrier to further progress for them in acquiring what jews have historically presumed to be theirs: a controlling interest in society both to protect themselves from such '*top*' and '*bottom*' combinations, but also in order to suit their Freudian egoistic needs for recognition of their superior status (and the necessary acquisition of wealth to make this a general reality).

This discussion thus sheds some very necessary light on the context of Ravage's two articles, which if viewed without context would seem to be far more malevolent than they in fact are. However they are not what philo-Semitic authors would wish them to be as in an innocent and courageous attempt at a satire of anti-Semitic views in the early part of the twentieth century. This is because regardless of supposed satire, which appears more as glaze rather than as anything more substantial within the work, the message that Ravage seems to want to deliver is that jews are central to Western civilisation, because the Christianity of today, as it was in Ravage's day, is derived in part from Judaism[14] and thus from jews.

Ravage's thesis regardless of satire is directed very pointedly at Aryan, i.e. Western, civilisation and seeks to prove that, because Western Europe has grown up in the arms of the Church in all her guises. It thus should be grateful to the jews for creating it, because in Ravage's estimation,

as to many other jews who in times of trouble always extend appeals to gentiles, usually Aryans, declaring in various degrees of politeness that because Christianity is jewish in origin then they should look favourably upon its creators.

This, of course, is the logic used by many Christians today in their support of Israel, because it has been impressed upon them, largely by jews, that Jesus was a jew and thus they must support jews no matter the cost. There is a whole body of theological speculation, largely concerning the Book of Revelations cross-referenced with books of the Old Testament such as Ezekiel, acting as support to this position, but it is enough to say here that this was no less true in Ravage's day than it is at present. All that has changed is the dimensions of the problem with it having been magnified astounding in last eighty years since Ravage's day[\[15\]](#).

If we look to the context of what I have argued is Ravage's motivation behind the writing of these two articles then we realise that Ravage's assertion that Christianity is the path through which the jews have operated is three things: it is a factual assertion, a satirical weapon and a plea for clemency for his race. Since when Ravage asserts, indirectly, that Christianity is jewish he is making these three weapons it is necessary to point out that they follow a logical sequence each dependent on the other.

This sequence is as follows: if Christianity is jewish (and therefore we may presume Aryan, i.e. Western European, civilisation is predicated on jewish ideas) then this fact because a satirical weapon because the anti-Semites from whose work Ravage is taking as representative, i.e. Henry Ford as argued above, are suggesting that the jews are corrupting Aryan civilisation but yet the basis of this civilisation, Christianity, is jewish. This thus makes the anti-Semitic argument absurd and hypocritical by declaring that the very thing that they are seeking to protect is jewish at its core and therefore it thus becomes a plea for clemency. This becomes a plea for clemency in so far that Ravage is asserting again indirectly, since remember he is covering what he writes with satirical gloss, that if the anti-Semites want to stop the rot in Western civilisation then they should embrace rather than attack the jews. He is indirectly telling his reader that the world should endorse the jews and put them in charge of their countries for the simple reason that the jews have created Christianity and therefore on his premises created Aryan civilisation.

This a sympathetic argument that is made to appeal to the reader who would like to think of themselves as a liberally-minded man or woman and to subtly place certain germs of presumptions and ideas into the readers head, which can at the same time seemingly disgust the reader with the supposedly intellectually crude and illiberal manner of anti-Semitism and inspire interest in the well-being of the jews.

This first effect, and indeed apparently the main intent of the articles, is affected by the satirical weapon, which is where the harsh and haughty language is used to really emphasize the satirical weapon to such a degree as to be quite vicious and overwrought, it is almost seemingly boastful[\[16\]](#). This would seem to be calculated to make the reader guffaw at the 'idiocy' of the anti-Semites and consider that they are superior, because he/she has the liberal turn of mind to read and accept such stinging and apparently educated criticism of the anti-Semitic position.

If one comprehends the liberal mind then one realises that those that are politically liberal tend to

be lovers of types of political discourse, which give the supposition of education, such as political satire, but which in reality contain little real critical substance. The appeal to a liberal mind is obvious if we also acknowledge that many of those of such turns of mind were then, although far less so now, devoutly Christian, usually of the Protestant variety, and their liberalism was predicated on their Christianity. This first effect then allows the discarding of the anti-Semitic theory by the reader who presumes him or herself liberally-minded.

The second effect, and the additional intent, of the article are affected by the plea for clemency, which is where the precise rather than the general arguments used come into play. The specific line of reasoning that Ravage uses, as we have stated above, is that Christianity is a Jewish creation and by playing off the then widespread religious devotion 'proves' to his reader that, because Christianity was at the heart of Aryan civilisation that the Jews were, and are, a force for progression in Western Europe.

I have termed this element the 'plea for clemency', because it comes off to the reader that what Ravage is subtly appealing for is aid from the, presumably Gentile Christian, reader in fighting the anti-Semites and their arguments. The plea is brought about by the appeal to charitable instincts by Ravage arguing that the contributions of the Jews should be acknowledged and that if they should be blamed for anything it should be for their great service to Aryan civilisation and forbearance of their 'persecution'. Hence allowing Ravage's argument to be heard since it subtly appeals to charitable sentiments on the part of the reader as well as allowing his two effects to be realised upon the liberally-minded contemporary reader.

So when we acknowledge the context in which Ravage wrote and the methodology that he has appeared to follow in writing the article. It becomes apparent that both the anti-Jewish and pro-Jewish thesis seems on the face of it to be called into question.

Since Ravage is not confirming the anti-Jewish argument so much as using it to attack itself with a thesis of his own, i.e. that Christianity is a Jewish creation, so any comment Ravage is in fact making is not a confirmation of the anti-Jewish thesis argued in the '*The International Jew*' and '*The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*' and if it is taken as such then the individual or group using it like so only plays into Ravage's hands by allowing him to suggest that they are in fact stupid and don't know what they are talking about. Which as I believe I have covered is essentially the result of his argument in that if the anti-Semites don't know that Christianity is Jewish, according to Ravage, then they really are quite unlearned, irrational and probably stupid. Therefore Ravage cannot be considered evidence for the validity of the assertions about Jewish control of finance, media, culture etc, because he is writing it to tear it down with his suppositions about Christianity and nor can he be considered a traitor to Jewry or to even be boasting.

On the pro-Jewish side, however, the argument that Ravage is merely being satirical is also quite vapid, but it has a kernel of truth to it^[17]. In that Ravage is indeed using satire as his medium, but he is not doing it simply to defend the Jews, but rather the context in which he writes and what he writes. Indicates that Ravage is in fact trying to gain advantage for his race, the Jews, rather than simply defend them. His argument relies on more than trying to poke fun at anti-Semites, but rather as we have briefly argued it includes an obvious logical element whereby the Jews must be the centre of civilisation, since if Aryan, i.e. Western, civilisation is based on

Christianity and Christianity, according to Ravage, is Jewish then Jews are the basis of civilisation. Hence thus indirectly putting forward the idea that because Jews are the basis of civilisation that they should be given absolute reign to do what they will, i.e. to be allowed to rule the cultural, intellectual, economic, social and political life of any nation in which they reside. So Ravage's words are hardly simply satire, but rather have both a defensive but also offensive purpose that needs to be recognised in order to realise their importance is in the stereotypical Jewish nature.

The real meaning of Ravage is in the nature of his writing and getting beneath the surface of it to find out what Ravage is actually thinking and how that logic flows from his other writings and progresses in the ones under consideration. Ravage, in essence, provides us, if we look at his writing carefully, a window to the Jewish mind and soul. A study of which a student of the Jewish question will find highly rewarding. In essence: it is necessary to treat Ravage as what he was rather than trying to make him, and his writing, into something it isn't. It is unfortunate that Ravage wasn't a toady to the Rothschild family and that his words aren't boasting, but we have to deal with Jews and their words as they are, rather than how we would like them to be. That is the key to fighting and defeating the Jewish enemy.

[1] Marcus Eli Ravage, 1928, '*A Real Case against the Jews: One of Them Points Out the Full Depth of Their Guilt*', The Century Magazine, Vol. 115, No. 3, pp. 346-351. This is available at the following address: <http://www.ety.com/HRP/leaflets/ravage/ravage1.htm>.

[2] Marcus Eli Ravage, 1928, '*Commissary To The Gentiles: The First to See the Possibilities of War by Propaganda*', The Century Magazine, Vol. 115, No. 4, pp. 476-483. This is available at the following address: <http://www.ety.com/HRP/leaflets/ravage/ravage2.htm>.

[3] For example he wrote several articles in Harper's Magazine in early 1917 on the subject of Jews, specifically recent Jewish immigrants to the United States from eastern Europe, defending them from accusations made against them and seeming to be writing to 'dispel stereotypes'. These can be found at the following address: <http://harpers.org/subjects/MERavage>.

[4] Ravage, '*A Real Case against the Jews*', Op. Cit.

[5] Henry Ford, 1920-22, '*The International Jew: The World's Foremost Problem*', 4 Vols., 1st Edition, Dearborn Publishing Company: Dearborn.

[6] The Dearborn Independent was the Ford Company's paper that Henry Ford marketed to his employees and hence was widely read due to Ford's status as both a friend to the honest working man (he treated and paid his workers well but he would not abide communist agitation within their ranks) and because it was officially encouraged within the Ford company for one to read the official paper.

[7] Henry Ford, 1922, '*An Address to "Gentiles" on the Jewish Problem*' in Henry Ford, 1922, '*The International Jew: The World's Foremost Problem*', Vol. IV, 1st Edition, Dearborn Publishing Company: Dearborn. This article was originally published in '*The Dearborn Independent*' of the 14th January, 1922. It can be found at the following address: http://www.jrbooksonline.com/Intl_Jew_full_version/ij80.htm.

[8] The article starts off with references to Gentiles in general, but in the 9th paragraph we see the beginning of mention of Christians and Christianity in place of talking about the Gentiles so it is correct to infer that what Ford was transliterating Gentiles for Christians in his own mind. See Ibid.

[9] Henry Ford, 1922, '*Candid Address to Jews on the Jewish Problem*', in Henry Ford, 1922,

'The International Jew: The World's Foremost Problem', Vol. IV, 1st Edition, Dearborn Publishing Company: Dearborn. This article was originally published in *'The Dearborn Independent'*, of the 7th January, 1922. It can be found at the following address:

http://www.jrbooksonline.com/Intl_Jew_full_version/ij79.htm.

[10] Benjamin Ginsberg, 1993, *'The Fatal Embrace: Jews and the State'*, 1st Edition, University of Chicago Press: Chicago.

[11] Ibid, pp. 97-144

[12] Ibid. pp. 56-57

[13] These two groups are called, the Folk, in the National Socialist weltanschauung.

[14] The influence of Judaism upon Christianity is often fantastically over-stated, largely by jews and protestant branches of Christianity, for both innocent and malicious reasons. The link between the two is often used to claim Jesus Christ was a jew, when was patently not, and thus to force as many as the Folk as possible into supporting the jews, and in particular Israel, on the reasoning that *'Jesus was also a jew'*. In fact Judaism is the interpretation by jews of other religions in the Middle East at the time and relation between early Judaism and the religions that surround it is largely one of jews absorbing and making sense of these ideas within their own racial perceptions of them thus creating Judaism.

[15] Some most vocal opponents of anti-Semitism at this time were Protestant Christians, especially of the Calvinist persuasion (or influenced by Calvin's thought), who argued that the jews as a people selected by God, and of whom they claimed Jesus Christ sprang, that jews could not possibly be evil and the 'jewish entrepreneurial spirit' was not something to be concerned about but was rather to be admired. For example see: Rev. D. McDougall, 1938?, *'The Story of Jew-Baiting'*, 1st Edition, The Jewish Mission Committee of the Church of Scotland: Edinburgh.

[16] This is where anti-Semites seem to get their position on the matter from as well as the accusation that Ravage was a lackey or devotee of the Rothschild family. Since I can find little to no connexion between the various branches of the Rothschild family and Ravage I must provisionally conclude that this is a later addition to provide some context to the article and to enhance its contents by suggesting, like Benjamin Freedman has about himself, that Ravage was in on the conspiracy and for some unknown reason decided to pen two articles boasting about it. An example of the Rothschild allegation can be found in Anon., 1990, *'The Project Newsletter'*, Vol. 7, No. 4. This is available at the following address:

<http://wiretap.area.com/Gopher/Library/Fringe/Conspiracy/proj-7.4> [Accessed: 03/10/2008]. The exact wording is as follows: *'Marcus Eli Ravage, a Jewish writer from the 1920's who worshiped at the feet of the Rothschilds, wrote A Real Case Against the Jews to prove that Christianity was created by Jews to destroy the Roman Empire and the robust Pagan spirit that prevented Jewish control of Pagan society. Only with the Pagans transformed under Jesus "meek and mild" could the Jews rise to covert world imperium! There is some chance this was written as a satire, but who knows?'*

[17] As most modern anti-Semites are yet to realise the key to much jewish writing is that it contains a lot of factual material, but the trick is spotting the manipulative twist and what is left out in that writing.

A Worthy Set of Principles: Theodor Fritsch's Decalogue

Friday, 10 October 2008

We reprint the following to show the reader a glimpse of the worthy thought of Theodor Fritsch as a 19th century German perspective on how one should begin to apply the philosophy of being jew-free. This of course applies if you are not a student of the jewish question, which would require you to act contrary to the principles outlined below, but can be stuck to in spirit rather than in letter, if you are such a student of the jewish question, by separating one's research from one's personal life as to not infect yourself, your family and your home. It is worth noting the difference in what Fritsch states plainly and simply with the mealy-mouthed and quasi-hysterical criticism of jews that is forthcoming from most so-called anti-Semites today. Fritsch says what he means so if you are easily offended please do not read further: if you do so then you risk being rather offended if you are of a philo-Semitic disposition.

‘1. Be proud of being a German and strive earnestly and steadily to practice the inherited virtues of our people, courage, faithfulness and veracity, and to inspire and develop these in thy children.

2. Thou shall know that thou with all thy fellow Germans, regardless of faith or creed, hast a common implacable foe. His name is the jew.

3. Thou shall keep thy blood pure. Consider it a crime to soil the noble Aryan breed of thy people by mingling it with the jewish breed. For thou must know that jewish blood is everlasting, putting the jewish stamp on body and soul lasting until the farthest generations.

4. Thou shall be helpful to thy fellow German and further him in all matters not counter to the German conscience, the more so if he be pressed by the jew. Thou shall at once take into court any offense or crime committed by the jew in deed, word or letter, that comes to thy knowledge, lest the jew abuse the laws of our country with impunity.

5. Thou shall have no social intercourse with the jew. Avoid all contact and community with the jew and keep him away from thyself and thy family, especially thy daughters, lest they suffer injury of body and soul.

6. Thou shall have no business relations with the jews. Never choose a jew as a business partner, nor borrow nor buy from him, and keep your wife, too, from doing so. Thou shall sell nothing to him, nor use him as an agent in thy transactions, that thou may remain free and not become a slave unto the jew nor help to increase his money, which is the power by which he enslaves our people.

7. Thou shall drive the jew from thy own breast and take no example from jewish tricks and jewish wiles, for thou shall never match the jew in trickery but forfeit thy honour and earn the contempt of thy fellow Germans and the punishment of the courts.

8. Thou shall not entrust thy rights to a jewish lawyer, nor thy body to a jewish physician, nor thy children to a jewish teacher lest thy honour, body and soul suffer harm.

9. Thou shall not listen nor give credence to the jew. Keep all jewish writings away from thy

German home and hearth lest their lingering poison may unnerve and corrupt thyself and thy family.

10. Thou shall not use violence against the jews because it is unworthy of thee and against the law. But if a jew attacks thee, ward off his Semitic insolence with German wrath.'[1]

Let Fritsch's words serve as the ideological basis from which we must begin to study jewry as it is, and not lower ourselves to the level of jews, and other Semites, by deliberate misdirection and misrepresentation of sources. The new anti-Semitism must ground itself in fact and make itself intellectually viable by standing on calm and careful scholarship, while being purported and distributed among the folk by incisive propaganda, which bases itself on what can be reasonably argued and inferred from the facts. Anti-Semites must address and fight the jew as he is and not some fantasy that he or she maintains is in fact the jew. The jew is not a monster in a fantasy novel, but a biological creature who in order to fight you have to be able to understand, while adhering in spirit to the principles, outlined by Fritsch above, in order to keep yourself from becoming unduly affected by that which you fight.

[1] Translated from the German of Thomas Frey [Theodor Fritsch], 1893, '*Antisemiten-Katechismus: Eine Zusammenstellung des wichtigsten zum Verstaendnis der Judenfrage*', 1st Edition, H. Beyer: Leipzig, p. 858. Alternative and slightly different translations to mine are available in Paul Mendes-Flohr and Jehuda Reinharz, 1980, '*The Jew in the Modern World: A Documentary History*', 1st Edition, Oxford University Press: New York: pp. 287-288; and Paul Massing, 1967, '*Rehearsal for Destruction: A Study of Political Anti-Semitism in Imperial Germany*', 2nd Edition, H. Fertig: New York, pp. 306-307.

In Brief: The Selenkov Quotation

Friday, 10 October 2008

It was recently drawn to my attention that there is a quotation from a supposed Bolshevik leader called Selenkov in 1922 that is often reproduced on Nationalist forums and in some Nationalist literature[1]. It is relevant to the jewish question, because it is often used in connexion with the '*Judeo-Bolshevism*' thesis to further prove the [conspiratorial] hostility of jews to non-jewish Nationalism.

The quotation runs as follows:

'We must create a climate of anti-nationalism and anti-racialism amongst Whites. We must reduce patriotism and pride of race to meaningless abstractions and make racialism a dirty word.'

This is in an '*In Brief*', because this quote seems to have come from no-where in terms of the literature in so far that it is not apparently not referred to or re-produced in Wilton's '*The Last Days of the Romanovs*'[2] or any other Nationalist/anti-Communist literature I can find[3]. I have largely been checking the indexes for the name rather than re-reading the many works

involved, but I am yet to find either the name or the quote being used. I have also checked several standard works on the Bolshevik revolution and the USSR: I am yet to find a Bolshevik leader called Selenkov, or even Zelenkov, in 1922[4]. I have also used several search engines to look for a communist/Marxist/Bolshevik leader named Selenkov/Zelenkov, but have come away empty-handed apart from uses of this quotation none of which have been found with attribution to an originating source for the quote although Birdwood's use of quotes seems to suggest that the origin may be Eustace Mullins once again.

The fact that in Birdwood's work the quotation is reproduced after quotations from Eustace Mullins' book, *'A History of the Jews'*, and after the unproven quotation from Israel Cohen's, *'A Racial Program for the Twentieth Century'* [5], would potentially seem to suggest that this is another quotation that we cannot find an origin for that may or may not have been first referenced by Eustace Mullins. It isn't in the index of George Knupffer's, *'The Struggle for World Power'* [6] and nor can I find it in a brief scan of Admiral Barry Domville's, *'From Admiral to Cabin Boy'* [7], which are all often cited by Birdwood. There is the possibility it is in Guy Carr's *'Pawns in the Game'*, which I do not have immediate access to a copy of, but I am doubtful of it given the tenor of Carr's remarks on these subjects. I haven't read and do not have access to a copy of Mullin's, *'A History of the Jews'*, but on balance I may reasonably expect to find it there with potentially an assertion about Selenkov being a Jew. If it is not there then its origins must truly remain a mystery.

The reason for this is relatively simple in that it is a quote, which is structured on the same lines as the Israel Cohen quotation, isn't likely to have been written or spoken by a Marxist who would have put in some reference to nationalism as being of 'bourgeoisie' origins and how race was a tool of the 'ruling class' to keep the 'proletariat' divided and hence able to be exploited. The wording that the Bolsheviks must '*reduce*' race to '*meaningless abstractions*' directly infers that this Selenkov knows, and importantly believes, that race is meaningful and this is deliberately trying to cover it up. No Bolshevik would have done this for to them race was non-existent and the differences between races were merely superficial and without real meaning. I think we may presume that had this Selenkov actually said the above passage he would have been denounced to the Cheka in short order and sentenced for 'politically incorrect/counter-revolutionary activities', especially since we are told, and I presume this Selenkov is male, he is a '*Bolshevik leader*'.

It's also worth mentioning that '*Whites*' in the quotation means the 'White race' [8] and not the anti-Communist, and usually Monarchist, forces for there is no use of 'counter-revolutionary', or its plural 'counter-revolutionaries', in the two sentences, which would almost always prefix any reference to '*Whites*', if the term '*Whites*' was even mentioned for in Marxist thinking they would just merely be 'counter-revolutionaries' or 'reactionaries' rather than anything more colloquial. There was no real concept of the 'White race' in Russia in this period since racialism had only just begun to compete for adherence among Imperial Russia's intellectuals and nobility and most thinking about Jews, in particular, was in religious terms with perhaps little strains of racialism here and there. Also what ideas of Racialism there were: were pan-Slavic (i.e. based on sub-race) in nature rather than about '*Whites*' (i.e. based on a colloquial term for Caucasoid), the latter being of more recent origins.

The 'White race' is also a colloquial term for referring to ostensive difference in colour between the racial groups, which doesn't take into account sub-racial groups, and since the Slavs and Aryans[9] residing in Russia were part of the 'White race' if we define it in the terms the quotation presumably means then the revolution can't be 'anti-White' unless it is Jewish or made up of those of Mongoloid and/or Turkic racial stock. Therefore: we also find our argument comes back to where it starts in that here we find the assumption behind the quotation i.e. that the Bolshevik revolution of 1917 was in the clear majority Jewish in character and what '*Bolshevik leader*' would make this kind of assumption let alone couch it in such terms, which presume the 'reactionaries', such as the 'Black Hundreds', are essentially right?

It is safe to say that this quotation is likely a fraudulent one for it lacks first Marxist terminology, uses assumptions which are not communist and were not current in Russia at that time, (i.e. the 'White race' rather than pan-Slavic racialism), there appears to be no Bolshevik leader named Selenkov and there is no originating source cited for the quote. We may tentatively suggest that this is Eustace Mullins, but we can't be entirely sure of this without finding an early use of the quotation or the original publication where it was used. If any reader has any information about this quotation or knows where it has been used then we would be most pleased to hear about it or revise our opinion in light of more definite information (which we will of course publish).

Unless the origins of this quote can be traced satisfactorily then it simply should not be used as evidence at all. Since there doesn't appear on a review of the literature and general commentary to be any trace of the quote or the individual who supposedly uttered it. That in itself makes the quote suspect especially as it further does not fit the phraseology of Marxism and seems in itself to suggest an anti-communist Racist origin.

[1] Such as Inter-City Researchers [likely Lady Jane Birdwood], 1991, '*The Longest Hatred: An Examination of Anti-Semitism*', 1st Edition, Inter-City Research Centre: London, p. 22. This is available at the following address:

<http://www.vho.org/aaargh/fran/livres8/TheLongestHatred.pdf>. Note that no source is cited for the comment.

[2] Robert Wilton, 1920, '*The Last Days of the Romanovs*', 1st Edition, Thornton Butterworth: London.

[3] Including such works where a quotation such as this would be extremely relevant, such as R. M. Whitney, 1924, '*Reds in America*', 1st Edition, The Beckwith Press: New York.

[4] For example George Katkov, 1967, '*Russia 1917: The February Revolution*', 1st Edition, Longmans: London and Marcel Liebman, Trans: Arnold Pomerans, 1970, '*The Russian Revolution: The Origins, Phases and Meaning of the Bolshevik Victory*', 1st Edition, History Book Club: London contain no mention of a Selenkov and presumably this Selenkov often described as a '*Bolshevik leader*' should be there at least in notation.

[5] Our comments about this quotation can be found at the following address:

<http://semiticcontroversies.blogspot.com/2008/09/some-brief-notes-on-eustace-mullins.html>.

[6] George Knupffer, 1986, '*The Struggle for World Power: Revolution and Counter-Revolution*', 4th Edition, Noontide Press: California.

[7] Barry Domville, 2008, [1947], '*From Admiral to Cabin Boy*', 1st Edition, Historical Review Press: Uckfield.

[8] I'll point out here again there is no such thing in terms of racial science: there are the 'White

racess' (plural not singular), which are some of the sub-races of the Caucasoid race, but no 'White race'.

[\[9\]](#) An example of such a group would be the Volga Germans.

On Jewish 'Traitors': Benjamin Freedman

Saturday, 18 October 2008

Benjamin Freedman is perhaps the archetypal example of the jewish 'traitor' in so far that he asserts that he spent most of his life working for the cause of international jewry so-called, and then all of sudden circa 1945, the end of the Second World War and the beginning of the occupation of Germany, he had a revelation. Whereby he jumped ship from being one of the most avid proponents of jewry to being one of its most avid of opponents for reasons that seem to escape us. Although the reason seems ostensibly to do with Christianity. This doesn't itself seem wholly satisfying for such a radical turn of allegiance if Freedman was being truthful. Since one simply does not 'jump ship' from an apparently very powerful conspiracy, which is willing to cause world wars, to its not very powerful opposition and hope to maintain one's own life in any meaningful form let alone one's wealth.

Now in this article as mentioned above we will focus on one of the two notable pieces of work[\[1\]](#) that Freedman has bequeathed to us. As well as look at Freedman as an individual to see what he claimed he had done on behalf of jewry, which is really the crux of his commentary. Since if Freedman is who he says he is. Then his words have some weight, which cannot simply be overlooked. Since if he is telling the truth about his connexions and work on behalf of jewry. It places him in an ideal position to give testimony about a conspiracy involving jews at the centre of the governing elite of the United States, but if Freedman is not telling us the truth then it places grave doubts as to anything involving his 'personal experience/knowledge' that he informs us of.

Freedman does, in fact, cover quite a few topics that are quite academic now, but his main claims in terms regarding jews themselves are in his '*Facts are Facts*' pamphlet[\[2\]](#), which Semitic Controversies will be authoring a commentary on/rebuttal to, because there is very little 'fact' involved, in our opinion, in the pamphlet. Some of these claims first brought up in '*Facts are Facts*' were reproduced in the last third of '*A Jewish Defector Warns America*', with a brief summation of Freedman's claims that the jews are in fact descended from the Khazars. This theme also dominates the question and answer session after the speech, which is reproduced in the transcript. Any additional claims or evidence presented will be examined in our rebuttal mentioned above. We will focus on Freedman's claims as to who he was and the conspiratorial element to his claims here: since that is the most relevant part to his jewish 'traitor' status.

Freedman, rather than dealing in 'facts' as he claims he is doing, seems to have been simply repeating a lot of then current anti-jewish material, especially notorious being Rev. Pranaithis' '*The Talmud Unmasked*'[\[3\]](#), which Freedman reproduces almost verbatim[\[4\]](#), but being a jew and having lived for quite a few years as an apparently observant, presumably Orthodox, jew. Freedman should have known a lot more about some of the debates, and specialist material, that

most anti-Semites wouldn't want to spend the time looking through, because much effort is involved for rewards, which may not come and may not be what is wished for. He should also have known better than to reproduce Pranaitis' work as explained briefly in n. 4 even if simply an observant jew.

It is also worth observing that Freedman doesn't split jewry into sects and specific religious groups, noting here that when Freedman uses jew he is talking in terms of religion not in terms of race[5], despite having ostensibly been an observant jew and as said above talking in terms of a jew being a follower of Judaism and not a biological creature[6]. This means Freedman should at the very least know that the authority of certain texts, such as the Zohar, is only accepted by some and not other parts of Judaism.

The Talmud is indeed largely accepted by jews, except Karaite jews, but what Freedman notably again doesn't cite, which having been an observant jew of some rank he should be well aware of, is the more recent debates as to the interpretation of the Talmud's interpretation of the Torah/Tanakh.

This isn't applying an unrealistic standard to Freedman. In that as an observant jew, much like as an observant Catholic, one is expected to keep up a little with the current issues surrounding theology even if only in very general terms. Freedman hasn't seemed to have done so, since he hasn't for example talked of the new vogue in Reform Judaism enacted by Isaac Mayer Wise and its drastic contrast to Orthodox Judaism. Let alone the prominence of Hasidic Judaism, which was and is a common feature of modern Diaspora jewish communities.

This brings into question Freedman's ipso facto claim to having been a loyal jew and presumably, using Freedman's definition of jew as being a follower of the Judaic religion rather than a definition in terms of race, that he was an observant jew of what we may presume was Orthodox Judaism. Since Freedman exhibits little understanding of Judaism as a religion in his *'Facts are Facts'* and *'A Jewish Defector Warns America'* as well as his critique of it being one common to anti-jewish literature. Rather than a critique based on Freedman's own reading of the jewish literature. It is reasonable for us presume that Freedman was not the loyal jew he asserts he was, but rather that this a pose he has adopted for the sake of the authority of the character he is playing to his intended audience and his own argument that jews are a religion alone.

This latter part of Freedman's argument, i.e. that jews are a religion and not a race and/or biological group, is something we will come back to, because it is very important in beginning to form a realistic interpretation of Freedman. Since it points firstly to what Freedman argues against and secondly, it fits with what we may reasonably expect ethnocentric jewish behaviour to be when facing an anti-Semitic audience or seeking personal, and hence racial, survival by joining the enemies apparent of jewry.

This however brings us back to a very important point to repeat. This point, that often gets lost in anti-jewish discussion of and unfortunate genuflection before, Freedman is that he was a jew: first, last and always. We cannot as discussed above[7] simply dismiss this fact, because the sword works both ways and if we did so. We would simply repeat the mistake of assuming a baptism, of sorts, washes away ones race and natural racial inclinations, which are the basis for

all rational study of humanity and in particular so unique a race as the jews.

If Freedman's evidence is to be admitted as plausible: he must be admitted to be a jew, not a 'former jew' [8], as he is introduced in '*A Jewish Defector Warns America*'. For he was a jew, but as stated if he is a jew then we must treat him, because he was a jew in terms of race, as a jew and not as simply trustworthy, because he has something to say, and a claim of 'insider' authority, that supports some popular, especially at the time, anti-jewish positions and theories. Therefore we must treat Freedman's work as we would that of Alan Dershowitz by suspending belief and looking at it with a highly critical eye in the light of what can be said to be known, possible and unknown about jewry.

Freedman's '*A Jewish Defector Warns America*' starts off with Freedman asserting a series of facts largely about the course of events surrounding America's entry into World War One, where-by there does seem to be a case to answer about the events surrounding the Zimmerman telegram and the sinking of the United States 'passenger' ship the Lusitania [9].

As well as issues surrounding the Paris peace conference and the accords of Versailles, for in Freedman's account of the behind the scenes proceedings. He (Freedman) seems to rely heavily on Dillon's widely-read 1919-1920 account [10] and subsequent anti-jewish interpretation of it. This is itself is noteworthy, because it would either indicate that Dillon was very accurate in what he asserted to be the case or as would seem to be more likely as we shall see is that Freedman is merely copying these themes and incorporating them into his 'inside knowledge'.

Freedman asserts that the conference was largely in the thrall of jews, when Dillon comments on the jewish presence there-of, but this was and has subsequently been taken in anti-jewish literature to transliterate as: jewry controlled it [11]. This is the interpretation Freedman is using when he states as follows:

'[...] when the war was ended, and the Germans went to Paris, to the Paris Peace Conference in 1919, there were 117 Jews there, as a delegation representing the Jews, headed by Bernard Baruch. I was there: I ought to know.' [12]

This reads remarkably like Dillon's oft-cited statement:

'Of all the collectivities whose interests were furthered at the Conference, the Jews had perhaps the most resourceful and certainly the most influential exponents. There were Jews from Palestine, from Poland, Russia....but the largest and most brilliant contingent was sent by the United States.' [13]

If we look at this further we note that Freedman claims a specific number of 117 jews having been present at the Conference, which he asserts were part of a jewish delegation. Freedman means this in the literal, rather than a metaphorical, sense, because of the logic of his assertions concerning this and other matters where-by there is an organised jewish conspiracy at work (and this is a well known fact to 'insiders') and not simply a series of jews working together. This specific interpretation is also alluded to by Freedman's statement that said delegation was '*headed by Bernard Baruch*'. Since if this is a metaphor then a statement that there was a head of

the delegation would be redundant, but if it is not and Freedman is asserting that there was a specific jewish delegation at the Versailles peace conference then it would be logical to state whom it was headed by: in this case Bernard Baruch.

If we notice further that Freedman's statement of a jewish delegation headed by Baruch has likely been directly derived from Dillon's statement that '*the largest and most brilliant contingent was sent by the United States*'. This has been taken literally by Freedman: who has placed at the contingents head a jew who is well known in popular 'conspiracy' literature, both in Freedman's time and at the present, as a leading 'conspirator'. Baruch was also identified quite strongly, and not unreasonably, as being a high ranking international financier and hence part of what, then as now, is termed jewish high finance[14]. Hence Baruch would be a natural jew to place in charge of such a delegation considering that he was influential and was well known to have attended the Versailles peace conference.

The above quoted statement is where we can suggest Freedman is deriving his jewish delegation from in that the contingent mentioned by Dillon has become a delegation as Dillon directly suggests that the contingent from the United States has the most jews and therefore is significantly jewish. Therefore, because the jews are part of an organised jewish conspiracy in Freedman's mind, they must be representing their own interests primarily and hence logically be part of a separate delegation (even if presumably unofficially).

This is a simple inference we can make from the direction of Freedman's assertions. In that he is arguing there is a jewish, specifically a Zionist, conspiracy at work, which in his alleged experience has its powerbase in the United States. Therefore if jews, specifically those influential jews of a Zionist persuasion, indeed forced the United States into the First World War for their objective of attaining agreement for a jewish homeland in Palestine[15]. Then it would logical for them to be at the Versailles peace treaty in force in order to enforce that agreement with the victorious and defeated powers. This is logical position that Freedman is asserting as we are told he, and the other jews, were there to do just that. It also what Dillon inferred occurred when he states that jews were the most resourceful and influential exponents of their collective cause[16].

It is worth noting that the Zionist jews that Freedman is discussing were not in fact as wildly successful as he seems to imply, but rather even with significant jewish representation at the Versailles peace conference. All that had been achieved is a promise to fulfil the British part of the bargain, but little to no action and almost a backward step had occurred in the enactment of the Sykes-Picot agreement of 1916, rather than the terms of the Balfour declaration of 1917.

Freedman's narrative suggests the benefit of hindsight in that it presumes that all the goals of the Zionist jews, who attended the Versailles peace conference, were ipso facto achieved, because Israel was created in 1948[17]. When in fact as I have just stated the Zionist jewish goals were not ostensibly achieved as they did not manage to force the implementation of the Balfour agreement, which presumably they should have been able to do had they wielded the kind of power and been part of a highly-organised jewish bloc that Freedman asserts was the case[18].

This is further evidenced by that in 1948 when it took a vicious multi-pronged and co-ordinated jewish terrorist, public relations and media assault to get the jewish homeland that the Zionist

jews dreamed of[19]. Had what Freedman stated been in the case then it should simply have not required any kind of assault, on the powers that were, to achieve, but rather been a case of behind doors enforcing of agreements made to the jews by the powers concerned and that this enforcing of the agreement should have occurred in 1919 rather than twenty-nine years later and only then by butchering and libelling any non-jew who opposed them they could possibly lay their hands on.

Freedman also asserts that there 117 jews present at the Versailles Peace Conference, but I have been unable to confirm or explode this assertion per se, but jews were certainly present in significant numbers but whether it was 117 jews and whether Bernard Baruch, who was present but ostensibly as part of the Versailles economic council rather than a jewish delegation, was at their head cannot be reasonably, if ever, confirmed, because we are unsure as to whom Freedman is including and not including in said count of 117 jews present.

It is also worth asking the question of how Freedman ‘knew’ there were 117 jews at the Versailles peace conference. Since surely Freedman did not count them all? It seems a rather arbitrary number to be using, unless one presumes Freedman had access to a list where the number of jews present was mentioned or he counted them all on said list himself. If there was a list then we come back to Freedman’s assertion that he was a member of an organised jewish conspiracy: since no such list to my knowledge exists or been referred to either in Dillon or elsewhere. This doesn’t make it impossible, but it seems very unlikely that such an official list would not be referred to at some stage or come up in direct reference in any historic or modern work on the matter. It is far more likely that Freedman’s number of 117 jews was derived from an anti-jewish speculation, which I have been unable to find[20], or a rough estimate on his own part[21].

This brings us again on to a key point in Freedman’s string of assertions. This point being that he is supposedly a ‘former insider’ in the organised jewish conspiracy, which we have already somewhat discussed above. Freedman’s assertions about the Versailles peace conference are predicated on his having been there and presumably part of the ‘jewish delegation’ he talks of.

Therefore the logic follows that, because he was there: he ‘*ought to know*’. That then raises an important question in our minds: was Freedman there? We have has written assertion that he was, but in order to go any further with his authority we need to establish if he was in fact present. Since if there is no evidence of him having been present then how can we presume he was present?

Since in order to presume this we would need to presume that Freedman is what he says he is: no longer a jew[22]. However, because a jew, in this sense, is a biological group and not simply a follower of the religion of Judaism as Freedman attempts to argue. We have to treat Freedman with the same scepticism as we would treat the work of Alan Dershowitz or Israel Shamir[23], because he is a jew, as I have covered in above[24].

However, perhaps predictably, there is no evidence of Freedman attending the Versailles peace conference and it would seem unlikely that he did so given that we have no evidence of him holding significant position in, or even being a member of, either jewish organisations, which

presumably would be a requisite to being in such a jewish delegation, or a significant, or any, position in the United States government, which would be likely be requisite to being in a diplomatic delegation of such importance. Freedman never provided proof of this and nor did he prove or show evidence of his claimed connexions to such high-ranking members of the United States government as President Woodrow Wilson, Bernard Baruch, Edward House^[25] and/or Henry Morgenthau, Sr^[26].

Hence although it is impossible to discount the possibility that Freedman did in fact attend the Versailles peace conference: it seems on the basis of what evidence we have rather unlikely. Since had Freedman been in attendance it should have been noted and should appear somewhere in the literature on the conference confirming that in fact he had attended preferably with some direct evidence of this being the case.

Since this is not the case it throws Freedman's assertions into extreme doubt. If combined with the fact that Freedman seems to be adapting Dillon's work on the Versailles peace conference in the manner that anti-jewish individuals and groups had been doing for many years and that Freedman narrates as if from hindsight making the mistake of alleging the organised jewish conspiracy was successful in achieving its objective at Versailles and that this objective was the creation of jewish state, Israel, in 1948.

Since if Freedman was taking his account from his own knowledge/experiences and made such elementary mistakes concerning the timeline of this organised jewish conspiracy then it is rather unlikely he in fact attended the Versailles peace conference let alone as part of a jewish delegation. Since if he had done so he should have known better and explained accordingly. This would seem to indicate he is drawing his account from secondary sources since that is where such mistakes would be likely to creep in and since we know he has read much anti-jewish literature it seems probable that this is the source of his account as we have outlined above.

Since Freedman had not been part of any jewish delegation: he used what literature was available and was current in the social group, presumably that surrounding Conde McGinley's '*Common Sense*', in which he was most active. Since that would have given him the kind of picture of a organised jewish conspiracy and what it had achieved when that he in fact describes in his '*A Jewish Defector Warns America*'. In essence we can say that Freedman's comments only makes sense if we see them as a jew spouting what he has read about jews in anti-jewish literature with a few personal opinions added in for variety and personal benefit.

It is pertinent to add to this discussion that Freedman when notes on the murder of the German diplomat Ernst vom Rath in Paris by the jew Herschel Grynszpan in his '*A Jewish Defector Warns America*', indirectly condemns himself as lacking 'insider knowledge', when he says:

'That continued for some time, and it wasn't until 1938, when a young Jew from Poland walked into the German embassy in Paris and shot one of the officials [a German official] that the Germans really started to get rough with the Jews in Germany. And you found them then breaking windows and having street fights and so forth.' ^[27]

This might not seem obvious at first: however what Freedman has done here is to believe hook,

line and sinker the official story of the night of broken glass, commonly known in the German as Kristallnacht, in 1938 without noting on the involvement of a Revisionist Zionist[28] organisation known as LICA[29]. LICA was heavily bound up with the murderer of vom Rath, Grynspan, as well as with the killing of Wilhelm Gustloff by the jew, David Frankfurter, in 1936. Now even without the 'inside knowledge' of a conspiracy, Ingrid Weckert[30], has placed a lot of facts and a potential interpretation of them in the public area, which point quite literally to a conspiracy against Germany and secondly, perhaps more importantly for Freedman, to provoke retribution from the German authorities and/or start a riot by using fake orders/uniforms[31] that would force the remaining jews to emigrate to Palestine[32].

Yet Freedman simply glides over this potentially large well of evidence for his case and accepts the standard line of events as told both by my foreign media and a very embarrassed German government[33]. Yet if he had been an insider in any kind of organised jewish Zionist conspiracy then he should have known of at least the possibility of this and given his use of loose 'facts' through '*A Jewish Defector Warns America*'[34], it should have been mentioned at least in passing. However it was not, and notably the night of broken glass was discussed by Freedman in the manner common to non-Revisionist anti-jewish literature. In that Freedman takes the position that the jews had provoked the Germans so much, especially by way of Samuel Untermyer's declaration of war against Germany on behalf of world jewry in 1933, that the political murder of vom Rath sparked spontaneous anti-jewish outrage leading to a 'pogrom'.

So why didn't Freedman know about LICA's potential involvement and use such a valuable piece of evidence for his assertions?

The simple answer must be because Freedman was not part of an 'organised jewish conspiracy' and that his assertions in this regard. Freedman seems to have got from reading anti-jewish and general conspiracy literature, whilst adding some new twists to make the material seem new, yet confirm common anti-jewish theories at the time when he wrote and lectured (which would create maximum laurels and acceptance for him and what he claimed). Freedman hasn't, and no one else to my knowledge has, produced a scrap of reasonable evidence to suggest Freedman is who he claimed to be beyond a jewish millionaire soap manufacturer who late in life became a baptised jew and tried to 'fight jewry', allegedly spending most of his fortune to do so.

Freedman as a proof of a jewish conspiracy thus must be abandoned, because although apparently being a jewish 'traitor' he was still remained very much a stereotypical jew to the last: a born liar.[35] The target for his lies? Anti-Semites.

[1] Benjamin Freedman, 1961, '*A Jewish Defector Warns America*'. This is available at the following address: <http://www.sweetliberty.org/issues/israel/freedman.htm>.

[2] Benjamin Freedman, 1954, '*Facts are Facts: The Truth about the Khazars*'. This is available at the following address: <http://www.biblebelievers.org.au/factindx.htm>.

[3] Rev. I. B. Pranaitis, Trans: E. Sanctuary, 1939, [1892], '*The Talmud Unmasked: The Secret Rabbinical Teachings Concerning Christians*', 1st Edition, E. N. Sanctuary: New York. This is available at the following address: <http://www.talmudunmasked.com/>.

[4] Freedman, '*Facts are Facts*', Op. Cit. Freedman should have known if he was indeed part of such a conspiracy that Pranaitis' arguments on the Talmud had been addressed and categorically

rebutted by the very famous Talmudist Louis Ginzberg several decades before he made his speech when as he claims he was part of a conspiracy. Hence Freedman should know either that Pranaitis' arguments were unsound or he should have addressed Ginzberg's argument. He did neither and simply repeated Pranaitis' argument verbatim, which indicates he is either dishonest or he somehow missed a quite famous publicly reprinted responsa by a very famous contemporary Talmudist and apparent high ranking jewish fellow denizen of New York City.

[5] Since Freedman in both '*A Jewish Defector Warns America*' and '*Facts are Facts*' assumes both in his language and his thesis that jews by en-large equal Khazars that jews are not a biological group. Freedman also repeatedly refers to himself as a Christian/Catholic and does not refer to himself as a jew only in allusions/terms like '*former jew*' much like those in which he was introduced to the audience before he gives his speech in '*A Jewish Defector Warns America*'.

[6] This would suggest he should certainly split jews into religious sub-divisions for if his definition of jews is based on religion, which it is, then he should know and recognise the importance of the splits and differences between the various sects and cults in Judaism in his critique. Otherwise it is a bit like critiquing Christianity by quoting Calvin and then quoting Loyola without making distinction of their widely differing theological beliefs and that they were opposed to each other.

[7] This was discussed in the first part of this article. This is available at the following address: <http://semiticcontroversies.blogspot.com/2008/09/on-jewish-traitors.html>.

[8] Freedman, '*A Jewish Defector Warns America*', Op. Cit.

[9] Some brief, but highly interesting, notes in this regard can be found in Revilo Oliver, 2006, '*America's Decline: The Education of a Conservative*', 1st Edition, Historical Review Press: Uckfield, pp. 37-42.

[10] Emile Joseph Dillon, 1920, '*The Inside Story of the Peace Conference*', 1st Edition, Harper & Brothers: New York. This can be read the following address:

<http://www.gutenberg.org/etext/14477>.

[11] This was a common theme in anti-Semitic propaganda around this time and it was picked up across the globe, particularly in Germany and Austria. It also enjoyed some prominence in France and increasingly so in the Middle East. It only really came to real prominence as an anti-Semitic point of view in North America after the Second World War and the creation of Israel as a 'homeland for the jews'. One oft-cited example of this can be found in Douglas Reed, 1985, '*The Controversy of Zion*', 2nd Edition, Veritas: Bullsbrook, pp. 283-290. Notably Reed doesn't cite many sources specifically and although most of his sources seem to be comments in the official minutes of the Houses of Parliament and the United States Congress/Senate. This hardly can be said to qualify for evidence for what Reed is asserting.

[12] Freedman, '*A Jewish Defector Warns America*', Op. Cit.

[13] Dillon, Op. Cit., p. 10.

[14] This inference in Freedman's thought is made obvious when he talks about his own alleged past service and states as follows: '*So I sat in these meetings with President Wilson at the head of the table, and all the others, and I heard them drum into President Wilson's brain the graduated income tax and what has become the Federal Reserve, and also indoctrinate him with the Zionist movement.*' Freedman, '*A Jewish Defector Warns America*', Op. Cit. Here Freedman is talking directly about high finance and its relationship with the Federal Reserve, which often figures in discussion on high finance since it allows the public debt on the United States to be run as a profitable business in effect and jews are often suggested, not unjustly, to have been

involved in the scheme to create this institution. Hence in Freedman, as it does in much North America anti-Semitic literature, this becomes part of the organised jewish conspiracy.

[15] Presumably in order to achieve something like the Balfour declaration of 1917, which Freedman confuses with the Sykes-Picot agreement when he states that it was agreed in 1916.

[16] Dillon's precise statement is as follows: *'Of all the collectivities whose interests were furthered at the Conference, the Jews had perhaps the most resourceful and certainly the most influential exponents.'* Dillon, Op. Cit., p. 10.

[17] For example Freedman states: *'Now the war -- World War One -- in which the United States participated had absolutely no reason to be our war. We went in there -- we were railroaded into it -- if I can be vulgar, we were suckered into -- that war merely so that the Zionists of the world could obtain Palestine. Now, that is something that the people in the United States have never been told. They never knew why we went into World War One. Now, what happened?*

After we got into the war, the Zionists went to Great Britain and they said: "Well, we performed our part of the agreement. Let's have something in writing that shows that you are going to keep your bargain and give us Palestine after you win the war." Because they didn't know whether the war would last another year or another ten years. So they started to work out a receipt. The receipt took the form of a letter, and it was worded in very cryptic language so that the world at large wouldn't know what it was all about. And that was called the Balfour Declaration.

The Balfour Declaration was merely Great Britain's promise to pay the Zionists what they had agreed upon as a consideration for getting the United States into the war. So this great Balfour Declaration, that you hear so much about, is just as phony as a three dollar bill. And I don't think I could make it more emphatic than that.' Freedman, *'A Jewish Defector Warns America'*, Op. Cit. Notably this indicates that jewish power was able to get an agreement yet even with a jewish delegation they were unable to achieve any kind of leeway over the Sykes-Picot agreement, which according to Freedman would have been agreed after the Balfour declaration although not *'officially'*, which we may infer from his wording.

[18] Freedman styles this as follows: *'The Jews at that peace conference, when they were cutting up Germany and parcelling out Europe to all these nations that claimed a right to a certain part of European territory, the Jews said, "How about Palestine for us?"'* Freedman, *'A Jewish Defector Warns America'*, Op. Cit. The question remains unanswered is why did these jewish power-brokers who Freedman tells us were acting as an organised conspiratorial bloc wait till 1948 to achieve their ambition when they had this apparent opportunity in 1919.

[19] For a standard pro-jewish account of this please see: Martin Gilbert, 1998, *'Israel: A History'*, 1st Edition, Doubleday: London.

[20] It may have come from Conde McGinley's anti-jewish publication, *'Common Sense'*, which Freedman supported financially and who in return sponsored his speech, *'A Jewish Defector Warns America'*. This would be very much in keeping with the line of anti-Semitic argument used by McGinley as well as the interests of one of his main writers: Eustace Mullins. Since I have not had time to research the issues of *'Common Sense'* as of yet: I have been unable to confirm my theory that many anti-jewish canards and false statements originate from this publication and the writers associated with it: including Benjamin Freedman.

[21] Both of which would explain why no actual list has been offered.

[22] In Freedman, *'Facts are Facts'*, Op. Cit.

[23] Who incidentally bears far more than a passing resemblance to Freedman in that he has

converted to Christianity, treats jews as a religion, is a vocal opponent of Zionism, is oft-cited by anti-jewish individuals and groups and endorses an organised jewish conspiracy thesis.

[24] This was covered in the first part of the article. This is available at the following address:

<http://semiticcontroversies.blogspot.com/2008/09/on-jewish-traitors.html>.

[25] Edward House is better known as Colonel House.

[26] Freedman states as follows: *'Who knew it? President Wilson knew it. Colonel House knew it. Others knew it. Did I know it? I had a pretty good idea of what was going on: I was liaison to Henry Morgenthau, Sr., in the 1912 campaign when President Wilson was elected, and there was talk around the office there.'*

I was 'confidential man' to Henry Morgenthau, Sr., who was chairman of the Finance Committee, and I was liaison between him and Rollo Wells, the treasurer.' Freedman, *'A Jewish Defector Warns America'*, Op. Cit.

[27] Freedman, *'A Jewish Defector Warns America'*, Op. Cit.

[28] This is the name given to the followers of the ideas of Ze'ev Jabotinsky. This is one of the most violent and vicious of all Zionist sub-divisions, which ultimately lead to the massacres, torture and genocides conducted by the jewish Stern gang and the Irgun.

[29] This stands for Ligue Internationale Contra l'Anti-Semitisme, which in English translates as the International League against Anti-Semitism.

[30] Ingrid Weckert, Trans: Carl Hottalet, 1991, *'Flashpoint: Kristallnacht 1938: Instigators, Victims and Beneficiaries'*, 1st Edition, Institute for Historical Review: California.

[31] Which let it be noted would have been easy enough to procure or convincingly imitate, especially for a reasonably well-moneyed organisation like LICA.

[32] Palestine was the favoured destination for German deportation at this point in time.

[33] Who would have been arguably far more damaged in terms of propaganda by letting it be known that the jews had managed to start anti-Semitic riots in Germany, by pretending to be SA and SS men and relaying false orders.

[34] Such as the following statement: *'Defense against 40,000 little Jews in Moscow that took over Russia, and then, in their devious ways, took over control of many other governments of the world.'* Freedman, *'A Jewish Defector Warns America'*, Op. Cit.

[35] Freedman is an excellent example of the apparent use of the 'Big Lie' propaganda technique that was first noted and pointed out as a key aspect in the understanding of jewish propaganda techniques by Adolf Hitler in his *'Mein Kampf'*.

Lies are not Facts: Benjamin Freedman's 'Facts are Facts' Debacle (Introduction)

Wednesday, 22 October 2008

Benjamin Freedman's pamphlet/booklet called *'Facts are Facts'*, is along with *'A Jewish Defector Warns America'*, his only substantial contribution to anti-jewish literature. Freedman claimed that during his life: he had been at the highest levels of organized jewish power and that he had met with, and presumably influenced figures of both international and American domestic importance. Freedman then had a change of heart he tells us and decided that he wanted to fight jewry, in the name of the fight of international communism and Zionist organised jewry. To this

end he is alleged to have spent most of the capital he had made supporting anti-jewish anti-communist causes in particular the anti-Semitic periodical: '*Common Sense*'[1].

The fact that Freedman contributed so little in terms of written material does not accurately reflect the subjective importance placed on what he has written by anti-jewish individuals and groups. As I have covered in my essay, '*On Jewish 'Traitors': Benjamin Freedman*', Freedman's importance lies not so much in the innovative nature of what he wrote, but rather in that what he wrote confirms and validates several positions held by anti-jewish individuals and groups, because of his claim to be a former high-ranking 'insider' in an organised Jewish conspiracy. He may indeed be reasonably suggested to be the reason for the widely-held view in many anti-jewish groups that the Ashkenazim are somehow not the Biblical Israelites and that they are in fact primarily the descendants of a people who converted to Judaism in the late 8th or early 9th centuries. This alone would mean that his pamphlet '*Facts are Facts*' should be addressed.

However what makes '*Facts are Facts*' worthy of notice and issuing a commentary on/rebuttal of. Is that it is an example of a pre-Koestler argument suggesting a Khazarian genesis for Ashkenazi Jewry and hence brings a lot of potentially valid arguments to the table that need to be examined and addressed. Although: it is worth saying that most of these arguments have already been addressed in the specialist literature on the Khazars and the general literature on Jewry in general. It remains for this to be brought together for the anti-Semitic audience and to rid them of the notion, however emotionally/intellectually convenient, that the Ashkenazim can be ascribed a Khazarian genesis. Hence intellectually freeing the path to the claim that the Israelites of the Bible are not the Jews of today and hence the Jews are 'false Jews' or some similar appellation.

As well as writing about the Khazarian genesis of the Ashkenazim Freedman, in '*Facts are Facts*', writes a lot, composing roughly half of '*Facts are Facts*', concerning Judaism and especially focuses on favourites of anti-Jewish critique of Jews, such as the Kol Nidre prayer on Yom Kippur. Although these are generally almost verbatim repetitions of material from Pranaitis' '*The Talmud Unmasked*' and Ford's '*The International Jew*', which were and are common works consulted/cited by anti-Semitic individuals and groups. Since Freedman brings together many of the claims concerning Judaism in one well known text. It is valuable to examine them thoroughly as well as his claims about a Khazarian genesis for the Ashkenazim in order to bring a coherent critique of both of these common arguments to the anti-Semitic reader.

Hence in order to do this '*Lies are not Facts*' will be split into two different chapters. The first chapter will address Freedman's Khazarian genesis thesis for the Ashkenazim and the second chapter will address Freedman's arguments concerning Judaism, which he has as we shall see copied from the standard anti-Jewish critique rather than innovate them himself. Two different authors associated with Semitic Controversies will be undertaking this task. One covering each section as the ground that Freedman covers in a short space of time is large and the knowledge of two specialist areas, Jewish theology and Jewish history, is required.

[1] Without Freedman's personal accounts from 1945 until his death it is impossible to ascertain whether this is true or not. He did it seems donate money to Conde McGinley's organisation, but whether this was as it is claimed most of his fortune remains to be seen. However given Freedman's laxity with the truth that I have documented somewhat in '*On Jewish 'Traitors*':

Benjamin Freedman it would be inexcusable and irrational to simply believe Freedman's word.

The Misleading Term 'ZOG'

Thursday, 23 October 2008

'ZOG' or '*Zionist Occupied Government*' was coined in 1976 by Eric Thomson and has been a widely used among those who adhere to a racist, anti-jewish or pseudo-racist ideology. Thomson writing in a 1999 repeat of his original 1976 terming of 'ZOG', '*Welcome to ZOG-World*', tells us that:

'Some claimed that The Enemy was the CFR, the Bilderbergers, the Trilateralists, the dreaded, but conveniently anonymous "Insiders". As a simple Nazi, I realized that what was lacking was a Feindbild or picture of the enemy. If one did not know who the enemy was, then one could never hope to combat him. Later, I learned that 'our side' had no definition of who or what it was, either. Without a Feindbild, the situation is serious, but not hopeless. Without a Selbstbild, a concept of who we are, then the situation is hopeless, but not serious. The blightwingers seem set in their ways, choosing to blunder and stumble along, on their treadmill to oblivion, because they choose not to identify themselves any more than they choose to identify their enemies.' [\[1\]](#)

I agree with Thomson here that there was, and is, a lack of knowledge of who '*the enemy*'; if you want to put it that way, was and is, but the picture of the enemy that Thomson evokes, as he describes it in his article, is ludicrous and quite simply anti-government. It is not in any rational way anti-jewish. If anything it is arguably pro-jewish, and presents us with the dichotomy of Thomson's profession of being a 'simple Nazi'. Since in order to be a National Socialist Thomson would have to be an uncompromising supporter of order and not disorder as well as the looser term: justice. Therefore to be a National Socialist Thomson would have to support the government on principle, but be opposed to the current powerful lobbying interests of the jews in the government, which is not the stance he ostensibly takes in his written work.

Thomson does not seem to support either, order and justice, and in most of his published work [\[2\]](#) spends most of his time attacking the '*jew-dominated government*' rather than the jews [\[3\]](#), when he should, if he was a good National Socialist, pin-point his specific criticism and lampoons onto the actual jews in power, rather than the broader term suggesting that government in general is wholly rotten [\[4\]](#). Not only is this a simplistic understanding of politics in general, and more specially lobby politics, it is also contrary to the organic worldview, which is the hallmark of the National Socialist weltanschauung.

Since if Thomson was abiding by this organic view he would, and indeed should, note that there are substantial anti-jewish forces in play in governments and that what we see are the results of the war between these two general forces who can be broken down into smaller camps but who have one of those two general allegiances. This explains, for example, the contrasting and varied political situation surrounding the jews and why for example they fail to implement things they wish, even when they are generally united. It also reconciles with the National Socialist view of the eternal eugenic struggle upwards to constantly evolve to build a better future for the folk.

Thomson's lack of clear thought and his insistence at playing the revolutionary are demonstrated admirably in his definition of 'ZOG'. Which he defines as follows:

'ZIONIST: a jew-supremacist or Israel-firster. Most Zionists are not jews, but jew-stooges who are bribed and/or bamboozled into serving their jewish masters. The previously-used term for such a critter was "useful idiot" or race-traitor.

OCCUPATION: the status of foreign troops or agents who rule a subject people against its own interests, on behalf of the alien occupiers.

GOVERNMENT: a minority of individuals who have the authority to shoot the majority and/or to levy taxes upon them.' [5]

Firstly: this definition of the jewish problem targets 'Zionists' very particularly and does not note that the problem that is central to National Socialist ideology is the jew in all his or her manifestations. It is not as simple as saying, 'Zionists' are the problem, because they are a ruling camp within the jewish community at present and were more so at the time of Thomson's first writing in 1976. There were, and are, considerable amounts of jews, of varying political stripes from the haredi, or ultra-orthodox, community and the 'jewish radical' traditions, who are, and have been, quite publicly opposed to Zionism.

Not only this, but Thomson does not recognise that jews have nearly always split into opposing camps publicly over various issues and even if one issue seems to predominate it can often fade into obscurity just as quickly as it arose. An excellent example of this in history is the Messianic movement of Shabbatai Tzevi [6] (more popularly known as Sabbatai Zvi) when his proclamations that he was the long awaited jewish Messiah drew tens, if not hundreds, of thousands of jews from all over Europe, the Near East and North Africa to his standard directly.

Even when Shabbatai Tzevi was assiduously led into a trap by the Ottoman Sultan, advised by a jewish convert to Islam no less who was according to some scholars working at the behest of the rabbinical authorities, and promptly converted to Islam to avoid being decapitated and having to rise from the dead to prove his divine origin. This promptly caused the general collapse of the Messianic movement around Shabbatai Tzevi. Although it as one might anticipate did not collapse completely with some Ashkenazi jews and their tzadiks as well as the remnants of his followers in Turkey, the Donmeh, kept alive his memory and constructed a new theology surrounding Shabbatai Tzevi. Never-the-less the movement, in spite of the ancestors of the Donmeh, around Shabbatai Tzevi collapsed and he was consigned to history as a 'false messiah'.

However: not all jews followed Shabbatai, even at the height of his influence, and if we are to believe Thomson's thinking we should have called the jewish problem of the 16th century the '*Shabbataian Occupied Government*'. The problem was of different aspect yes, but the issues at hand were very much the same with the proliferation of the hofjude, or court (and usually baptised/converted) jews, as well as the mercantile, [small and large scale] money-lending, tax farming and the international activities of the jews in this period.

So rather than sending their capital to and working on behalf of the Israeli government they at that time would have been working on behalf of Shabbatai Tzevi. But in the present, like Shabbatai Tzevi's time, there is a substantial number of jews who have held back from the all too alluring chalice that is the ideology of Zionism. This can be compared to the many rabbis who condemned Shabbatai Tzevi as a false Messiah, among other things, and successfully removed him as a significant threat to their power and goals. Will these jewish 'anti-Zionists' destroy Zionism or Israel as a country? It is too early to tell, but we have to when dealing with jews think ahead and describe the problem as it actually is and not as it is at the moment.

Shabbatai Tzevi's fall from grace in the world of jewry provides us with an example whereby if we were to judge and label *'the enemy'*, as Thomson refers to it, as 'Zionists', but the problem is not in fact 'Zionists', or Shabbatians to use my example of a previous fashionable jewish intellectual movement, rather jews then we cause a problem for ourselves by not underlining one of the root causes to the problems that face Europe, North America and Oceania today.

The jew does not champion a single cause such as Zionism, as I noted above, but rather he has many causes which he advocates. Sometimes the fashion is communism, sometimes the fashion is Zionism, sometimes the fashion is Hellenism and other times the fashion is to turn from [\[7\]](#). One cannot just ascribe to him the appellation, 'Zionist', and expect that to stick, because there are 'anti-Zionist' jews running around in significant numbers, which someone who sees 'Zionists' as his enemy will logically presume to get quite alright because they are not 'Zionists'. Even these 'anti-Zionist' jews vary in their ideas from a joint Israeli-Palestinian state [\[8\]](#) to the idea that Israel should not exist, because the Messiah has not come yet and therefore the jews by taking up residence in the land are violating Hashem's covenant with the jewish people [\[9\]](#).

'Zionist' does not mean 'jew', and the problem is not simply Israel, but rather it is jews writ large. By using 'Zionist' Thomson is completely confusing the problem at hand, and allowing jews to escape the scorching spotlight of anti-Semitic critique (much as I suspect to his chagrin this can be compared to the baptismal font in that it allows the jew opposed to Zionism to escape much as conversion ostensibly formerly did in Europe), and not realising that by using it he is adversely affecting the cause he ostensibly advocates.

Secondly: Thomson as many have done, ignores a quintessential fact of jewish discourse that the senior powerbase of what one can term, international jewry, is not in fact located in Israel, but rather in North America with New York City being the unstated capital of this worldwide fraternity. Since the international jewish community is made up essentially of two geographic elements: those in Israel and those not in Israel. Most, and moreover the more politically and financially powerful, jews are outside of Israel and although most of these powerful jews support Israel that support is not unconditional.

The Israeli government has to placate the jewish Diaspora on a regular basis, because to paraphrase one recent article in an Israeli newspaper: *'the American jewish Diaspora does things for Israel and expects Israel to be very grateful to it'*. This is why you find that nearly every Israeli Prime Minister and President at some point in their term in office has talked of *'changing Israel's relationship with its Diaspora'*, because Israel is the junior not the senior partner in the relationship and is dependent on the Diaspora to rescue it from itself.

As I noted about the Jewish Diaspora is not essentially Zionist either. Although the Jewish Diaspora has historically been supportive since Zionism came into Jewish intellectual fashion in and around the turn of the twentieth century. A lot of Israeli government money is in fact expended in convincing the Jews of the Diaspora, especially those of New York City, that Israel is a cause worth supporting and putting their money towards. It is worth noting that Jews have a very considerable tradition for philanthropy among their own kind and Israeli Jews do have to compete for these considerable monies alongside other Jewish philanthropic/educational organisations, which work on a more national basis.

Of course Israeli organisations within the Diaspora have been very successful in fundraising and garnering support. Primarily by hysteric predictions of '*another holocaust*' and of atrocity propaganda currently relating to the rockets launched by the Hezbollah from southern Lebanon and by Hamas near the Gaza border (against Sderot for one prominent example). However the important issue here is who is the target for this propaganda for since Israel spends so much time and money on garnering support using this type of propaganda it is of importance to understand the target audience, which is in fact Jews and not as is commonly presumed Gentiles.

The average Jew in the ghettos of Brooklyn, for example, is highly susceptible to Jewish atrocity propaganda. Since he or she does not know better than to question what Israel says and if their Rabbi and community endorses it all the better. Since then the community pressure, that is a negative sanction in most groups, is brought to bear on Jews to make them observant to Israel. This is addition to the fact that other openly Jewish sources of information are often very pro-Zionist and your average Jew in the ghettos of Brooklyn doesn't trust nor want to listen to the non-Jewish news for it has no real relevance for him or her. In all essentials then this Israeli propaganda in the mainstream Jewish organisations and media gives your average Jew the impression that Israel is in the right and that any criticism from non-Jewish (and occasionally Jewish) sources of media that are anti-Israel are anti-Semitic or in the case of Jewish criticism: 'self-hating'.[\[10\]](#).

Convincing the Diaspora Jews of the necessity of supporting Israel financially, morally, physically and intellectually no matter what the cost has been part of Israeli strategy since Israel's foundation, which was made possible by the Diaspora's actions within government circles, fighting with the emergent IDF, smuggling arms and people to Israel and the financing of the war as well as the purchase of land. This reliance on the Diaspora is still as strong as it was in 1948. Although Israel can stand on her own: Israel is never-the-less is a state, which heavily relies upon its Jewish origins to garner the necessary support in all spheres, both Jewish and Judeo-Christian, to make its very controversial actions possible.

This is the ideology behind the Zionist rhetoric about requiring a self-sustaining Jewish state, because the Zionists around the world, and especially within Israel itself, realise that Israel is not currently a self-sustaining state and in order to survive it needs help from the outside. This has been the function of Israeli propaganda within the Jewish community and is often mistaken by opponents of Jews and/or Israel, as Thomson has likely mistaken it, to be simply aimed at Gentiles around the world. When in fact this propaganda's primary function is to garner Jewish support for Israel and the secondary function there-of is to create '*righteous Gentiles*', to use the

Noahide conception, who support the Jewish people and specifically the efforts of Zionism to establish then support, sustain and advance the Jewish state.

Thirdly: Thomson is probably correct to state that most Zionists are not Jews since the majority of 'Zionists' would appear to be the so-called 'Christian-Zionists'. Whom follow a theology where-by it becomes necessary for the Jews to return to Palestine so that Jesus Christ can come again and the tribulation can begin. However much of 'Christian-Zionist' movement is supported and aided by (usually secular) Jewish Zionists who blend 'Christian-Zionist' political, economic and social weight to their own on questions relating to Israel, United States policy towards the Middle East and Jews in general.

Are the people who have been lead into believing such millennial ideas '*race traitors*' (to the pseudo-racist/racist cause) and '*useful idiots*' (to the Jewish cause)? I certainly don't think so.

The idea that such people are '*race traitors*', because they serve the Zionist cause is only applicable to those who knowingly promote Jews despite knowledge that the cause of Zionism is not in the best interests of their folk, let alone their religion, or can be proved to have taken money to preach the cause of Zionism. '*Race traitor*' is a term, which should be specifically applied to particular political criminals. Rather than one that can be applied to entire segments of the folk who have simply been misled by the people whom they have trusted to be honest with them and look to their best interests.

The same implies to '*useful idiots*' in that the folk are not idiots and nor are they inherently idiotic as this characterisation of them implies. Rather they are people who are simple in their beliefs^[11] and do not have time to deeply research into things pertaining to politics or their situation. The folk often have more important things to do such as earning the bread for the family table and keeping the family home clean and tidy as well spending time with their families. These are far more important things than concerning themselves with the machinations behind the scenes in politics, diplomacy, academe and business. The folk trust the representatives of power to tell them the truth and when they do not do so it is up to the National Socialist to inform of this fact gently and without malice. This stems from the fact that the National Socialist loves the folk unconditionally and with all their heart and does not belittle or look down on them with scorn, because they may not follow the National Socialist weltanschauung at the current time.

If you treat the folk as Thomson treats them in his work, as ignorant cattle, then you are simply treating them as a communist would do in the Marxian [and general Jewish] presumption that there are '*opiates of the masses*' so to speak. Nobody but a masochistic pervert responds well to condescension and one must treat the folk as part of your extended family: care for, help and love them as if they were your father or mother, brother or sister, son or daughter, grandson or granddaughter. To assume that the folk are such creatures, as Thomson does, degrades them and puts the writer on an unearned pedestal as the paradigm of virtue, because he or she 'knows the truth', which is an excuse for feeling intellectually superior when there is absolutely no grounds for doing so.

How does Thomson, putting himself on the unearned pedestal, know that he knows 'the truth' of the matter? When he is ostensibly dealing with a sub-rosa ethnocentric network of individuals, informal groups and formal organisations: who do not share the same overt goals, such as Zionism or Communism, but share the same underlying one: what is good for jews.

Perceptions of what is in fact good for jews differ, which is why you get jews who argue for secular integration, others who argue for religious Zionism, others who argue for secular Zionism, others who argue for a return to the Diaspora without Israel etc. The same fundamental theme, even in the case of 'anti-Semitic' jews, is one of what is good for the jewish people. Jews cannot be viewed as a monolithic entity taking 'orders from the top', but must be viewed rather as a series of interconnecting ethnocentric individuals, informal groups and formal organisations who have a shifting pattern of alliances and output based on their own interpretation of what is best for jewry and what is best for their particular theory as to what is best for jewry at that given time.

Unless the writer acknowledges that what he or she is writing is a theory based on the presented facts of the matter. Then he or she is simply setting themselves up as easy prey to jewish intellectuals who can point out contrary examples and show with some ease that not all jewry is united. Therefore they can seem to prove to the folk that what 'anti-Semites' say is paranoid hogwash and that 'anti-Semites' really are the irrational beings they portray them as.

What Thomson fails to recognise is that there are few absolutes when it comes to jews and one must understand that the idea of Zionism being the root cause of the problem jewry poses in the present age is fallacious and more generally distorts the problem at hand and substitutes caring for the folk for looking down on them as intellectual inferiors.

'*The enemy*' is not the 'Zionists': it is the jews.

[1] Eric Thomson, 'Welcome to ZOG-World', <http://www.faem.com/eric/2000/et047.htm> [Accessed: 23/10/2008].

[2] Available at the following address: <http://www.faem.com/eric/>.

[3] This is typified by Thomson's consistent casting of himself as a 'revolutionary' and also in such foul and discourteous terms as: 'ZOGWENCH: a female employee of the government', 'ZOGLING or ZOGDOG: any employee of the government', 'ZOGNERD: a government clerk' and 'ZOG-TURD: a taxpayer, i.e., that which is consumed and excreted by the ZOG' (Thomson, 'Welcome to ZOG-World', Op. Cit.), that he is responsible for. National Socialists are polite and courteous ladies and gentlemen: they don't engage in treating the folk as de facto scum, because they work for the state.

[4] Thomson does the same with Christianity as he does with government and treats it with a very broad brush claiming it is based on Judaism and therefore it is de facto bad and contrary to the interests of the Aryan race. This is just as inaccurate as his criticism against government in that Thomson fails to comprehend that working against the grain of human nature and the Aryan racial characteristic as the upholder of order and justice.

[5] Thomson, 'Welcome to ZOG-World', Op. Cit.

[6] For a brief description of Shabbatai Tzevi see Geoffrey Wigoder, 1991, 'Dictionary of Jewish Biography', 1st Edition, Simon & Schuster: New York, pp. 472-473

[7] Translated: pious. This is usually used to describe haredi, or ultra-orthodox jews, and they in turn describe non-haredi with some exceptions as frei (or free from the yoke of the mitzvot).

[8] One prominent group that holds to this is the Israeli 'human rights advocates' organisation: B'tselem.

[9] One prominent group that holds to this is the haredi: Neturei Karta.

[10] This doesn't mean the jew is stupid, but rather that because of their compact minority community. They feel in danger from the gentile world around them, for jews are perennially mentally insecure and feel inadequate (which is where Freudianism comes from), and thus can relate to atrocity propaganda coming from Israel about what the horrid, evil, ungrateful gentiles are cooking up to do to them (the 'poor, innocent and misunderstood' jew) again. It is also worth stating that jews feel their experiences generally justify whatever is done to the local Arabs, because they feel they deserve a homeland of their own and have historically refused to have anything other than Palestine.

[11] This isn't to belittle them, but rather is a statement of the natural order of the universe. In that there are people who are very bright and are highly critical, there are those who are very bright but not critical and there are those who are not very bright and are highly critical (etc). Simplicity is a virtue not a vice in that only in simplicity can the true racial essence of the folk be seen.

A Note to Readers

Saturday, 1 November 2008

Since we haven't published anything new on Semitic Controversies for over a week now. I thought it apt to write a note here to inform our readers that the reason for this has been a mixture of work commitments, the beginning of the new academic year and because we are preparing several long articles that cannot reasonably be published in segments.

We will be publishing one or two of these articles next week along with some 'In Brief' discussions, so please rest assured that we are still working hard on forming and publishing the intellectual basis and justification for the new anti-Semitism.

Thank you,

The Editor,

Ashkenazim versus Sephardim: The Conflict Inside Jewry (Part I)

Sunday, 9 November 2008

When we try to understand international jewry most of those who state their opposition to this entity do so in very broad terms without making an attempt to understand the internal dynamics of this jewish bloc. If we only look to the external dynamics, i.e. the actions and reactions, of this bloc rather than its internal dynamics then will naturally only receive roughly half of the picture.

One such internal dynamic we need to take into account can be found in the conflict between the Ashkenazi and Sephardi jews, which is actualised within Israel's borders itself.

To begin our discussion we should look at what has been reported of the actualities concerning this phenomenon of conflict between the current and formerly dominant groups in world jewry.

In a news article, entitled '*Girl admitted to Haredi School under Court Order*' and published on the 10th of September, Neta Sela brings our attention to this conflict between the Ashkenazim and the Sephardim. Sela's article focuses on a long-term focus of complaint among the Sephardim concerning their treatment by the Ashkenazim in Israel. This complaint is about anti-Sephardi discrimination in the Israeli school system, in particular relating to schools for ultra-orthodox jews, popularly known as haredi.

Sela is covering a long-standing dispute between the Beit Yaakov school in the Israeli city of Eldad and the Sephardim/Mizrahim community. Sela tells us that:

'The child's parents asked for the court's intervention after their child was denied entry, apparently due to the family's "oriental descent."

During the court hearing, Judge Kobi Vardi said that "without delving into the question of discrimination that floats above the refusal to admit the child, the refusal itself is peculiar, to say the least." [...]

Besides the child in question, there are four other girls who were denied admittance by the same school.

Attorneys Shneor Tzoref and Ronen Milrad, representing the parents, told Ynet that "this is a historic and precedent decision obligating a school belonging to the haredi Ashkenazi stream to admit the child immediately.

"This girl was denied admittance as the result of a racial policy led by the leader of the Independent Education Center and the Beit Yaakov School." [...]

The appeal to the court was filled after the Beit Yaakov School denied the admittance of a 6-year-old girl, stating that the decision stems from her being "a Mizrahi." [\[1\]](#)

These remarks can be put in context by noting an earlier article written by Sela on this case where she informs of the intake rates for Ashkenazi and Sephardi jewish children at the Beit Yaakov school. Sela informs us that:

'Last year, 221 pre-school girls, including Rachel, applied for the 1st grade at Beit Yaakov. Of the 93 Ashkenazi girls who applied, 90 were accepted (97 percent), while of the 130 Sephardic girls who applied, only 70 got in (54 percent).' [\[2\]](#)

In the same article Sela makes a point of noting the Beit Yaakov's school method for effecting this discrimination between Sephardi and Ashkenazi jewish children without it seeming to

contravene any official guidelines to the contrary. Sela states that:

‘The school’s method for determining whether an applicant is from a Sephardic origin was simple. In her deposition to court, Rachel’s mother described a questionnaire she was asked to fill out as part of the application process. It included questions such as, “What is the mother’s maiden name?” “What is the grandparents’ surname?” and “In which synagogue does the father pray on Shabbat?”’ [3]

This description by Sela of the Beit Yaakov schools method for filtering in as many Ashkenazi pupils as possible, while filtering out as many Sephardi pupils as possible is quite plausible. Since it allows the school to find out the background of the pupil concerning by finding out the mother’s maiden name and the grandfathers name, which would indicate if the children was a descendent of Ashkenazi, Sephardi and/or Mizrahi lines, without having to formally ask the question.

Secondly the question of which Synagogue does the jewish father pray on Shabbat allows the second half of the genealogy to be filled in by finding out the synagogue used by the father of the jewish child. Hence allowing the Beit Yaakov School: to indirectly discover whether that father is Ashkenazi or Sephardi without officially asking the question of the jewish mother. Since synagogues, due to historical differences in the various rites in Judaism, usually either belong to the Ashkenazi or the Sephardi ritual tradition. Hence if the school knows the father’s synagogue attendance they can infer the father’s biological origin from the statement and choose according.

Thirdly we must also note the numbers cited by Sela in that the Beit Yaakov School in Eldad has near total Ashkenazi applicant acceptance (97%), but only approximately half Sephardi applicant acceptance (54%). If we note that the Beit Yaakov Schools as with most specialist schools in the developed world only have a set number of places per year to fill then we begin to see a more interesting picture develop. In that if only three Ashkenazi girls were rejected, but sixty Sephardi girls were rejected then there was likely some ulterior motive in the acceptance procedure.

This ulterior motive can be suggested, because of the respective numbers involved and that the question asked, which while defensible in the argument that the school wished to check the mitzvot observance of the family (i.e. whether it is really frum) or whether the family are descended from converts, allow the school as pointed above, to indirectly discover the specific origins of the jewish girl in question. This is important because there should be little need for asking for maiden name of the mother or the grandfather’s name, but rather the focus should normally be on whether they were frum and which synagogue they used (to gain suitable confirmation from the rabbi or the records).

It could be argued that the Beit Yaakov school was merely looking at ability, but if that is indeed the case then without some kind of objective data as to the IQs and performance of the jewish girls in question it would be impossible to confirm this. If the school did not have this information to begin with, which would seem to be the case, then it is hard to see how the school could have been discriminating based on ability rather than the specific jewish origins of jewish girls involved.

We can thus reasonably suggest that the Beit Yaakov School in Eldad is engaging in anti-Sephardi discrimination, but trying to make it seem as if it was part of the standard school selection procedure. It is worth noting again on the figures in that the Beit Yaakov School seems to firstly take as many Ashkenazi girls as it can and then fill up the remaining places from among the Sephardi girls in order both to fill its intake quota for that year as well as seem to keep within the bounds of Israeli law.

This can be further suggested by the Beit Yaakov School's reaction to the successful appeal of one hysterical Sephardi jewess, whose jewish daughter was not accepted, to the Israeli court system. Neta Sela reports thus:

'Last Friday, parents from both ultra-Orthodox Beit Yaakov schools in the central city of Elad caused the termination of first grade classes in light of the court order to allow the admission of a Sephardic girl.' [4]

Why do the Beit Yaakov Schools, they are a large network of religious jewish schools which stretch across the world, in Eldad feel the need to react in this way? Shutting their doors to all the successful applicants, because one Sephardi girl was judged to have been unfairly discriminated against and the decision ordered revoked seems like an over-reaction in a fit of pique by the Beit Yaakov schools in Eldad.

This action by the Beit Yaakov Schools in Eldad, although by no means an admission of guilt, certainly is of interest in this case of apparent discrimination between Ashkenazi and Sephardi applicants. Since it begs the question in the jewish mentality: what are they hiding?

[1] Neta Sela, 10th September 2008, 'Girl admitted to Haredi School under Court Order', <http://www.ynet.co.il/english/articles/0,7340,L-3594809,00.html> [Accessed: 09/11/2008].

[2] Neta Sela, 4th April 2008, 'Discrimination from 1st Grade', <http://www.ynetnews.com/articles/0,7340,L-3393620,00.html> [Accessed: 09/11/2008].

[3] Ibid.

[4] Neta Sela, 23rd September 2008, 'MK Ravitz: Positive discrimination needed in religious schools', <http://www.ynet.co.il/english/articles/0,7340,L-3600390,00.html> [Accessed: 09/11/2008].

Lies are not Facts: Benjamin Freedman's 'Facts are Facts' Debacle (Section II, Part I)

Sunday, 16 November 2008

We have previously begun an analytical critique of Benjaïm Freedman's critique of world jewry and its this in his "Facts Are Facts" pamphlet where he, among other things, quotes various passages of the Talmud in his attempt to show his readers, and a given Dr Goldstein, how the Oral Torah is deplorable.

Instead of me hobknobbing about this man, as he has already been done in the another series of articles[\[1\]](#), let us begin with a quote of his choice in the formentioned publication:

"Sanhedrin, 55b. "A maiden three years and a day may be acquired in marriage by coition, and if her deceased husband's brother cohabits with her, she becomes his. The penalty of adultery may be incurred through her; (if a niddah) she defiles him who has connection with her, so that he in turn defiles that upon which he lies, as a garment which has lain upon (a person afflicted with gonorrhea)." (emphasis in original text of Soncino Edition, Ed.)"

The above quotation is indeed a quote from the Soncino Edition of the Babylonian Talmud in English translation. It is one of the many quotes that has been frequently used as part of the argument that the Talmud teaches and sanctions paedophilia.

Personally, I am of the opinion that Freedman hasn't studied the Talmud as he professes, he has simply chosen the general arguments commonly derived from people like Pranaitis[\[2\]](#), Roehling[\[3\]](#) et al and were used by Elizabeth Dilling[\[4\]](#), Michael A. Hoffman II[\[5\]](#) and others.

With the argument that the Talmud teaches it is alright to have sexual intercourse with a three year old and that it sanctions it, there is a problem of interpretation. The problem is, namely, it does not include the necessary corroboration of halakah (jewish law) of the Mishna or of the Talmud were it specifically talks about whether such an act renders the offender completely exempt from legal consequences.

You see, the Talmud does not list an offence and then lists the relevant penalties thereof, rather it lists penalties and then discusses scenarios where guilt there-of is incurred or not, for example in the Sanhedrin tractate the penalty is death, in the tractate Keritot the penalty is divine retribution and so forth.

A few clarifications are in order. The prohibitions given by the Torah are generally divided into two categories. The first category deals with crimes against God, for example they include blasphemy and adultery, and the other category deals with interpersonal crimes (i.e. crimes against man) such as theft, slander and basically any deed by a Jew that would harm his fellow Jew.

So, there are certain vile acts that were not punishable as sexual crimes (between man and God), because they were not legally categorised as such. However, this does not mean those instances weren't punishable as interpersonal crimes. The consequences are given elsewhere, in the Sanhedrin you have a very lengthy, diverse and elaborate discussion of what deed requires the implementation of capital punishment. This is the key variable to understand the format of the Sanhedrin tractate.

The laws (on man) on marriage/betrothal are predominantly discussed in the Kiddushin tractate (laws of marriage, betrothal and tithing there-of), where the rabbis argue that marriage by coition (of any age) is not a valid way to acquire a woman. Marriage, or betrothal (with parental consent) had no defined age-limit, which allowed confusion, hence a man could betroth a girl of very young age, given that the parent agreed.

The Talmud is, partially, an ongoing stream of issued regulations and punishments against acts that were outside of crimes against God, i.e civil matters and interpersonal crimes. Hence what was on one hand not regulated, not rejected by the old laws, could be punishable instead as interpersonal offences. If I, as a clergyman in the 12th-14th century for example, reflected on how this was so, yet elsewhere stated how I'd punish it, would this mean I was in support of it occurring?

Let me, in turn, quote the Talmud on this matter from the tractate that deals with crimes and rulings related to betrothal and marriage (the Kiddushin Tractate):

"A certain man betrothed [a woman] with a myrtle branch in a market place. Thereupon R. Aha b. Huna sent [a question] to R. Joseph: How is it in such a case? He sent back: Have him flagellated, in accordance with Rab; and demand a divorce, in accordance with Samuel. For Rab punished any man who betrothed [a woman] in a market place, or by intercourse, or without shiddukin"[\[6\]](#)

Here it is explained how[\[7\]](#) betrothing a woman through intercourse, without shiddukin (a contract made between the girl's father, or legal guardian, and with the desired husband).

To bring further doubt to Freedman's take on the issue (it being allowed to marry a three year old after you've had sex with her) and myopic display of talmudic context, it is important to see that a girl that young, just three years old, would not be acquirable without shiddukin. You might ask what would happen if a girl's father had given his consent prior to another man having sex with his three year old daughter, well this was also negated in the same tractate.

"A MAN MAY GIVE HIS DAUGHTER IN BETROTHAL WHEN A NA'ARAH. Only when a na'arah, but not when a minor: this supports Rab. For Rab Judah said in Rab's name: One may not give his daughter in betrothal when a minor, [but must wait] until she grows up and says: 'I want So-and-so'."

Hence, a man may not agree to a shiddukin before his daughter has reached "na'arah"[\[8\]](#), ergo another man can not acquire her by intercourse without shiddukin and a father can not enter into this contract prior to the girl having become of the age of na'arah. Add to this, Maimonides statements in the "Laws of Forbidden Relationships" 1:14, in the commentary of Miggad Mishnah (Mishen Torah) that the punishment for sexually using a minor is "serious" and "prolonged flagellation" is due, meaning that this is a crime against man and it is clearly forbidden in Jewish law.

"The contract of marriage, like every other contract, requires the mutual consent of the parties. Without such a consent the marriage is void, though the pre-scribed forms have been complied with. A consent obtained by FORCE is no consent. Some authorities, however, make a difference between these two cases, viz., where the FEMALE or the MALE party had been forced to the marriage contract. In the former case the marriage is void."[\[9\]](#)

Again, no one was allowed by any talmudic decree to force oneself upon a girl in order to betroth

her, nor with consent until the girl had reached the age of na'rah. One of the more notable rabbinical authorities, in the third century, stated:

"It is a moral wrong for a father to contract a marriage on behalf of his daughter before she has attained the age of consent"[\[10\]](#).

One simply has to cross-reference and corroborate the actual halaka laws on relationships with these passages in order to not misunderstand them, which clearly Freedman has not done, he just found a passage in the Talmud and assumed it to be an absolute and halakah decree, missing the context of what punishment category was under discussion.

As additional references on such matters (albeit vague), showing that by it being addressed there was a known problem revolving around it having occurred, the halacha (jewish law) on this says:

"A young man shouldn't marry a woman many years older than himself. An older man shouldn't marry a woman many years younger than himself"[\[11\]](#).

Another, similar to the above excerpt from the Talmud:

"Let youth and old age not be joined in marriage, lest the purity and peace of domestic life be disturbed."[\[12\]](#)

Therefore, it is incorrect to say that the Talmud gives permission for sex with three year olds, cohabitation was without legal and religious sanction for a very long time throughout the civilized world, in these times. In Judaism, only with the added laws of the Talmud's progressing regulations, was this changed and finally put under a religious category. Also, with the later Schulchan Aruch (a more direct and down-to-basics codification of the laws enacted progressively through the Talmud) marriage became a wholly religious enterprise, weddings were officiated by rabbis and private contractual betrothals and such bonds became invalid by religious mandate (which, prior to the Talmud, was not a complete religious mandate).

Let us look at another quote that Freedman uses:

"Kethuboth, 11a-11b. "Rabba said, It means (5) this: When a grown up man has intercourse with a little girl it is nothing, for when the girl is less than this (6), it is as if one puts the finger in the eye (7); but when a small boy has intercourse with a grown up woman, he makes her as 'a girl who is injured by a piece of wood'"

This is another common passage oft used in order to argue how the Talmud does not consider it an offence to have intercourse with a little girl. The discussions relates to the dowry for virgins and non-virgins. So, what's being debated is, effectively, whether such a deed could effect the dowry of the girl. The answer given is no, as far as the sanctity of virginity concerned what happened was just like getting poked with an inanimate object, since it didn't remove her ability to remain innocent (a virgin).

A footnote of this passage confirms this:

"Tears come to the eyes again and again, so does virginity come back to the little girl under three years."[\[13\]](#)

Ergo, the statement in Ketuboth 11b: *"When a grown-up man has intercourse with a little girl, it is nothing"* does not mean that it is permissible to rape her. Rather the Talmud is discussing whether or not she is considered a virgin later in life as I noted on in the previous post, meaning she would not be considered *"damaged goods"*.

Let us examine two more talmudic quotes, for now, from Freedman's text;

"Yebamoth, 60b. "As R. Joshua b. Levi related: "There was a certain town in the Land of Israel the legitimacy of whose inhabitants was disputed, and Rabbi sent R. Ramanos who conducted an enquiry and found in it the daughter of a proselyte who was under the age of three years and one day (14), and Rabbi declared her eligible to live with a priest (15)."

Clearly, this is another pick that is used to bolster the argument that humping three year olds, in this case a proselyte (convert) under the age of three, is valid and good.

The case in point is the opposite, as the same tractate folio demonstrates further on. Initially, it is important to note that, as the quote says, this example is about a certain town of questionable proportions. The discussion in this folio mentions the following:

"A priest may not marry one who is adolescent or 'wounded', but if already married, he may continue to live with her."

It further states that, had the marriage not been sanctioned by a rabbi, it would have been annulled by default. Still, with the *"maskana"* (again, the final prevailing judgement), the Talmud issues the rabbinical decision of nullifying this kind of thing from being valid by end segment of this debate and folio with the following:

"A certain priest married a proselyte who was under the age of three years and one day. Said R. Nahman b. Isaac to him: What [do you mean by] this? — The other replied: Because R. Jacob b. Idi stated in the name of R. Joshua b. Levi that the halachah is in agreement with R. Simeon b. Yohai. 'Go', the first said, 'and arrange for her release, or else I will pull R. Jacob b. Idi out of your ear'."[\[14\]](#)

One of the rabbis tried to defend it as a sanction that found halachah agreement with the previous Rabbi Simeon Yohai, yet this was not valid as he was commanded to secure her release from this bond with a threat attached to it. It is not customary for a rabbi to physically threaten another rabbi with such measures, hence it can be deducted this unsavious and fraudulent sanction was to be even more so opposed. This rejection is ultimately ended with the footnote to this threat against the rabbi who was commanded to reverse Rabbi Jacob Idi's sanctioned bond:

"He would place him under the ban and thus compel him to carry out his decision which is contrary to that of R. Jacob b. Idi."

The following quote is the last one discussed in this article, additional ones will be addressed further on:

"Sanhedrin, 55b-55a: "What is meant by this? - Rab said: Pederasty with a child below nine years of age is not deemed as pederasty with a child above that. Samuel said: Pederasty with a child below three years is not treated as with a child above that (2). What is the basis of their dispute?-Rab maintains that only he who is able to engage in sexual intercourse, may, as the passive subject of pederasty throw guilt (upon the actual offender); whilst he who is unable to engage in sexual intercourse cannot be a passive subject of pederasty (in that respect) (3). But Samuel maintains: Scriptures writes, (And thou shalt not lie with mankind) as with the lyings of a woman (4). It has been taught in accordance with Rab: Pederasty at the age of nine years and a day; (55a) (he) who commits bestiality, whether naturally or unnaturally: or a woman who causes herself to be bestially abused, whether naturally or unnaturally, is liable to punishment (5)."

The above passage is argued to state that it is permissible for a Jew to have sodomy with a boy less than nine years. Again, we run into the debacle on when a crime can be categorised as a sexual act and crime against God and not. Let me just point out that it would be fundamentally incoherent and, well, quite silly with any Jewish law if the reviled act of sodomy would be permissible if done to their Jewish pre-pupertal members but not those above that.

The discussion in this Sanhedrin folio deals with the age issue and at which age a boy child is legally recognisable of having relations that have the full legal ramifications and judgements of sodomy. This whole discussion is closely related to an analysis on punishment for such action.

When the passage stated that intercourse with a child of nine and a day is not the same as that with a child of nine, it is made within the context of what penalty is to be applied, and whether it is of a capital nature or not, as the Sanhedrin tractate deals with what offenses are liable of guilt for capital punishment.

This quote used by Freedman involves two offenses of sodomy: active and passive. Now, the act of sodomy is by its definition prohibited, as seen for example in this footnote to Sanhedrin 54:

"I Kings XIV, 24. Just as abomination applies to sodomy in the latter verse, so it applies to it in the former too: thus it is as though the former verse read, There shall be no Sodomite of the sons of Israel: it is an abomination. And just as the abomination implicit here applies to both parties, so the abomination explicitly stated in Lev. XIII, 22 refers to both."

The above explains first of all that sodomy is prohibited, secondly it refers to active and passive participants, as also seen here in the same text:

"From this we learn the formal prohibition for him who lies [with a male]: whence do we know a formal prohibition for the person who permits himself thus to be abused?"

If the sodomite had committed the act with a consenting adult he would be guilty both of active sodomy in that he had sodomized another man and passive sodomy in allowing himself to be sodomized. Whereas, active sodomy would thus, of course, be to sodomize another person, from which the a adult who sodomizes a child is not exempt from (and which this Talmud passage does not contest his obvious guilt for active sodomy, though purporters of this material, like Michael A. Hoffman, are invited to prove me wrong). And so, passive sodomy would be to allow oneself to be sodomized by another, which is also the sin of sodomy, but it is PASSIVE sodomy rather than active sodomy you see. Now an adult who sodomizes a child is obviously guilty of active sodomy but he is not guilty of passive sodomy (allowing another person to sodomize him) since the child is not capable of actively sodomizing him.

Hence, it deals with passive vs active sodomy, what age a person must be for guilt to be incurred in the sense of crime against God (note this is not the same as crime against man).

Also, guilt is therefore not incurred on the boy, since by law he is by default innocent. The Talmud, in this case, defends the child, and does not condone the acts of the active participant. The adult is not exempt from charges of sodomy, it is just not considered passive or active sodomy on the behalf of the boy. So, the Rabbis in this folio clarify how they break this down into two basic kinds of sodomy: active sodomy vs passive sodomy. The former is to sodomize someone else, while the latter (passive sodomy) is to subject oneself to being sodomized.

The argument goes into some detail in order to point out that while he who sodomizes a child below the age of nine is not exempt from active sodomy, he cannot be guilty of passive sodomy since the child is not capable of actively sodomizing him. Therefore this issue is a technical issue of whether or not the adult is guilty of one sin or two as the formentioned passage simply specifies how the man who sodomizes a child under the age of nine is not guilty of passive sodomy (i.e. allowing the child to sodomize him).

In conclusion, none of the above given quotes provides a valid case that the Talmud adds legal sanction or support to acts of sodomy or intercourse with pre-pupertal children, on the contrary, in a time where there were few if any laws to regulate such encounters and deeds to officially non-sexual beings (i.e. children) the Talmud progressively added litigious measures to circumvent and end any occasional civil discrepancies on such matters as the Tanakh (Written Torah) dealt little if at all will laws pertaining to children. It is by this analysis that I sincerely doubt Freedman had, himself, studied the Talmud and jewish law or was even remotely acquainted with it, as opposed to just having regurgitated known anti-Talmud quotes in a seemingly automatic rejection and equally one dimensional quote-mining "exposé" of it.

[1] This is available at the following address:

<http://semiticcontroversies.blogspot.com/2008/10/on-jewish-traitors-benjamin-freedman.html>.

[2] Iustinus Pranaitis, Trans: E. N. Sanctuary, 1939, [1892], *'The Talmud Unmasked: The Secret Rabbinical Teachings Concerning Christians'*, 1st Edition, E. N. Sanctuary: New York.

[3] August Roehling, 1871, *"Der Talmudjude"*, 1st Edition, Verlag von Theodor Fritsch: Leipzig.

[4] Elizabeth Dilling, 1964, *"The Plot Against Christianity"*. This is available at the following address: <http://www.come-and-hear.com/dilling/index.html>.

- [5] Michael Hoffman II, 2000, "The Truth about the Talmud: A Documented Expose of Supremacist Rabbinic Hate Literature". This is available at the following address: <http://www.revisionisthistory.org/talmudtruth.html>.
- [6] Tractate Kiddushin, 12 b; Babylonian Talmud, Soncino Edition, english translation.
- [7] Via the "Maskana" (final prevailing judgement) delivered without being objected to, meaning the issue of who's authority ruling is to be followed.
- [8] Na'aroth pl. of na'arah, technically, a girl between twelve years and twelve and a half years of age. (A footnote in the Soncino Talmud, Kethuboth 29a, defines Narah and Naaroth)
- [9] Maim. H. Ishuth. IV. 1 ; Eben Ha-Ezer, XLII, 1.
- [10] Tosafot to Kiddushin, page 41: K. ISSEBLBS' glossary to Eben Ha- Ezer XXXVII. 8.
- [11] Eben Ha Ezer Siman "2" Se'if 9
- [12] Tractate Sanhedrin. 76 ; Yebamoth 101, Babylonian Talmud, Soncino Edition, english translation
- [13] Tractate Kethuboth, 11b, Babylonian Talmud; Soncino Edition, english translation.
- [14] Yebamoth, 60b. Babylonian Talmud, Soncino Edition, english translation.

A Response to the Wandering Jew

Friday, 21 November 2008

I recently wrote a response on the forum, Vanguard News Network, that I would like to republish here to for the sake of both archiving it and clarifying some of my general thoughts on jewish ritual murder, also known as the blood libel in jewish and academic circles.

I point out that the common argument concerning the observance of kashrut precludes jews from having committed such crimes is a nonsense and presumes incorrectly that jews firstly all believe precisely the same interpretation of the Torah/Tanakh and that secondly all jews are wholly observant of the official dictates of Judaism. This is quite obviously an unrealistic argument to make, but often it is the only argument made by both scholars and laymen possibly because it offers a quick and easy road to pooh-poo the allegation and then move onto the 'interesting bit' of why people believed it and still do believe it (etc).

Originally Posted by The Wandering Jew <http://www.vnnforum.com/showthread.php?p=879146>

I'm glad you do not believe the blood libel bullshit. Its ridiculous to suggest that we make Matzah (Bread) from the blood of non-Jewish children. Kashrut dictates there can be no worse crime than to eat human flesh.

Actually I do 'believe' in it. Belief really isn't the right word for a historical argument unless it is quite literally a religion (like the 'holocaust'): jewish ritual murder (the 'blood libel' is not an accurate description and is a nonsense term) is a valid event that can be reasonably be argued to

take place/have taken place. It isn't true in all the allegations of this type, but then since when was every accusation of murder taken as a case of actual murder and used to suggest murder was in fact a fantasy?

It isn't 'ridiculous' to suggest that it occurred. For example Trent is a case where it can be reasonably asserted that it took place. If you read Hsia's study, which is the standard one, of it carefully and with a knowledge of the primary accounts he is relying on then it becomes clear that Hsia's argument is essentially incorrect. Even worse: Hsia is simply inventing reasons to explain away certain issues (such as 'a thorn circumcised the boy's penis before he was swept into the Mikvah' [to paraphrase him] when Hsia has nothing at all to suggest that firstly a thorn could do such an injury and secondly any other evidence to suggest any other cause other than human agency). Hsia ends up accusing the Schweitzer of the crime and bends over backwards, rather than deducing from the evidence, to prevent the jews even being under suspicion.

In his other major work on this, *'The Myth of Ritual Murder'* (Yale: 1988 [I think]), Hsia comes clean with his views on the subject a lot more while again not following the evidence that implicates jews, that he quite often mentions but does not think along that avenue at all [from having had a conversation with him it seems to be deliberate], while following to its logical conclusion any evidence that implicates gentile [read: local non-jewish] involvement. He makes quite the patchwork quilt of a theory as to why he thinks jews could not have been responsible and why they were blamed for the crimes [he also doesn't follow his theory through, which in fact points to the jews being largely responsible for the origins of the claim even if it was false].

It wasn't/isn't a widespread practice as has been wrongly claimed by most anti-Semitic authors on this [and nor is it an 'anti-Semitic/Christian/anti-Judaic fantasy' as most philo-Semitic authors have claimed] , but it is something that is wholly consistent with jewish acts of violence towards non-jews throughout the millennia of jew/gentile co-existence [that jews have tried to minimize and just write out of history]. The idea of the blood drinking being opposed to Kashrut is indeed true: however this does not disqualify jews having committed it for religious reasons.

Ironically von Leers offered an interesting, and certainly potentially valid, rationale for the crime in the kapparot committed to wipe away jewish sins (in that the hebrew word used to justify the sacrifice actually means both 'man' and 'rooster'). This is an underinvestigated angle to the issue of jewish ritual murder (and also includes the consumption aspect there-of as the kapparot rooster/hen is given to the jewish poor as a philanthropic donation. This would be consistent with the reports of the distribution of blood/matzoh to other jews, usually poor and not involved in the actual sacrifice itself, after the event.) and one that certainly deserves attention far more so than the irrational declarations that 'it is a lie' when little/no reasonable evidence/interpretation has been offered for why this might be the case (a lot of bluster though).

Motivation for such crimes was also suggested in Horowitz's excellent *'Reckless Rites: Purim and the Legacy of Jewish Violence'* (Princeton: 2007) although he didn't quite take it to ritual murder he took it to the twin of it in standard literature: host desecration (see the Passau case for example). He hinted it could be taken further, but taking it to JRM would have been a step too far [in terms of it being considered 'acceptable criticism'] as proven later that year by Ariel Toaff (and the polemics and campaign launched against him by jewish organisations worldwide).

It is found in the concept of vengeance in Jewish culture and theology: in that if one takes the concept of Amalek and Agagite (who remember Rambam ruled still existed and hence it is still part of the Jewish religious mission to hunt down and exterminate 'the seed of Amalek' and especially 'the seed of Agag'). Since in Jewish literature the cultures, especially Christianity before the Lutheran Reformation, were identified as Amalek it is quite plausible that a group of Jews performed Jewish ritual murder on this basis.

It is true there were cases, such as Beilis (1913) and potentially Damascus (1840) [but that's still open for argument because the evidence swings either way depending on interpretation], where there were erroneous claims of this type, but then as Jews are so fond of telling me, each case must be evaluated on its own merits and not those of an ulterior agenda.

However your argument can be answered very succinctly with the following counter-question: have all Jews historically and presently observed the (and/or precisely the) same mitzvot and commands of the Torah/Tanakh to keep Kashrut while professing to be observant Jews? Do you see now why that argument you used is a complete nonsense?

Book Review: Carleton Putnam, 1980, 'Race and Reality: A Search for Solutions', 2nd Edition, Howard Allen: Cape Canaveral.

Sunday, 23 November 2008

The current debate concerning race, between those whom recognise empirical reality, and those who would cling to the dogmatism and religious experience of 'modern' egalitarianism, is often considered to be a recent debate, which has only been reignited recently by the publication of such works as Richard Herrnstein and Charles Murray's 1994 book, *'The Bell Curve'*.

However in *'Race and Reality'*: Carleton Putnam writes of the very same debate, which raged in academia then as it does now. It betrays startling similarity to today's debate between science, and political ideology, or 'cultural Darwinism', and 'cultural Lysenkoism', as perhaps we can refer to it with some degree of accuracy. Both arguments have progressed, but the problems have stayed essentially the same.

Carleton Putnam was the cousin of the famous Professor Carleton Coon with whom he shared similar views on the subject of race. He was the Chief Executive Officer of Delta Airlines for several decades, a recognised aviation pioneer and a qualified lawyer. In fact this book was written as immediate sequel to his other major work, *'Race and Reason: A Yankee View'*, first published in 1961. *Race and Reality* on the other hand was originally published in 1967, but a second edition was re-launched in 1980.

Putnam extensively records the way in which the Marxist Jew Franz Boas, of much fame as the founder of modern egalitarianism in the biological and social sciences, made science match his ideology and how he was merely continuing a trend in his family towards socialism and an

unrealistic utopianism. This perhaps is the ultimate irony in so far as it has been suggested in several recent psychological studies that pre-disposition to specific politics may be partly genetic, in the same way as personality can be said to have a strong genetic basis (as per the 'London School' of the late Hans Eysenck).

'Race and Reality' also documents the scale of Boas', and his disciple's involvement with communism, as well as socialism, with Boas himself being a confirmed member of no less than 46 marxist organisations. Many with ties directly back to the Soviet Union then under the iron fist of Lenin and later Stalin. Thus as Putnam so clearly demonstrates modern egalitarianism started out as an extreme form of marxist ideology, i.e. all differences between people's must be explained purely in class and economic terms, and then tried to find selective evidence to 'prove' that it was scientifically correct. This attitude is much in the same vein as Karl Marx's original coining of the term, 'scientific socialism', in order to give it a veneer of supposed authority to his thought among the more liberally-minded in the scientific community, and the folk at large.

Interestingly, this evidence as demonstrated by UNESCO's pamphlets, written by the jewish anthropologist Anthony Montagu, formerly Israel Ehrenberg, is nothing to do with actual science per se, and concentrates on moral invective, scientific smoke-screens [creating unknowns/mysteries where there are none and pretension to bias on the part of those whom do not agree with them], and exploiting and twisting popular themes.

Putnam spends two chapters, which he calls *"The Fantasy"* and *"The Facts"*, dealing with the general beliefs of the two camps and also clarifying and stressing the sheer qualifications in the racist camp. This is perhaps the most important part of the book. Since what Putnam later recounts is a story of woe indeed, but it hinges on the fact that there was no basis for the 'Brown versus Board of Education' decision originally and that the relevant scientists were not consulted as to the scientific grounds for that decision. Thus Putnam rightly concludes the decision was not based on scientific grounds but rather on political ideology informing legal and social ideas.

He notes that all the 'science' used to justify the very legal decisions made, was never really put to the test since few 'race realist' scientists were even allowed to testify before the committee: the majority of those that were allowed being social scientists of one marxist stripe or another.

Putnam also discusses what many, otherwise sane academics, are so afraid of discussing: the disconcerting alliance of the media and boasian/marxist academics. Based I would argue on their shared ideals and in many cases further on their shared jewish heritage. This alliance Putnam demonstrates by quoting some very disturbing extracts and details both from his own and other's experiences. It is best conveyed to the reader in an example on ABC Television in 1962 given by Putnam:

'Smith (Anchor): 'Sir, what do you think about the statement that was made the American Anthropological Association? It says 'The Association repudiates statements now appearing in the United States that Negroes are biologically and in innate mental ability inferior to Whites/'[I]

Putnam: 'I might compare the statement with a recent book written by the President of the

American Association of Physical Anthropologists [Coon] in which he presents evidence, and takes the position, that the Negro race is 200,000 years behind the White race on the ladder of evolution'.

Smith: 'What are some of the findings?'

Putnam: 'The findings are that there is from every standpoint - from the standpoint of Zoology, from the standpoint of Anatomy, from the standpoint of Anthropology, from the standpoint of psychology - there is no question - the evidence is overwhelming in favor of a difference between the races in those elements which are involved in adaptability to our Western Culture.'

Smith: [In a changed background, facing the audience, Putnam cut from scene.] 'Mr. Putnam suggested that Dr. Carleton Coon, the president of the Association of Physical Anthropologists, gave some support to his view. We asked that Association, and it gave us this statement 'We condemn such writings as Race and Reason' – that's Mr. Putnam's book - 'There is nothing in Science that justifies the denial of opportunities or rights to any group by virtue of Race.' [Interview Terminated].'

Now this classic example of the manipulation of opinion by the media, which is why Putnam includes it in his work, confirms exactly what Pearson, in *'Race, Intelligence and Bias in Academe'*, recognised in that the media is nothing, but a bed-fellow of the marxist movement in academe.

What Putnam doesn't mention, of course, is the fact that marxism [and associated views] have, especially in Boas' time, generally been a significantly jewish movement in terms of physical and intellectual leadership, and that co-incidentally the media happens to also have a very significant jewish presence both in terms of ownership as well as the face's of the media (and the 'television experts' it uses). However, we must forgive him for this oversight since Putnam is writing a book about race generally, rather than making a point of exposing jewish influence in European and Aryan countries both in the past and the present.

As you can see Putnam makes a compelling and objective case against the decisions made, and shows why he is correct in his assertions. It is also worth saying that on the publication of Putnam's 1961 book: *'Race and Reason: A Yankee View'*. This same academic association on the instigation of a tiny minority of hard-line marxists put forward a motion to compose a press release condemning Putnam's book as unscientific. Coon asked that before a vote was taken, that all those who had actually read the book raise their hands, apparently only two or three in the entire room did so. Coon promptly packed up and left to go home for the night, much to the annoyance of the minority of hard-line marxists.

This media and scientific pattern has continued well beyond the time of Putnam's writing, and may well continue well into the future. Doubtless this book was any less well received, and as Putnam points out he has been called a 'racist' many times, but nobody has thus far managed to produce any serious evidence to contradict his or other race realist's ideas.

Perhaps one of the most interesting quotations to share with those readers who have heard the

popular refrain from egalitarians, that there is no physical difference between different races brains, is from C. J. Connolly's 1950, *The External Morphology of the Primate Brain*, which studied a sample of 60 Negro, and White brains.

I quote:

"Comparing the two large groups of Whites and Negroes, while the variability is large and there is much overlapping, the mean values reveal significant differences. The dimensions correlate well with what we might expect from a knowledge of the cranium in the two races. The Negro brain is on the average relatively longer, narrower, and flatter than the brain of the Whites. The frontal region, as measured by the projectional distance to the mid-point of the second sulcus, is, relative to the total length of the brain, larger in male Whites than in Negroes, while the parietal is larger in Negroes than in Whites [...]. It can be said that the pattern of the frontal lobes in the Whites brains of our series is more regular, more uniform than in the Negro brain [...]. The White series is perhaps more slightly fissurated and there is more anatomising of the sulci [...] it is a matter of frequencies."

Putnam doesn't just take Connolly on his word, but quotes some of the best academics of the day in their analyses of the Negro and White brain. This is a great strength of the book since Putnam unlike so many other authors in this area has surveyed the material extensively, and has shown that it agrees on large racial differences, but ironically feels that it can't tell anyone about it.

Later in this book Putnam provides a blow-by-blow account of how the NAACP got the 'Brown vs. Board of Education' decision in the first place, but unfortunately does not mention that jews were instrumental in both this decision and in the creation of the early NAACP. And, then used this decision as opposed to their 'science' [which, was later shown to be utterly false in the academic literature] to nullify any further decisions, which opposed their egalitarian political ideology. It is perhaps interesting to note that by the time of 'Race and Reality's' second publication in 1980 all the research that had been used as justification for the 'Brown' decision had been found to be either fraudulent, inaccurate or wanting in many ways. But, by then of course it was all too late...

At the end of the book Putnam includes a section called "*Point Counter-Point*", which is essentially a racist Frequently Asked Questions, or 'FAQ', answering every possible criticism that could be offered off Putnam's and Race Realism's position in general. It gives details as to the supposedly 'magnificent' African cultures, and notes the differentiation between the presentation, and the actuality. However unfortunately Putnam distances himself from the jewish angle claiming that National Socialist Germany was an aberration in terms of racialism and that racialism should not be 'judged', because of the Third Reich's real or imagined crimes. He also does not detail, as I have stated the significant jewish involvement in the 'Brown vs. Board of Education' decision, in the promotion of Marxism or in the creation of the NAACP. These are certainly weaknesses of 'Race and Reality' and do require further reading to correct, but the book does serve as an excellent learning guide for those seeking to understand what science said at the time of the Brown versus Board of Education decision and the 'Civil Rights' movement.

But perhaps the real value of the book is not the devastating arguments, and sources Putnam

uses, but by the very humbling realisation of how racial sanity was defeated by racial insanity. Not by cold hard science, but by jewish-inspired real politick, media complicity, idealism and political manipulation. '*Race and Reality*' is a lesson to racialists both in how they should look to compose their own works and that ignoring significant jewish involvement is a considerable mistake and that by ignoring it their arguments, become less factually-based and thus become open to co-option by these same jewish voices who in the 1960's were all for egalitarianism.

It is also worth remembering that many of the academics cited by 'White Nationalists', such as Arthur Jensen and Richard Herrnstein, in regards to race, especially to do with IQ testing and the resulting trends, are in fact jews, and that in unduly relying on them gives jews an escape route, as they have created in organisations such as American Renaissance, where-by said jews become 'whites' and 'White Nationalists'. The danger is very real and this coupled with the poor state of anti-jewish critique, which we have been examining and beginning to correct here at Semitic Controversies, there is an opportunity for the jews to escape the scorching spotlight of accurate and incisive anti-jewish critique by re-inventing themselves as 'racialists'.

It is more than time that the anti-Semitic intellectual movement began to get its collective act together and use the many intellectual tools available to re-forge the interdisciplinary field of anti-Semitic critique of the jews and Judaism that was lost when National Socialist Germany surrendered in 1945.

On Jewish 'Traitors': Jack Bernstein (Part I)

Sunday, 30 November 2008

The name of Jack Bernstein is well known both in Nationalist and leftist circles as a jew opposed to Zionism. The main work that appears under his name is of a similar importance in its use as key reading and as a source of citations in Nationalist literature is: '*The Life of an American Jew in Racist, Marxist Israel*'[1]. The work itself seems to have been dictated to one Len Martin and is not actually Bernstein's own writing although it is presumably verbatim: with the necessary tidying up from an oral to written format kept to a minimum. This would seem to be evident in the highly unusual structure of the book: for it is a series of small self-contained arguments/talks on various subjects concerning Israel and Ashkenazi jewry. It in structure is not unlike Reginald Scot's '*The Discoverie of Witchcraft*'[2], but in a more contemporary fashion, with each section relating to a specific point that the author wishes to make/argue, but these points are not necessarily interconnected, but rather are points of concentration decided by the author and only give the opinions of the author rather than factual argument.

The reason for Bernstein's popularity on both, and ostensibly opposing, sides of the political spectrum is routed in this structure. In that he takes a strong anti-Zionist pro-Palestinian stance, but at the same time he rejects communism and lampoons the jews as having their origins in Khazaria as well as declaring the Israelis to be fascist. By this mercurial switch between criticism of Zionism as both communist and fascist and questioning the Semitic roots of the Ashkenazim: Bernstein manages to successfully straddle the political fence between the Nationalist right and the Internationalist left.

What sealed Bernstein's book in a place, where it is cited by both the political right and left, as an authority is the supposed circumstances of his death, which is alleged to have been conducted by Mossad: Israel's foreign intelligence service and notoriously fanatical Zionists[3]. In order to silence so effective a critic who was 'revealing too much'. I can find no date or particulars of this alleged assassination and nor can I find a short or extensive biography of Bernstein or any detailed source as to the circumstances surrounding his death.

We can however state that, however much importance is ascribed to Bernstein now, it is hard to see why he would have been the target of a successful assassination attempt by the Mossad. Assassination is a weapon of last resort for any intelligence/security service and firstly is only conducted when there is no other option, secondly is usually conducted in such a way as for it not to seem like an assassination, and thirdly is preferably conducted in a remote location and even more preferably in a location where the local security services can be persuaded via bribes or threats to look the other way.

Political assassination is not an uncommon strategy among jews, particularly for the violent religious Zionist fringe in Israel itself[4], but there would seem to be no particular reason why Bernstein would have been such a threat as to expend a large quantity of state resources in killing him.

Bernstein was one of a plethora of critics of Israel and Zionism, but there seems no reason why he was especially dangerous and should be dealt with in such an extreme way. Sephardi jews have long complained, and criticised the Ashkenazim, about their treatment in Israel so Bernstein wasn't notable in this regard. His arguments that Israel was a fascist/'Nazi-like' state were, and are, standard fare on the political left. His arguments that the Ashkenazim were descended from the Khazars were then a point of academic contention, which had then been recently revived by Arthur Koestler's book on the subject[5]. His arguments concerning the alliance between Zionist bankers in New York and Bolshevik/communist jews in the Soviet Union were, and still are, standard fare on the Nationalist right.

In short: Bernstein argued nothing that was not argued before, during or after his time: yet he is alleged to have been singled out and targeted quite specifically, presumably as stated because he was especially dangerous, by the Mossad.

Since we don't seem to have a reasonable motive for the Mossad singling out Bernstein then we must suggest that he wasn't singled out by the Mossad at all. Particularly as there doesn't appear to be any record of the manner of his death or what evidences the state the Mossad were involved at all.

A solution to this may be found in some of Bernstein's first words, which are a '*challenge to his Zionist brethren*', in the book, which are as follows:

'But, if a Jew is the person doing the exposing, you resort to other tactics.

** First, you ignore the charges, hoping the information will not be given widespread*

distribution.

** If the information starts reaching too many people, you ridicule the information and the persons giving the information.*

** If that doesn't work, your next step is character assassination. If the author or speaker hasn't been involved in sufficient scandal you are adept at fabricating scandal against the person or persons.*

** If none of these are effective, you are known to resort to physical attacks.'* [\[6\]](#)

Now if we consider the possibility that Bernstein died in, for example, a car accident, which is an infamous method for removing problematic individuals: as it can be made to look like accident and the task is done with the minimum of risk and involvement (as per my comments on assassination above). Then it might be suggested in order to make Bernstein's work more appealing and his words more authoritative, because if he was dangerous enough to be assassinated by the Mossad then he must, as the logic goes, be on to something very important. The assertion that Bernstein was assassinated by the Mossad, the Israeli intelligence agency that is best known outside of Israel itself and has a considerable mythos of invincibility that makes its involvement in any conspiracy almost *de rigueur* in alternative political literature of the conspiratorial variety, was promulgated.

These apparent words of Bernstein found in the first pages of the book, that I have quoted above, are then regarded as prophetic, by the reader, of what happened to Bernstein, because he was simply too dangerous an opponent of the Zionist conspiracy to let live (and hence may have had some inkling he would be killed by the Mossad). This then re-enforces the notion in the reader's mind that Bernstein had something very important to say and that his opinions and testimony should be heard with great reverence and regarded with great authority. This is certainly a reverence and authority that, on the face of it, the work, and Bernstein as an author, do not deserve, since if we remember that Bernstein is an Ashkenazi jew himself and the opinions he gives on a variety of issues are quite lurid: we begin to understand that it isn't either admirable or likely useful in many meaningful sense of the term.

If similar assertions were coming from a 'holocaust survivor' they would be regarded, rightly in most cases I would argue, as so much fabricated jewish nonsense, but because they are coming from a jew who is critical of both Israel and the influential jewish establishment: this same kind of lurid testimony and opining is taken as solid evidence of jewish perfidy. Yet, as I have covered above in my introductory discussion of 'jewish traitor' testimony and the general problem and considerations that have to be made with, this is a hugely problematic double standard, which renders the critique of jewry that uses it hypocritical (and inconsistent ergo irrational) as well as open to dismissal by pro-jewish authors via the targeting of this double standard. Anti-jewish thought, as I have said, needs to leave behind this weakness and treat all jews as jews, and as such we must remember once more than Bernstein is first and foremost a jew and however much apparent value we see in what he writes we must always bear this singular fact foremost in our minds.

It is possible that these most important words, and in particular: *'If none of these are effective, you are known to resort to physical attacks'*, are not Bernstein's own, but rather Len Martin's. Since it is an interesting and notable co-incidence that the key part of the emphasis of the authority of Bernstein is the manner of his death, as you will see when he is cited particularly by the Nationalist right in that there is generally affixed an addendum to the effect of *'assassinated/killed by the Mossad'*, and this short passage, which as I have said acts to re-enforce the belief in the importance of Bernstein's opinions and testimony. This combined with Len Martin's likely responsibility for spreading the suggestion of Bernstein's having been assassinated by the Mossad[7], makes for further suggestion that this first part of Bernstein's book may not in fact be his, but rather a deliberate addition by Martin in order to facilitate the authority and hence the sales of the work.

Since if the booklet is taken an authoritative and devastating critique, which can be facilitated by the idea that the author was assassinated by the Mossad for his views [ergo he *'knew something especially dangerous'*], then the sales of the work will be much higher than if it is just a normal set of opinions. Since the work itself has little value in terms of making an evidenced argument, it has to have another point of interest (or otherwise it is simply akin to reading a long string of assertions by a jew posting on an internet forum) and that point is provided as I have said by the claimed manner of Bernstein's death.

Hence although it is impossible to definitely say that Bernstein's assassination by the Mossad did not happen: it does seem very improbable given what evidence we do have and that this assassination has become the main selling point of a work with little else in particular to recommend itself, but the mythos of the author's assassination. Hence in pointing this out we strip Bernstein of his perceived authority and can begin to look at his work as it actually is without having to contend with complaints emanating from the claimed manner of his death.

Bernstein's political sympathies would appear to lie more with the political left than with Nationalism since he takes great pains to detail the 'Nazi-Zionist collaboration' as being the cause of the so-called 'holocaust', the discrimination by the Ashkenazim against the Sephardim and the Zionist conspiracy against the Palestinians and Arabs in general as well as the war crimes committed by Zionists/Israeli soldiers during the several conflicts that Israel has been involved in its short existence.

It is all worth saying that Bernstein comes out in this book as a devoted anti-racist, of an apparently liberal/libertarian political persuasion, whom is fighting on behalf of the people of the world against the Zionist Ashkenazi jewish elite whom he styles as the *'new Nazis'*. His motive in this seems to be just as much about ideology, as about his own personal circumstances. Since Bernstein brings up his wife, Ziva, a Sephardi jewess several times throughout the work to indicate her experiences. Bernstein also often uses his marriage to Ziva as the starting point of the many anecdotes of which the work is made up.

This bring us onto another important point in that much like Benjamin Freedman and Maurice Samuel, Bernstein is writing from personal perspective and without references. Unlike Freedman, but like Samuel, Bernstein doesn't claim to have any special knowledge or authority, but rather to have simply been the witness to the behaviours and observations he describes. This

makes it very hard to take Bernstein's points as actual argument, but rather we have to take what we would normally categorize as arguments as being the opinions of a Jew and his anecdotal relation of events as simply being testimony, which must be corroborated in the standard way in order for it to be considered of value in an argument.

Using Bernstein to evidence a particular point without noting that this is a Jew relating his own personal experience, regardless of the appealing, but I would suggest poisoned, evidence that he offers us, and hence, because we must remember that Bernstein is a Jew, without corroboration it must be treated with an extremely sceptical eye. It is also worth repeating that Bernstein does not write from a balanced well-argued perspective, but merely personal opinion and that as with any account of this kind we must pay keen attention to detail.

This detail is essential to understanding Bernstein's work for what Bernstein is writing here is opinion, which may or may not represent facts and experiences accurately, but what we must try and do is deduce the value of Bernstein from these short opinions and anecdotes. In performing this task we have to look at one particular aspect of Bernstein's work and that is what he has included in it. Since this detail, more than actual argument used, is essential to Bernstein's position for it offers us an insight into Bernstein's thinking and the sub-text involved in the production of this work.

As I have said above what Bernstein includes mainly relates to his Sephardi Jewish wife, and his reasoning and thought seem to be centred on her and the treatment she received from his fellow Ashkenazim. One of the very first things he does in the work is to introduce Ziva, properly Fawzia Daboul, his wife to us and gives us some brief biographical ideas about when he met her and her origins as a Sephardi Jewish woman from Iraq^[8]. He also elaborates on how he and Ziva courted^[9] and how they were married.

After these biographical notes, which are of note because they are Bernstein's route to the core motivation of his writing, Bernstein reveals to us how he is motivated by his marriage to Ziva to become opposed to his fellow Ashkenazim. He describes his experience, which leads his thoughts into beginning his case against his fellow Ashkenazim as well as against what he perceives, not unjustly so, as the fruit of their creative labours: Israel.

Bernstein states as follows when leading us into his opinions on the Ashkenazim and Israel:

'Ziva and I were happy, but our marriage created serious problems. You see, Ziva is a Sephardic Jewish woman and I am an Ashkenazi Jew. For an Ashkenazi Jew to marry a Sephardic Jew is frowned upon in Israel by the ruling Ashkenazis. To understand why this is the case, you must realize the difference between the Sephardic and Ashkenazi Jews.'^[10]

This is qualified in the paragraph above the quoted passage by the following statement:

'Yet, I was happy to leave after 4 months — two months earlier than originally planned. During the time I was working in the Kibbutz, I carried on courtship with Ziva. She was one of the reasons I left the Kibbutz after only 4 months — we were to be married.'^[11]

It is not unreasonable to suggest with these comments, leading into Bernstein's thoughts on the origin of the Ashkenazim, rather he is motivated by the ill-treatment of his wife as a non-Ashkenazi jewess married to an Ashkenazi jew by his Ashkenazi kin. As Bernstein states: *'it was love at first sight'*, which suggests a strong and passionate romantic relationship between himself and Ziva. We may presume Ziva shared his feelings to a significant degree, if not completely, for the reason of Bernstein's passionate regard for her.

It is also possible to infer from the second passage cited that his relationship with Ziva was arguably a point of friction between Bernstein and the other members of the kibbutz named Ein HaShofet^[12]. Since Bernstein's leaving the kibbutz early in order to marry would be somewhat unusual and in the course of his and Ziva's courting we may reasonably suggest she at least once visited him on at Ein HaShofet. This is all the more plausible when we take into account that Ein HaShofet was created by a combined group of Ashkenazi jews from Poland and North America. It is thus quite plausible to suggest that Bernstein may have begun to form his views from the fiction between himself and his fellow kibbutz members. This may also be suggested by the following comment he makes about the kibbutzim in general:

'A kibbutz is a farming and sometimes industrial venture. It is important to explain that Israel's Kibbutz system is a Marxist idea brought to Israel by the Ashkenazi Jews who migrated to Israel mainly from Poland and Russia. These Jews are part of that bunch of Jews know as the BOLSHEVIKS.'^[13]

Here Bernstein is lampooning kibbutzim as a form of applied Marxism and as (proto-) Bolsheviks, but notably he states that the idea was brought to Israel by jews from Poland and Russia. Since in Bernstein's writing the 'Nazis' are similar to the 'Bolsheviks' in that they all persecute jews in some manner or another (i.e. as totalitarian deniers of freedom to himself and Ziva). This association of Marxism/Bolshevism with National Socialism can be seen in the following statements by Bernstein:

'Once out of the service, a number of the ex-service people join the Shin Bet, the equivalent of Hitler's Gestapo. Like the Gestapo, they engage in repressing anyone who acts or speaks out against the Marxist/Fascist government of Zionist dominated Israel. Like in Nazi Germany, all people in Israel are required to carry identity booklets called "Teudat Zehut" in Hebrew.'^[14]

And then:

'Concerning Nazism/Fascism, please let me clear a point. Germans are an admirable people — I dare say even great. But in Germany, the general population were victims of the Nazis who through cunning and brutality gained power. In Germany, the average Jews were victims of the Zionist elite who worked hand in hand with the Nazis. Many of those same Zionist Jews who, in Germany, had worked with the Nazis, came to Israel and joined hands with the Zionist/Communist Jews from Poland and Russia. It is the two faces of communism and Nazi-style fascism that rule Israel. Democracy is merely an illusion. Regarding the tie between the elite Ashkenazi Jew and the Nazis, take a look at the word 'Ashkenazi' — look again 'Ashke-NAZI'.

Interesting isn't it? There is a great confusion regarding the relationship of fascism to communism. Fascism is national socialism. Communism is international socialism.' [15]

Here Bernstein makes it quite clear that he is a democrat, i.e. a liberal or a libertarian, who sees National Socialism and Marxism/Bolshevism as being simply '*totalitarian*'. To him they are the same, even if actually opposed to one another, since Bernstein is reasoning from the perspective of that these ideologies impede him from marrying the woman he loves, Ziva, and hence the Ashkenazi jews must also be '*Fascists*' and '*Bolsheviks*'. This is most obviously representing in Bernstein's puerile notation about the word, Ashkenazi, singling out the ending as the colloquial diminutive term for National Socialism or a National Socialist: '*Nazi*'. It is also plausible to suggest that Bernstein knows that being called '*Nazis*' would be deeply offensive to Ashkenazi jews, who are obsessed with their supposed suffering in the so-called 'holocaust', and hence allows him to once again attack and emotionally hurt those who are deliberately attacking and emotionally hurting his wife: Ziva.

In light of this when we note that Ein HaShofet was composed of a significant proportion of jews from Poland [16], put that together with the above lampoons and our discussion of Bernstein's motivation originating from the treatment of his Sephardi/Mizrahi wife by his fellow Ashkenazi. It becomes quite plausible that Ziva did visit him and that he came into some form of conflict with his fellow Ashkenazi kibbutzim members over his intending to marry her.

Thus we see that Bernstein is using the lurid, and quite possibly hysterical, description of the kibbutzim as a network of marxist/Bolshevik communities as a tool to attack those who tried, likely repeatedly and in increasingly drastic ways if they did so, to make him break off his engagement to Ziva. This then acts as a reasonable starting point for understanding Bernstein's work in that when we see him attack the jews: it is because of the experience he has had with discrimination against his wife and he focuses that anger on the Ashkenazim and the state of Israel, which he sees as turning a blind to and even sanctioning this behaviour towards the woman he loves.

This origin of his thought becomes increasingly clear as we move through the text, shortly coming to another passage where Bernstein rails against the Ashkenazim in the context of the treatment that Ziva has received. Bernstein states as follows:

'For the first three years of our marriage, it was necessary for us to live with Ziva's aunt. This was because of the critical housing shortage in Israel and because of racism. Housing is allotted as follows:

** Ashkenazi Jews who have lived in Israel for many years are given first choice.*

** Second in line are Ashkenazi Jews from Europe — especially if they are married or marry an Israel-born Ashkenazi Jew.*

** The next favored are Ashkenazi Jews from the U.S. — especially if they marry an Israeli born Ashkenazi.*

* *Sephardic Jews have the next choice of whatever housing is left.*

* *At the bottom of the list are Moslems, Druze and Christians.*

Opportunities for employment follow the same pattern: Ashkenazi Jews get the choicest jobs, Sephardic Jews next, and Moslem, Druze and Christians fill the menial jobs with a great many left unemployed. Even though I was an Ashkenazi Jew from the U.S., I was placed lower on the list for housing because I married a Sephardic Jewess.' [17]

This attack on/description of the discrimination against Sephardi jews by the Ashkenazim, which is not likely to be untrue given that discrimination by the Ashkenazim against the Sephardim and Mizrahim is well documented in both jewish [18] and non-jewish sources [19], need not have been placed in the context of Bernstein's own experiences having married a Sephardi/Mizrahi jewess. However he does so frequently talking from the perspective of being engaged in a personal animosity with those who have made the woman he loves want for anything deliberately. For in the above quoted passage Bernstein complains of not being able to gain housing and suitable employment opportunities for the sake of Ziva. Suggesting that Ziva is both the unwilling cause of his present misfortune and that Bernstein apportions the blame on those discriminating against Ziva and not himself: for as Bernstein states. This discrimination was 'because he married a Sephardic Jewess'.

This according to Freud's theory of psycho-analysis, the key as I have said to understanding jewish thought, would be a simple manifestation of the built-up loathing for those who indirectly/directly questioned Bernstein's manhood in questioning the suitability of the woman he most desired, Ziva, in the questioning of the legitimacy of the Ashkenazi pre-eminence.

This manifestation of the loathing for those who would question Bernstein's manhood is manifested most obviously in Bernstein's assertion that the Ashkenazi jews are not Semites at all, but are rather descended from the Khazars and hence the foundation of Zionist ideology, the key part of the legitimizing argument for the existence of Israel, is thus invalidated and the legitimacy of the Ashkenazim is questioned in their own eyes since the question to many Zionists and Ashkenazim of fundamental importance is whether they are Semitic and the 'true inheritors' of Palestine.

[1] Jack Bernstein, 1985, *The Life of an American Jew in Racist Marxist Israel: As told to Len Martin*. The full text is available at the following address: <http://www.jackbernstein.org/>. There is no pagination in this online edition of the work, which I am forced to use due to the lack of a reliable print copy. Hence page references cannot be reasonably given, but I will endeavour to give some indication of which part of the work the quotation/assertions in question maybe found.

[2] Reginald Scot, 1930, [1584], *The Discoverie of Witchcraft*, 1st Edition, John Rodker: London.

[3] For a general, although I suspect not wholly accurate, account please see: Gordon Thomas', 2007, *Gideon's Spies: The Secret History of the Mossad*, 1st Edition, St. Martin's Griffin: New York; Ian Black & Benny Morris', 1992, *Israel's Secret Wars: A History of Israel's Intelligence Services*, 1st Edition, Grove Press: New York and Dan Raviv & Yossi Melman's, 1990, *Every Spy a Prince: The Complete History of Israel's Intelligence Community*, 1st Edition, Houghton

Mifflin: Boston.

[4] Such as the assassination of the Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin in 1995 by a Jewish radical named Yigal Amir.

[5] Arthur Koestler, 1976, *'The Thirteenth Tribe'*, 1st Edition, Random House: New York.

[6] Bernstein, Op. Cit.

[7] Since the following note, presumably written by Martin, is included in the text: *'(This honest and courageous Jew was assassinated some years ago, by MOSSAD).'*' Ibid.

[8] Since she was from Iraq she would actually be a Mizrahi, rather than a Sephardi, Jewess, but Mizrahim generally follow the Sephardi religious ritual in Judaism and with Bernstein's own definition of a Jew as a follower of Judaism rather in the more accurate racial sense. This would also correspond with Bernstein's comments about their being married in a Sephardi synagogue.

[9] Bernstein however fails to note that the Kibbutzim, on which he briefly opines, were often also religious as well as socialistic in nature, as well as that some of them were non-Marxist and nationalistic in nature. Bernstein's lurid and apparently hysterical statement that: *'EACH OF THESE KIBBUTZ ARE AFFILIATED WITH ONE OF ISRAEL'S MARXIST PARTIES ranging from SOCIALIST TO HARD-CORE COMMUNIST'* is patently untrue since as I have said there were highly nationalistic kibbutzim, such as the Gush Emunim who were, and are, followers of the Jewish radical rabbi Abraham (Avraham) Kook, as well as Marxist and simply religious ascetic kibbutzim. On this point see Roger Friedland & Richard Hecht, 1996, *'To Rule Jerusalem'*, 1st Edition, Cambridge University Press: New York, pp. 200-209.

[10] Bernstein, Op. Cit.

[11] Ibid.

[12] Translated: *'Spring of the Judge'* and named after the famous Jewish supreme court justice: Louis Brandeis. This kibbutz is located in northern Israel near the city of Haifa.

[13] Bernstein, Op. Cit.

[14] Ibid.

[15] Ibid.

[16] Depending on Bernstein's definition of Poland: this could include parts of the most densely populated, in terms of Jews residing there, part of Russia: the former Pale of Settlement. Russia could also include Poland as it had absorbed it into its territory in the 18th century under Catherine the Great and later absorbed Poland into Russia again with the defeat of National Socialist Germany in 1945.

[17] Bernstein, Op. Cit.

[18] For example Daniel Elazar, 1973, *'Local Government as an Integrating Factor in Israeli Society'* in Michael Curtis (Ed.), Mordecai Chertoff (Ed.), 1973, *'Israel: Social Structure and Change'*, 1st Edition, Transaction: New York, pp. 21-23, contends that such discrimination was significant in the early years of Israel's existence, but that Sephardim have made strides since then in terms of local influence. However as of 35 years after Elazar wrote those words there is still a strong feeling in Sephardi circles, as well proof of (such as the very recent case of the Beit Yaakov schools in the Israeli city of Eldad), institutional discrimination against them by the ruling Ashkenazim. However when Elazar wrote his words at time roughly congruent with when Bernstein was gleaning his first impressions of Israel it points out that Bernstein's observation, although certainly exaggerated, is not without a factual foundation.

[19] For example the humanitarian organisation, *'Human Rights Watch'*, reported that: *'Although low income Jewish students--especially new immigrant, Sephardic, or Mizrahi students--face some of the same challenges related to poverty that Palestinian Arab students do,*

the government provides disadvantaged Jewish students with a battery of resources designed to improve academic performance and to keep them from dropping out. The remedial and enrichment resources made available for Jewish schools include extra school hours and remedial and enrichment programs, offered both during school hours and after school, as well as truant officers, counseling, and the opportunity for vocational education.' Human Rights Watch, 2001, *'Second Class: Discrimination Against Palestinian Arab Children in Israel's Schools'*, Human Rights Watch: New York. The quotation is available at the following address: <http://www.hrw.org/legacy/reports/2001/israel2/ISRAEL0901-01.htm> [Accessed: 30/11/2008].

On Jewish 'Traitors': Jack Bernstein (Part II)

Sunday, 7 December 2008

Bernstein brings this questioning of the Semitic origins and legitimacy of the Ashkenazim and specifically their assertion of their right as Semites to a homeland in Palestine, to its height when he asserts as follows:

'These Khazars are now known as Ashkenazi Jews. Because these Khazar Ashkenazi Jews merely chose Judaism, they are not really Jews — at least not blood Jews.' [1]

And three paragraphs later:

'At the time, Palestine was inhabited by a half a million Palestinian Arabs and a few Palestinian Jews who are blood related and who had lived together in peace for centuries. With Palestine as their choice for a homeland, European Ashkenazi Jews began migrating to Palestine.' [2]

These assertions on the part of Bernstein are questioning the legitimacy of Ashkenazi origins, asserting that they are merely converts whom in Judaism are generally regarded as a second class and not full jews originating from the biological line of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and therefore as noted above attacking the very root of the central Zionist claim: that jews have a right to have their own state in Palestine. This is especially notable when Bernstein asserts that Ashkenazim are not *'blood Jews'*. Hence they are illegitimate and second class citizens in Judaic law and is further confirmed by Bernstein's assertion that there were *'a few Palestinian Jews who are blood-related'* to Arabs and other Semites. Therefore in Bernstein's conception these few jews are the *'real jews'*, while the Ashkenazim, although they claim to be, are not.

Further to this we find Bernstein stating that:

'Leading the cry, "We are God's Chosen People" are the Zionist/Marxist (Ashkenazi) Jews who for political purposes chose Judaism and who don't have a drop of biblical Jewish blood in them.' [3]

This statement, in the section entitled *'God's Chosen People'*, is the fullest expression of Bernstein's using an argument as to the potential origins of the Ashkenazim and striking back at them with it. Since in the above quoted sentence he brings the logic of the illegitimate, in terms

of Judaism, origins of the Ashkenazim through and applies it to Zionism in order to fundamentally undermine, as stated above, Zionism's claim to have a Jewish state in Palestine and thus Israel's right to existence.

Bernstein's consistent refrain that the Khazars didn't accept Judaism for religious reasons, but rather did so for political ones, is another point at which Bernstein is undermining the basis for the Ashkenazi claims, because although a convert is not well regarded in Judaism, a convert who converts out of nothing but secular concerns is considered far worse[4]. This further demonstrates Bernstein's need to question the legitimacy of the Ashkenazim and illuminates the reason for doing so again. In that Ziva, in his conception, is the real Jew, while he and the other Ashkenazim are not and hence she is better than the Ashkenazim, including himself, which is not an uncommon sentiment from a man who certainly seems to be deeply in love with his wife and is greatly offended and angered by the questioning of her Jewish legitimacy by other Jews.

This last part of Bernstein's argument is very important, because it focuses on asserting Jewish legitimacy for the woman he loves, Ziva, whose legitimacy as a Jew has been questioned by the Ashkenazim. This thus protects Ziva from attack, while projecting the very same attack, ostensibly used by the Ashkenazim on her, back onto the Ashkenazim themselves. This projection of the, presumably verbal, attacks on his wife onto the Ashkenazim takes the form of Bernstein's attacks on Zionism. Both because its main proponents, i.e. Ashkenazi Jews, have been the ones who have been responsible for the hurt to his wife, and also because it allows Bernstein to satisfy his own need for revenge, because in calling into question his wife's legitimacy his fellow Ashkenazim have questioned his own manhood.

This, of course, demands some kind of necessary revenge on Bernstein's part and hence this is what Bernstein is delighting in doing here by attacking the Ashkenazim in such a way as to potentially deeply hurt them. Hence revenging the presumably deep hurt his wife may or may not have actually felt which may or may not have been openly expressed to Bernstein himself on the cause of that hurt. This is a Freudian frame of reference that Bakan has indirectly asserted was taken by Sigmund Freud from his Jewish heritage, especially Jewish mysticism, and thus offers the opportunity to understand Jewish behaviour in the proper context as well as its underlying psychology and motivation[5]. Hence we are well within our logical bounds to apply it to understanding Bernstein's actions and reactions as they are indicated in the text.

We see further expression of Bernstein's very personal animus towards Ashkenazi Jews, as well as potentially additional confirmation for there having been an incident between himself and the Jewish community of kibbutz Ein HaShofet, when he states as follows:

'Throughout their history, these Polish and Russian Ashkenazi Jews practiced communism/socialism and worked to have their ideas implemented in these countries. By the late 1800s significant numbers of these communist/socialist Jews were found in Germany, the Balkans and eventually all over Europe. Because of their interference in the social and governmental affairs of Russia, they became the target of persecution by the Czars. Because of this, migration of these communist/socialist oriented Jews began. Some went to Palestine; some to Central and South America; and a large number of them came to the U.S.'[6]

As well as:

‘As I explained earlier, most were communist/socialist oriented with some of them being radical Bolshevik communists whose aim is world domination.’ [7]

Bernstein in the above is using the considerable involvement of Ashkenazi jews with radical movements in 19th century Russia in order to condemn the Ashkenazi as marxists/communists and, as has already been said, the allusion to this concerning the Kibbutzim, i.e. being marxist communes, seems to be based, as I have argued, on some negative event between Ziva and the Ein HaShofet community. However as stated the allusion to the marxist origin of the kibbutzim is due to Bernstein’s perception of marxism/Bolshevism, as well as ‘Nazism’, as being totalitarian and hence denying the right to himself and Ziva to be married and happy. It is not so much about the actual ideologies concerned, but more about Bernstein’s perception of them as taking his and Ziva’s ‘freedom’/‘liberty’ away from them.

Bernstein’s own words on this point are very instructive: since he reveals his thought concerning what he considers ‘Nazism’ and ‘marxist/Bolshevism’ to be in the following sentence:

‘This war-creating country which has been portrayed as ‘the only barrier to communism in the Mideast’ sell its war products to anyone who has the money — including repressive dictatorships — FASCIST or COMMUNIST.’ [8]

If we note Bernstein’s use of the description, ‘*repressive dictatorship – Fascist or Communist*’, it becomes very clear that the characteristic that Bernstein is thinking of, in his use of adjectives denoting ‘totalitarianism’, is defined by the loss of ‘liberty’ in Bernstein’s case of course this is the loss of the ability to marry the jewess, i.e. Ziva, he loves.

This attitude is perhaps best further pointed out by noting that both marxism/Bolshevism and ‘Nazism’ would not in terms of ideology have any objection to an Ashkenazi and Sephardi couple entering into coital relations or marriage. For in marxism/Bolshevism there is no differentiation between the two groups, since the only differences which matter in marxism are class distinctions and even then one can be ‘de-classed’ so no objection can be made to inter-ethnic/racial group marriage or breeding.

In ‘Nazism’, more properly National Socialism, there is no objection to this on the grounds that the two persons concerned are in National Socialist racial science both are classified as jews and hence have every right to mix their blood. As well as since National Socialism focuses on the well-being of the Aryan race and the racial hygiene of the jewish sub-racial groupings is for jews to be concerned with and not National Socialists.

Hence we can assert that Bernstein’s allusions to ‘Nazis’, ‘Gestapo’, ‘Marxists’, ‘Bolshevism’ among other things are analogies from the popular literature, and Bernstein’s own perceptions, in order to explain what he is feeling and he asserts he experienced in such a way as to make his own work appeal and be more readable (in order that other’s may ‘understand’ and ‘sympathise’ with his perceived plight). These perceptions centre around the treatment of Ziva and hence can be argued to be merely expressions of feeling, rather than any real condemnation, because of

Bernstein's perception of 'totalitarianism' and his own 'rights' as a Jew.

What Bernstein then proceeds to do to again attack Ashkenazi Jewry, in a way he knows will considerably hurt their sensibilities, by asserting a whole series of connexions between Marxism and Zionism noting that they are in his view the same thing. We should also mention that Bernstein adds in consistent allusion to Nazism in his monologue on the subject. Further confirming the interpretation that I have been arguing here that it is not so much the ideologies, but rather how these ideologies in Bernstein's perceptions would impinge on his relationship with Ziva.

This use of a communist and Zionist connexion, based on their apparent shared Jewish heritage, reaches its peak, and perhaps most hysterical, expression in the following section, entitled '*Communism in Israel*', which I quote in full:

'The Zionist controlled news-media in the U.S. has led the American people to believe that Israel is the only barrier holding back communism in the Mideast. This would be humorous if it did not have such serious implications for the United States.

From what I have said so far, you should now realize that Israel is basically a Marxist country mixed with some Nazi-type fascism. A large book could be written about it, but for now I only wish to add:

1. Israel is the only country in the Mideast that allows communist parties to operate — there are three. Ironically, it is the Arab countries which forbid communist parties to operate. (The exception is North Yemen which, through treachery, was taken over by the communists). Some of the Arab countries buy military equipment from communist countries because they can't get enough from the U.S. to offset the huge amounts the U.S. provides Israel. But, that's as far as any Arab/Soviet ties go.

2. The Soviet Union allows a good number of Jews to leave if they promise to go to Israel and Israel welcomes these communist oriented Jews. It must be noted that once out of the Soviet Union, many, if not most, Soviet Jews come to the U.S. instead of going to Israel. It must also be noted that hundreds of thousands of Jews have left Israel since its founding; some sources put the number at one million. Some of these Jews have requested to go back to the Soviet Union rather than live in Israel. Life for these Jews is better in Soviet Russia.

3. The latest scientific developments that the U.S. provides Israel are channeled on to the Soviet Union. The main center through which this scientific information passes is Israel's Weizman Institute in the town of Rehovot about 40 kilometers south of Tel Aviv.

4. About one-third (1/3) of the Knesset belong to one of Israel's communist, socialist or other Marxist oriented parties.

That should put to rest the lie about Israel being the only barrier against Communism in the Mideast. In fact, it is the Arab countries that form the barrier that has stopped the spread of communism in the Mideast. Israel is one leg of the New York/Moscow/Tel Aviv Triangle which is

behind the communist movement.' [\[9\]](#)

In this above quoted section we can see the attempt to hurt the Ashkenazi, whom Bernstein does rightly associate with Zionism, by Bernstein's suggestion that Zionism, represented by Israel, and communism, represented by the Soviet Union, are closely aligned with one another [\[10\]](#). What Bernstein is using is an old anti-Semitic theory, not entirely without some factual/historical foundation, that the jews of the Kremlin were closely co-operating with the jews in New York, but adds a third twist that they were further closely co-operating with the Israeli government. This assertion, and his own personal addition, by Bernstein are intended to create the illusion that Ashkenazi jews are in fact the problem that is commonly ascribed as international jewry (hence in common parlance: are to blame).

Since if the Ashkenazim are the jews in the Kremlin, New York and Tel Aviv and therefore the power-brokers and those responsible for all/most of the nefarious activities and crimes ascribed justly or unjustly to jews then it leaves the field open to the Sephardim and the Mizrahim to claim that they had nothing to do with it and hence allow these two jewish ethnic/sub-racial groups to escape the spotlight of anti-Semitic critique for any involvement with these activities and crimes.

In this then we begin to really see another aspect of Bernstein's motivation for writing this work for if the Ashkenazim are simply to blame for the ills associated with Israel, Zionism and communism then it deflects attention away from other jews. Notably this includes his wife Ziva.

Whom it can be argued he is doing this for in order that she would be able to escape criticism and any realised reprisals on the part of those critical of jews, which Bernstein believes are coming, but what he does not seem to be so sure of is precisely when said reprisals will actually occur. So in order to protect Ziva, and those he has made a larger surrogate for her, he is trying to deflect criticism away from the Sephardim and Mizrahim as well as revenging himself upon the Ashkenazim for their alleged maltreatment of her. Hence his revenge and his protection of Ziva become one joint action.

This touches on the heart of the meaning of the term: 'jewish traitor'. In that no jew is really a traitor to jewry, but rather is an agent of it. That jew might seem to be acting against jewry by calling attention to what, in Bernstein's case, he suggests the Ashkenazim are up to.

However what jewish 'traitors' are actually doing is answering the fundamental question that all jews ask themselves, '*What is best for jews?*', differently to the majority of other jews. Thus in order to assure jewish survival by either provoking fresh waves of anti-jewish feeling at a target that they feel may cause a more destructive outbreak in the near or distant future if allowed to go unchecked and hence they minimize/prevent that behaviours real consequences for jews (by starting the wave of anti-jewish feeling earlier and making it much easier to nullify as well as less destructive). Or in the other instance the jewish 'traitor' feels that his/her fellow jews are going to be persecuted regardless. The reasoning may change to the jew condemning jews, while suggesting that they themselves or a small group of jews are actually on the anti-jewish side (or are simply 'different' or 'special' in some way) and hence offer their services as a 'decent', 'good' or 'former' jews, much like Benjamin Freedman did, regardless if this means persecuting

their own kinsmen: thus allowing them the Jewish people to survive, and to rebuild, rather than face the possibility of complete extermination.

Bernstein is enacting a combination of both these two motivations for his Jewish 'traitor' behaviour in that he both is trying to provoke the storm before it turns into a terribly destructive hurricane, because he sees the activities of his fellow Jews and comprehends that resentment is growing and wishes consciously or not to prevent catastrophe. He also, likely because of his feelings for Ziva, wishes to focus the anti-Semitic feelings on the Ashkenazim, whom he also has a great personal enmity to, who are responsible in his mind for many of the activities and crimes that are justly or unjustly suggested to be the result of Jewish endeavours and actions. In this once again we note he saves Ziva, and his surrogates for Ziva: Sephardi and Mizrahi Jews as well as notably Arabs, while revenging himself on those who have hurt or attacked her.

Bernstein's attitude to the Arabs is interesting, because he simply denies that there are extensive Arab/Soviet relations beyond military contacts completely ignoring the Soviet Union's role in the Middle East as a countering bloc against the United States of America. Since the Soviet Union had failed to gain Israel as an ally, which it has sought to do in Israel's first years of existence and Israel had become orientated towards the United States of America. The Soviet Union naturally looked to the Arab bloc for allies. Who were becoming deeply disenfranchised by almost unconditional American support for Israel and who correctly identified the source of his support to be anchored in the position and power in the United States of Jews, whether devoted Zionists or not, whom were loyal to their Jewish ancestry often in contradiction to the best interests of the United States. Hence a Soviet and Arab bloc alliance formed and hence further polarisation between the two camps, Israeli and Arab, occurred.

However the source for this pro-Arab attitude is not hard to find in that Ziva was identified as an Arab by the Ashkenazi, which Bernstein indirectly notes on when he recounts as follows:

'One day, I entered a cafe in Tel Aviv. The place was crowded and I sat down on the only seat available. Also sitting at this table were 5 Sephardic Jews from Morocco. They learned that I was studying the Hebrew language, so they were helping me with my studies when a blue-eyed, Nazi-type Israeli police officer walked into the cafe.

He ordered me to "Get away from those Kooshim. 'Kooshim' in Hebrew means 'Niggers'." [\[11\]](#)

Bernstein's description of the use of the pejorative word 'Kooshim' to describe the Sephardi Jews in the café is something that can also be suggested to be in his eyes: a word used to describe Arabs. In that because Bernstein identifies the policeman as blue-eyed there would have been real physical contrast between him and the Sephardim whom he was with.

Hence the policeman looked down the Sephardim because they were darker and probably also because they looked like Arabs. Hence it is possible to suggest that in Bernstein's mind the Arabs are just like the Sephardim/Mizrahim in that they have been unjustly treated by the Ashkenazim and displaced/massacred by the Ashkenazi creation of Zionism. Hence they like Ziva become a victim of unjustified maltreatment in Bernstein's mind and his pro-Arab sentiments were likely increased with the added personal dimension that Ziva was originally

from a Mizrahi family who resided in Iraq before coming to Israel.

Hence it becomes quite arguable that Bernstein's pro-Arab comments are the result of this identification of the Arabs with his wife Ziva's origins as well as the similar treatment, in his eyes, that both Ziva and the Arabs have received from the Ashkenazim and their creation Zionism. Hence it allows Bernstein to also take the side of the Arabs as well as the side of the Sephardi/Mizrahi Jews and thus also re-enforce his position by recalling injustice to the Arabs and defending them, rather irrationally as it happens, from the suggestion that they are in alliance with the Soviet Union, which I discussed briefly above.

Hence we can conclude that Bernstein is a Jewish 'traitor' in that he seeks to revenge himself on the Ashkenazim by both attacking them and manipulating the next wave of anti-Semitism to fall preferably exclusively on them rather than on his wife's kinsmen: the Sephardim and the Mizrahim: hence protected that which he loves and destroying that which threatens it at the same time. Bernstein's work is one, as we have discussed, which derives almost entirely from his personal feelings, especially his relationship with his wife Ziva and their experiences together, and not from wide reading and thought.

Bernstein manipulates information throughout the text to suit his own personal agenda and although he presents a very unsavoury picture of Israel, which appeals to many an anti-Semite, the work is marred by his deeply personal motivations, hysterical accusations towards the Ashkenazim, by potential additions from Len Martin and a lack of precise references. Even as a testimonial it is not worth the paper it is written on, because of all these problems with the text. I suggest that no anti-Semite who wishes to conduct a thorough critique of this text uses it as evidence of any kind other than of the hysterical and essentially Freudian mentality of the Jews and especially of the Ashkenazim.

Bear in mind this work is there to manipulate your thoughts into hating the Ashkenazi and letting the Sephardim and Mizrahim off from any charges laid at their door. Do not presume just because a Jew such as Bernstein seems to be on your side that he is indeed so for the Jew will always ask this question first and foremost in any interaction he has: '*what is best for Jews?*' Now that is not what is best for Aryans: is it?

[1] Bernstein, Op. Cit.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid.

[4] For example on this point see the Mishneh Torah, Shoftim, The Law of Kings, 8:14.

[5] David Bakan, 1990, [1958], '*Sigmund Freud and the Jewish Mystical Tradition*', 3rd Edition, Free Association: London.

[6] Bernstein, Op. Cit.

[7] Ibid.

[8] Ibid.

[9] Ibid.

[10] In fact they have historically had a deep animosity to one another even in the days before the Bolshevik revolution it was regarded in the Jewish community that the young generally had one of two choices in terms of ideologies. Those choices were Zionism or Communism not

Zionism and Communism as Bernstein necessarily assumes in his work.
[\[11\]](#) Bernstein, Op. Cit.

Book Review: Alan E. Steinweis, 2008, 'Studying the Jew: Scholarly Anti-Semitism in Nazi Germany', 2nd Edition, Harvard University Press: Cambridge.

Saturday, 13 December 2008

Serious studies of National Socialism are rare, but serious studies of National Socialist scholarship, especially as it relates to the most emotional topic that is associated with it and the Third Reich, the jews, are even rarer. Most studies that claim to be '*serious studies*' of this topic are afflicted with the kind of suffocating and smarmy postscript that has evolved into the mythos of, i.e. the justification, the era in which we live[\[1\]](#). This Steinweis, who is the Rosenberg Professor of History and Judaic Studies at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, correctly notes is due to the automatic presumption on the part of the authors concerned that everything that was associated with National Socialist ideology was simply irrational and lacking in any substance what-so-ever.

What Steinweis in introducing the subject area does not state is that this presumption has allowed whole theoretical castles in the sky to be built around the policies and concepts that make up National Socialism, which at their best do not do it justice as a credible political ideology, because they assume it has no rational basis. Where-as it most certainly did, and does[\[2\]](#), and at their worst deliberately misrepresent the Third Reich and National Socialism and make them out to be completely evil. In some cases, such as in the work of Daniel Goldhagen, this has been taken further into the realms of demonic.

In writing a book on National Socialist scholarship regarding the jewish question Steinweis moves, as he himself notes, into an understudied area that has not been generally covered since 1946[\[3\]](#), because of this simple presumption of irrationality. There have, as Steinweis informs us, been several specific studies of some parts of the subject area, and of some of the individual scholars who contributed to the National Socialist critique of jews in the Third Reich, in recent years. However the literature is still very sparse with much opportunity for further study.

Steinweis is certainly to be commended for writing such an accessible, and quite enjoyable, work and writing it in a relatively unemotional and factual manner, while not engaging in too much condemnation and manipulation of the facts to suit his personal bias in the issue due to his being of jewish origin. Steinweis has commendably done his research and concentrates on what he, rightly, considers to be the key scholars who created the rational anti-Semitism that Adolf Hitler had long called for as a counter to the almost purely jewish domination of the study of jews. It is noteworthy that Steinweis recognises that Adolf Hitler in the earliest days of the N.S.D.A.P., and during his own political awakening, recognised that the traditional anti-Semitic materials, such as those the anti-Semitic movement's own titans: Theodor Fritsch, Adolf Stoecker and Eduard Drumont, were not sufficient and that in addition to the traditional low to medium-brow

literature, which sought to condemn the jews, but which did not provide a scholarly case against them. What was required was a scholarly inter-disciplinary collaboration to create what Steinweis refers to as a 'Nazi Jewish Studies' with its own reference literature and standard works. This is precisely what, as Steinweis records, a number of eminent scholars from a variety of different fields of study set out to do.

However: despite doing an excellent job of presenting the general history of anti-jewish scholarship in the Third Reich. Steinweis does not give much credit to National Socialist scholarship regarding the jewish question. Although Steinweis has certainly, as I have stated, done his research; he refuses to give credit where credit is due. Instead of a realistic and scholarly appraisal of the works of the Third Reich and whether there was a scholarly basis for their contentions concerning the jews. Steinweis simply ignores the possibility that '*Nazi anti-Semitism*' may have been correct in whole or in part in its analysis and condemnation of the jews.

This is despite his declaration at the beginning of '*Studying the Jew*' that National Socialist scholarship in the Third Reich has been summarily dismissed as propaganda, but should be looked at on the basis of it being scholarship rather than as '*regime propaganda*'. Hence Steinweis proceeds to commit exactly the same error he noted was unfortunate in his introduction: he simply presumes that such scholarship was '*pseudo-scientific*' and '*fallacious*' rather than make a balanced critique of such work. What is particularly notable is that Steinweis takes any opportunity to find one objection, often quite slight, to an anti-Semitic work and to infer that this makes the work invalid in terms of scholarship. If we were to apply Steinweis' own standard here to his own work then he would be equally, if not more, fallacious than the scholars he is writing about.

An example of this can be found in his comments concerning Hans Guenther, which make up most of the second chapter, '*Racializing the Jew*', of '*Studying the Jew*'. Steinweis is at his most specific here in his analysis of Guenther's middle-brow study of the jews as a race^[4]. Guenther cites a variety of different authors, including jews such as Maurice Fishberg^[5], whom argued against the concept of race both in its application to jews and as a lens for understanding humanity. Steinweis notes that these authors disagreed with Guenther and hence Steinweis claims Guenther was being disingenuous in citing their work, the thrust of which Steinweis rightly notes disagrees with Guenther.

However what Steinweis, in his anxiousness to discredit Guenther, omits to mention is that Guenther is making very specific points and is noting that others have found specific evidence, to which he adds his own interpretation, in the light of other evidence, on. This is hardly being disingenuous or unscholarly, as Steinweis claims, but rather it is the normal practice of scholars across the many disciplines that make up academe. For example if one disagrees with the conclusions and thrust of another scholar's argument, but agrees with a specific interpretation on one point that is relevant to your own work. It is not misrepresenting the other scholar to cite that one point from their work in support of your own even if the arguments made are completely opposed to one another. Since Guenther was not suggesting that the jewish scholars in question actually supported either his interpretation or conclusion, but rather that they made a point, or a series of points, which were worth noting in terms of his own interpretation, arguments and

conclusions: hence Steinweis' argument cannot be considered as valid.

However not all Steinweis' negative criticism is unjustified in that he briefly cites and discusses the work of Johann von Leers, who besides writing a lot of middle-brow works on jews in general, wrote some notable scholarly work concerning jews and criminality where he argued that jews were inherently, i.e. biologically, pre-disposed towards crime[6]. Steinweis correctly notes that for one particular figure[7] von Leers drew on a 1927 Polish anti-Semitic pamphlet: this is of course problematic, but hardly worth of the emphasis Steinweis places on it. Steinweis himself does not cite or analyze the publication, which von Leers is citing, but simply dismisses it. Presumably, because it is anti-Semitic and therefore irrational in Steinweis' eyes. We must opine that in this it is Steinweis who is being irrational and unscholarly, and not von Leers, for he has made not attempt to analyze von Leers' work, but merely has sought to find some reason, which can be argued as a valid criticism, to dismiss von Leers' entire book as so much anti-Semitic rubbish.

Steinweis makes another, perhaps more cogent, general criticism of von Leers' work in that he notes that von Leers left out some figures that might have counted against his general thesis[8]. However this later criticism relies upon on a problematic understanding of von Leers' argument concerning jewish criminality. Where von Leers is arguing quite specifically that jews are fundamentally disposed towards crime, but this does not equate that jews must have more incidences of all types of crime, but merely that they must show significant incidence of crime across socio-economic boundaries hence potentially indicating a biological pre-disposition towards certain types of criminality. This is what von Leers sets out to prove.

Steinweis' objection, although valid, does not discount von Leers' thesis, as Steinweis claims it does, but rather von Leers' thesis simply requires further clarification and the refining of the original argument. It is also important to state that von Leers' use of one bad reference does not negate his work either being scholarly or his thesis being valid. Hence it is reasonable to suggest that Steinweis is looking for a reason, however trivial, to call into question the scholarship and integrity of scholars in the Third Reich researching and writing about the jewish question.

Steinweis' negative assessment of all the academic work of the scholars who forged the interdisciplinary field of 'Nazi Jewish Studies' has only one minor exception where he notes as to the work of Volkmar Eichstaedt. Who researched and wrote a meticulous bibliography of works, '*Bibliography on the History of the Jewish Question*'[9], relevant to the jewish question with precise cross-referencing from numerous different catalogues. Eichstaedt also notably added in an asterisk next to each author's name who was known to have been a jew by religious profession and/or by birth/lineage. He further adds in a question mark next to each authors name who may have been a jew, but whose status was indeterminate. Steinweis pays Eichstaedt the grudging compliment that this work became the standard index on the subject and was used well after the defeat and occupation of Germany as a standard reference work in the philo-Semitic study of jews.

That Steinweis doesn't see fit to actually praise any of this work, aside for his grudging positive notation about the utility of Eichstaedt's work, is notable, because as stated above, it carries on the assumption that Steinweis distances himself from in his introduction. Steinweis himself

appears to be suffering from a problem that he traduces the main scholars in the Third Reich involved in developing the field of 'Nazi Jewish Studies' for. Steinweis notes that the specialists on the jewish question in the Third Reich attacked what they, correctly, saw as the problem of inherent bias in the domination of the scholarly study of jews by jews. In that jews were very unlikely to produce a balanced and accurate depiction of their own history due to the racial perception and interests of the jews as a race.

Steinweis' objection to this is an ostensibly correct one: in that if the logic of racialism holds then racist thinking contradicts the assertion of the Third Reich scholars on the jewish question that their own works were in the objective spirit (since they are biased against the jews due to being of Aryan biological origin). However what Steinweis misunderstands is that different races have, and will always, think that their approach to a subject is objective when in fact in terms of racialism it is subjective. It is not that the scholars concerned were objective, because they, like their jewish counterparts, were actually writing from a subjective racial viewpoint, but rather that they felt that they were being objective, because they were looking at the issue as members of the Aryan race. Likewise the jewish scholars whom they cited thought they were objective, when they were actually racially subjective, as members of the jewish sub-racial/ethnic group.

Steinweis himself fits within this paradigm since he maintains that he is objective, but as we have pointed out above with reference to two examples, but he is not and consistently interprets issues that best suit his jewish heritage and on similar presumptions to those he criticises. Hence Steinweis' argument that there is a contradiction in terms of these claims is quite incorrect.

This isn't to say that Steinweis' study is without considerable value, because it does give the reader an excellent historiographic picture of scholarly anti-jewish writing in the Third Reich, citing all the major authors and giving some background to them. As well as allowing the reader to begin to engage with the literature and thought that Steinweis is describing. However Steinweis' analysis, and refusal to give credit when it is due, does not give the scholars he is discussing a fair and honest appraisal and gives the impression of '*pseudo-scholarship*' that contradicts Steinweis' earlier professions to treat the scholars concerning with honesty and consideration in terms of their academic work.

It is obvious throughout Steinweis' description and analysis that there is an overt agenda present in '*Studying the Jew*'. In that in addition to describing the Third Reich studies on the jewish question. Steinweis in the case of nearly the all individuals he discusses goes onto describe the post-Third Reich careers of the scholars concerned. This is meant to, as Steinweis states in his conclusion, highlight the '*lack of justice*' and '*Nazi influence*' in post-Third Reich German scholarship. Hence becoming more fodder for the jewish guilt-industry that surrounds the Second World War and re-enforcing the notion that jews are 'victims' and that Germany hasn't done '*enough*' to '*remove Nazi influence*'. This is the jewish agenda that '*Studying the Jew*' is riddled with and hence it must be pointed out that in reading '*Studying the Jew*'. One must be wary of this further disingenuous attempt to claim that anti-Semitism has no rational basis and that jews should be '*compensated*', because they suffered 'discrimination' at the hands of National Socialism. The irony of course is bitter but in today's topsy-turvy world it is to be expected most of all from the cause of that state: the jews of which Steinweis is but one of many.

Hence although *'Studying the Jew'* is of value as a general historiographic guide to scholarship on, and scholars who addressed, the Jewish question in the Third Reich: the work is so beset with problems as to make its analysis problematic at best and all but worthless at worst.

[1] The same can be said for the popular view of the Second World War, which ascribed as a *'German war of aggression'* and that Britain was clueless as to the *'evils and irrationality'* of *'Nazism'* only *'standing her ground'* many years after popular, i.e. the Jewish, postscript maintains it should have. Of course: this, as with many a popular conception in the current era, is almost entirely poppycock built around a slim and selective propaganda foundation. The actual facts of the lead up to and the beginning of hostilities are essentially the inverse of the popular version of events with a campaign of propaganda of such a scale as to be on the scale of the Roman demonization of the Germanic and Gallic tribes and comparable in extent to modern *'holocaust'* propaganda combined with an aggressively hostile diplomatic game played by France and Great Britain, with the support of the Roosevelt administration, ending in these powers giving a blank cheque guarantee to Poland to do *'what thou wilt'*, which presaged the attempted genocide of those perceived to be of Germanic stock in Western Poland by murderous Slavic mobs.

[2] For if Marxism must be admitted as a credible ideology then so must National Socialism: the reason the former is considered as a credible alternative and the latter is considered an irrational aberration is due to their alleged treatment of Jews. Who dominate, and have dominated, Anglo-American culture for the last century and who have turned all their energies into opposing critique of Jews and arguing that the Jews being critiqued for their involvement in anything equates anti-Semitism.

[3] This study was by Max Weinreich in his 1946, *'Hitler's Professors: The Part of Scholarship in Hitler's Crimes against the Jewish People'*, 1st Edition, YIVO: New York.

[4] Hans Guenther, 1930, *'Rassenkunde des Juedischen Volkes'*, 1st Edition, Lehmann: Munich.

[5] Guenther cites Fishberg's then well known work on the physical anthropology and physiology of the Jews, that was heavily influenced by Franz Boas whose measurements have been recently discovered to have been falsified (although neither Fishberg or Guenther could have known this): *'Jews, Race and Environment'* [2006, [1911], 1st Edition, Transaction: New York].

[6] Johann von Leers, 1944, *'Die Verbrechernatur der Juden'*, 1st Edition, Hochmuth: Berlin.

[7] This was concerning the domination of the prostitution trade in Poland by Jews.

[8] These figures related to violent crime.

[9] Volkmar Eichstaedt, 1938, *'Bibliographie zur Geschichte der Judenfrage: 1750-1848'*, Vol. I, 1st Edition, Hanseatische Verlagsanstalt: Hamburg.

Weird Accusations: An IP Trap?

Thursday, 18 December 2008

Recently during an argument with one of the contributors to this blog, a Stormfront poster declared that he had been *'warned'* that Semitic Controversies was an IP trap: i.e. a site set up to locate people by tracing their IP. This was used as an excuse by said posters not to read the article that he was linked to.

It should also be noted that said poster on Stormfront also made a series of accusations stating that he would not post links to his sources for they would be '*removed*' by those seeking to '*cover up*' 9/11: presuming of course that what he said to say was so important and dangerous that intelligence agencies/the government/politicians would go to any lengths to stop him saying it. Certainly this is possible, but extremely unlikely given that there are a great many more dangerous people out there than individual posters on Stormfront and the intelligence agencies/government would have to be very bored indeed to use their valuable assets against people whose grasp of logic and of what one can reasonably infer from the evidence is tenuous at best. It is plausible to suggest that this poster was simply trying to find any reason to ignore what we post here and to not deal with cogent argument.

The contributor concerned expressed surprise at this particular accusation and reproduced his article in full for the Stormfront poster concerned, only then to be accused of 'plagiarism' in reproducing the whole article without citation to Semitic Controversies. Since Semitic Controversies has never exercised copyright over any of the work published here and has a note at the bottom of the blog stating that the copyright remains in the hands of the authors who write the work and that they can be contacted for any who wish to reproduce the work through the central mail box.

Since the accusation that Semitic Controversies is an IP Trap has been made. I thought I would publicly clarify the issue. Although I doubt it will stop it being used as an excuse by those who are unable and/or unwilling to engage in rational critique and debate: it is here anyway.

Semitic Controversies does indeed use a free counter (supplied by Sitemeter), which includes the IP address, country of origin, type of browser being used and where the reader is being referred from among other things. I use the information therein to look for regular readers to see how many we have and where in the world they are. I also use it to see if there are any new links to Semitic Controversies around the internet so that if I disapprove of a link I can email the webmaster/administrator concerned and ask them to take it down.

For there are some individuals and organisations out there: who have inferred that Semitic Controversies is associated with them when it is not and hence swift and appropriate action is required. Since Semitic Controversies is proudly independent of all organisational ties and supports no current Nationalist organisation although had it the choice it would declare its absolute fidelity to the National Socialist German Workers Party in the Third Reich, but this is neither here nor there.

Hence the free counter allows me to nip these kinds of problems and issues in the bud and also allows me to keep a track of where referrals come from and what countries these readers ostensibly originate from. Although it should be stated that Semitic Controversies does get quite a lot of anonymous traffic that I make no attempt to look into for the simple reasons that I don't have the tools, expertise, the time and the wish to do so.

I don't record who comes to Semitic Controversies and I have never bothered to look at, let alone store, the actual IP of individual or groups of readers. I merely make a mental note of the country

of origin and the referral. If I wished to operate an IP trap then I would use far more advanced software and I wouldn't have allowed that software to have its symbol on the Semitic Controversies front page. I have however made our statistics on Sitemeter private for the simple reason that I don't want prying eyes to use that information against either readers or contributors.

So there we are: Semitic Controversies has a free counter and is not an 'IP Trap'.

In Brief: The 'Nobody told me about it' Fallacy

Thursday, 18 December 2008

Recently on Debbie Schlusel's blog[1] she commented that she gets a lot of '*anti-Semitic BS*' in replies written and sent to her email box. By that we can aptly state what '*anti-Semitic BS*' is: criticism for anything Schlusel likes and/or supports, which seems to be equated with '*anti-Semitism*', against herself as a jewess, in her eyes. However Schlusel's general misrepresentation, wild accusations and lunacy are not of interest to us here. What is of interest to us is a further comment she makes in the same article where she dismisses the idea of a jewish conspiracy on the grounds that nobody, i.e. no jew, has told her about, or let her in on, a jewish conspiracy[2]. She uses the example of international bankers, or as it is more commonly called international finance, as the practical example to show in her eyes how '*insane*' such an idea is.

This is a common fallacy often used by jews in order to counteract claims of a jewish conspiracy and can be answered very simply. In that it is using the fallacy of unfalsifiability in order to attack a straw man characterisation of the varied anti-Semitic arguments on this point.

It is using the fallacy of unfalsifiability, because there is no proof, and can be no proof, that nobody told or informed the jew or jewess in question about a conspiracy of any kind. Therefore the argument is unfalsifiable, because we cannot prove or test whether the jew or jewess in question has been told or informed about a jewish conspiracy, and therefore it is invalid. It is a straw man fallacy, because the anti-Semitic position is very varied and no anti-Semitic school of thought actually argues that all jews are involved in a conspiracy against something, but what is posited by some older anti-Semitic schools of thought is that the conspiracy is centred around jewish identify and therefore all jews are potential, not actual, conspirators.

Therefore all jewish claims there is not a jewish conspiracy, because they '*haven't been told about it*' are fallacious arguments and cannot be used to claim there is/are no such thing(s). As an additional comment if they, the jew or jewess in question, had not been told about a jewish conspiracy, if indeed it did and/or does exist, then they as one specific example would not disprove the rule inherent in the argument. So therefore the '*Nobody told me about it*' argument cannot be held to be a serious one and nor can Schlusel's specific contention be held to hold any intellectual water at all.

[1] Debbie Schlusel, 17th December 2008, '*Hey Conspiracy Theorists, Here's How I "Build-a-Burger"*'. This is available at the following address:

http://www.debbieschlusel.com/archives/2008/12/hey_conspiracy.html#comments [Accessed:

18/12/2008].

[2] *'Afterward, I got a couple of angry, anti-Semitic e-mails, calling me rude and "explaining" how the Jews control the world (and how 9/11 was an "inside job"). Like I've always said, I'm still waiting for my share of this "control," my piece of the "international banking system."*

Schlusel, Op. Cit.

Some Reflections on 2008 and Some Thoughts for 2009

Monday, 22 December 2008

Semitic Controversies was conceived as place where anti-Semitism could begin to be re-thought, re-evaluated and re-constructed in order to begin the long and difficult process of rebuilding a credible opposition to the jews as a whole. It started out life as a series of conversations between me and my close friend, Hans Anderberg, and has grown from there into something I am proud to be involved with. We are almost half a year old as we come up to Christmas and although we have been through many trials and doubts over this period as to whether it was all worth the thought, the effort and the sleep deprivation.

It has been an interesting few months as many people who label themselves 'anti-Semites' have questioned Semitic Controversies status as an anti-Semitic blog, although I would have thought this was evident from even a cursory reading, because we have consistently questioned anti-Semitic orthodoxy and sacred cows on numerous points from the Talmud Balvi to the Judeo-Bolshevik thesis. The irony is that we are true anti-Semites for the simple reason that although we are dedicated to exposing and fighting jewry: we know that we have to fight jews with the most precise weapons possible. That requires us to separate the gold from the base metal in terms of the voluminous anti-Semitic literature that exists out there and hence forces Semitic Controversies to examine the anti-Semitic literature first in order to determine what is useful and what is not. That is why Semitic Controversies publishes so much on the anti-Semitic literature and the consistently repeated arguments and sources there in. It also allows us while we are critiquing the anti-Semitic literature from the perspective of critical anti-Semites to improve upon or note ways that one can improve on anti-Semitic arguments used.

Since, although there are a great many canards and irrational speculations within the anti-Semitic literature, there is often a fundamental grain of truth behind the base metal of the original argument. That is the grain of truth that we must as anti-Semites seek not only in order so that we can build new and more factually correct arguments for our own time on top of those from times past, but so anti-Semitism can move from the lunatic fringe to the intellectual mainstream.

In order to facilitate this move Semitic Controversies will be moving into 2009 with a view to becoming a more permanent presence in the anti-Semitic international and will be looking to work towards achieving pre-eminent status among anti-Semites as an authority where those critical of jews can go to have their arguments evaluated and constructively critiqued. We also wish to begin to provide a news service regarding jews, similar to that provided by Robert Spencer's philo-Semitic '*Jihad Watch*' and '*Dhimmi Watch*', in order that those critical of jews can receive daily updates as to the latest stories of interest regarding jews and our weekly

analysis of the jews. Semitic Controversies is also looking to begin to split out our critiques and essays into specific sections categorised as '*Contemporary Jewry*', '*Antisemitica*', '*Book Reviews*', '*Israel*', '*Jewish History*' and '*Judaism*'.

Hence in 2009 to facilitate this move from a regular blog on various issues concerning jews Semitic Controversies will be moving to a website format and will focus on building on three key aspects of the jewish question: a critique of standard anti-Semitism, building a critique of jews as the new anti-Semitism and then elucidating news and current events in the light of the new anti-Semitism. Allowing the reader to see jewish news and understand it in such a way as we argue is both rational and anti-Semitic. We have had new recruits to Semitic Controversies throughout our short existence and we will be pleased to start bring you their writings in the New Year.

We haven't been posting as much for the last month or so, but I can assure you this is only temporary and with my comments as to why posting has been less has been added some personal matters and illness, which have dominated my own and most of the contributors lives for the last month. However we now have a large amount of articles in the works from the various contributors that range from book reviews and responses to critics to a thesis on understanding the public and private face of jewry and our analysis of William Dudley Pelley's destructive influence on anti-Semitism.

We hope you will continue to read Semitic Controversies and if you disagree with something we have written, have a topic you would like us to cover, would like to ask some questions of us and/or would like to contribute to or help manage Semitic Controversies then please send us an email on: semitic.controversies@gmail.com.

It only remains thus for myself and the team to wish all our readers a very enjoyable Yule tide and a very merry Christmas.

Yours truly,

The Editor,