

Semitic Controversies

2010 Issue

Edited by Karl Radl

<http://semiticcontroversies.blogspot.com>

Contents

The Resurrection of Semitic Controversies

In Brief: Jews and the 'Socialist History Society'

My Journey from Ethnocentrism to Egocentrism

No Beauty in a Book

In Brief: Anti-Semitism and Child Abuse

Sources on Jews and Communism (Part I)

Sources on Jews and Communism (Part II)

Sources on Jews and Communism (Part III)

Sources on Jews and Communism (Part IV)

Sources on Jews and Communism (Part V)

A Pleasant Surprise: John Beaty's 'The Iron Curtain over America'

Why Say Anything At All?

Sources on Jews and Communism (Part VI)

Sources on Jews and Communism (Part VII)

Sources on Jews and Communism (Part VIII)

Sources on Jews and Communism (Appendix II)

Sources on Jews and Communism (Part IX)

The Rabbinical Roundup: This Week among the Jews (W/C: 24/05/2010)

A Martyr to the Anti-Semitic Cause: Captain Archibald Ramsay M.P. and his ‘The Nameless War’

Sources on Jews and Communism (Part X)

In Brief: A Few Words Say a Thousand

In Brief: Jews and American Communism

The Rabbinical Roundup: This Week among the Jews (WC: 31/05/2010)

Why I am an anti-Semite

Correction: ‘Judeo-Bolshevik Debacle’ Article

Useful Quotations and Summaries for anti-Semites: Moses Hess (Part I)

Sources on Jews and Communism (Part XI)

The Rabbinical Roundup (W/C: 14/06/2010)

Five Points of Anti-Semitic Belief

Hypocrisy 2.0

In Brief: The ‘An Anti-Semite is someone who is hated by Jews’ Argument

Challenging Rabbi David Eidensohn to a Debate

Hampstead Garden Suburb Synagogue: A Case Study in Egocentrism (Part I)

The Ritual Murder in Konitz

Twelve Prominent Jewish Anti-Apartheid Activists (Short Version)

In Brief: Socialism before Jews?

Is Yuri Ivanov’s ‘Caution: Zionism!’ anti-Semitic?

An Analysis of a Jewish Anti-Defamation Handbook (Part I)

Sources on Jews and Communism (Part XII)

Popular Television Franchises and the Jews (2010 Short Edition)

Response to Timothy Minear (listed in 'Angel' Franchise)

Hampstead Garden Suburb Synagogue: A Case Study in Egocentrism (Part II)

The Secret Language of the Jews: Leshon Hakmah

Echoes in the Synagogue: The 1615 Hebrew Chronicle of Prague (Part I)

Echoes in the Synagogue: The 1615 Hebrew Chronicle of Prague (Part II)

Hampstead Garden Suburb Synagogue: A Case Study in Egocentrism (Part III)

Hampstead Garden Suburb Synagogue: A Case Study in Egocentrism (Part IV)

In Brief: The Meaning of 'Righteous among the Nations'

Elie's Awesome Adventure (Part I)

Elie's Awesome Adventure (Part II)

In Brief: A Little More Gefilte in the Socialist History Society

Jared and the Jews

In Brief: Kim Philby and the Jews

Moratorium till November

Semitic Controversies Returns...

Another Kosher Communist Obituary

Tacitus and the Jews (Part I)

Tacitus and the Jews (Part II)

Today's Jews (22nd September 2010)

A Change

Pliny the Elder, the Jews and the Essenes

Christopher Jon Bjerknes: Sliced and Diced

The Socialist History Society does Auschwitz

Pliny the Younger, the Christians and the Jews

The Resurrection of Semitic Controversies

Saturday, 27 March 2010

Dear Reader,

Unfortunately since my plans for expanding Semitic Controversies into a monthly publication of sorts fell through I have had little time to write since my life has been filled with all kinds of issues (I won't bore you with the reasons or any recrimination on part as I take full and unreserved responsibility for not putting pen to paper). However finally I have had the time and breathing space to sit down and think about what I was going to do with this blog. I have decided, on the basis of encouraging emails and notes from friends and readers, to resurrect this blog as it was originally i.e. a blog about jews from a critical point of view and I have decided to post at least one essay per week on the issue of jews.

I have also decided that if I have time I would like to write a little about events in jewry each week. As before any contributions to the blog, letters and criticism can be sent to the Semitic Controversies email box and I will answer them as soon as I am able.

Kindest Regards,

The Editor,

P.S. Oh and yes I might poke a little fun at 'holocaust survivors' from time to time. After all when one actually reads their accounts of what 'happened to them' then one either finds them incredible generally speaking or one takes on faith what they say as the absolute truth.

In Brief: Jews and the 'Socialist History Society'

Saturday, 27 March 2010

The '*Socialist History Society*' will likely be unknown to many of my readers and I don't particularly blame them. I first became aware of it when I accidentally acquired one of its monographs that dealt with the jewish baker's union in London on Ebay (of all places). Now the '*Socialist History Society*', or SHS as it likes to call itself, is quite a considerable organisation of marxist intellectuals in Britain. It is also looking to expand to North America, i.e. here in the USA, in the next few months as I am informed by its Newsletter for March 2010 (p. 12 if you are interested) with the help of something called the '*Institute of Working Class History*' (one doubts there are many 'working class' let alone 'proletarian' individuals involved and that most of its clientele are 'de-classed' 'bourgeoisie'/'petit-bourgeoisie' if my observations on this point based on my experience with the Left in general are correct [1]).

The '*Socialist History Society*' was formed in 1992, after the fall of Communism in Eastern Europe, out of the Communist Party History Group. It, as you might expect, has a useable website [2] and publishes a relatively respectable intellectual journal of its own called '*Socialist*

History'. It also, as alluded to above, produces a bulletin of sorts and has its own '*Occasional Papers*' series, of which I have several (most of them however are worthless amounts of ink spilt on paper with a nice glossy cover). That said however the SHS has quite a few academic contacts (and members) and is organised enough to attend booksales, such as the 'Freethinkers Book Fair', and hold regular public lectures (which I have also attended out of curiosity) in London (in the UK).

That said however what immediately grabbed my attention was the fact that the SHS has a jewish Stalinist, Professor Eric Hobsbawm (formerly Obstbaum), as its chairman [3]. Until recently its secretary was another jewish Stalinist, Professor Nina Fishman, who recently died and whose laudatory obituary (the only one I am aware of in my significant publication) was written by a fellow member of the tribe: Donald Sassoon. Also its 'joint chair' is one June Cohen. So now with Fishman's timely death the SHS' Officers roll smells a little less of gefilte fish although it is still at least 25% (formerly at least 37.5%) kosher. I do not know the pedigree of the other officers, but it is quite plausible that some of them may be partially jewish.

It is also notable that the SHS retains close ties with the '*Jewish Socialists' Group*' [4], which, in spite of it being basic Marxist doctrine that all religious and political considerations are based on economics [and therefore do not exist outside of an economic framework], has decided that really jews as a group do exist and that they are really a biological group (otherwise why bother with a '*Jewish Socialists' Group*' after all one thought that they would be progressive enough to become one with everyone else since biology doesn't matter a whole lot to any relatively orthodox Marxist today). One also notes that they allow jews, such as one Professor David Loewenstein of the University of Wisconsin-Madison, to warble at them and even applaud the jew (no doubt the enterprising Professor Loewenstein found one or two victims from the audience for a little more 'private' ego-fuillment, but there we go) [5].

So apparently the Socialist History Society is really a bit of a kosher butchering house, but there we go again... The SHS may not abide by the halakha regarding kashrut, but they certainly do abide by the secular halakha of Marx in '*Das Kapital*', among other of his works, and it is fitting to say the least that they have more than their fair share of hooked noses at the top of the SHS.

[1] Also see for example: Denis Hill, 1989, '*Seeing Red, Being Green: The Life and Times of a Southern Rebel*', 1st Edition, Iconoclast Press: Brighton. Where Hill, a former Communist and senior trade union official, often speaks of the problems presented by university radicals and 'de-classed' middle-class individuals for those who actually work with rather than try to dictate to 'the working class'/'proletariat' etc. It is a pointed expose, but all the more remarkable for its intellectual history in showing just how cretinous the left in general is (if we on the 'far right' think we have it bad then I'd hate to think what would happen if we were like the left in general [the proverb '*too many cooks spoil the broth*' would be an apt characterisation of the left, while a modification of that proverb would do just as well for the right: '*too few cooks make no broth*']). Hill also remarks on numerous occasions on the amount of jews in left-wing and marxist movements in general and one can't really call Hill anti-Semitic given that he lived with and loved a jewish trotskyite, one Ann Frost, for several years in his later life (of whom he speaks affectionately in his book).

[2] <http://www.socialisthistorysociety.co.uk/> [Accessed: 27/03/2010]

[3] Hobsbawm is reported to have told Professor Robert Conquest that any amount of deaths justified the 'formation of a better society' according to Wikipedia. How true this is I cannot say, but having read some of Hobsbawm's writing it wouldn't surprise me if he did state something along these lines as Hobsbawm is a pretty obvious apologist for both Stalin and Communism in general.

[4] Their website can be found at the following address: <http://www.jewishsocialist.org.uk/>
[Accessed: 27/03/2010]

[5] Anon., *'Making Winstanley Respectable'*, Socialist History Society Newsletter, December 2009, p. 8

My Journey from Ethnocentrism to Egocentrism

Saturday, 3 April 2010

Ethnocentrism as a framework or methodology for understanding jewish behaviour can be traced back over century in anti-Semitic, philo-Semitic and intellectually neutral literature on jews (1). However its current expression, and probably the most lucid expression of that particular thesis, is found and based on the work of Professor Kevin MacDonald who we cannot praisely highly enough for actually having the fortitude to be critical of jews as a group and to try to place our understanding them in the context of an evolutionary perspective. MacDonald has taken a lot of flack from jewish and 'anti-racist' pressure groups about his theories not because they don't have merit, but because they are 'used by anti-Semites' (as if an author is responsible for how others use his or her work)! (2) However this, as some would have it, doesn't inform us that MacDonald was and is right, but rather that is work touched a sensitive subject for jews in general, which is a non-jew taking a critical perspective about the jews (i.e. jews are only allowed to be critical of jews and even then they get called anti-Semitic by other jews who they often in turn call anti-Semitic etc).

When I first began my research into the jewish question: MacDonald's trilogy on understanding the jews from the standpoint of evolutionary psychology were some of the first books that I read, reflected and made notes on. I thought MacDonald's work, and I still do today, is an excellent general introduction to the jewish question as it provides a way of making sense of jews in a relatively simple way without having to do a considerable amount of research to gain and insight into how the jewish mind works.

However over the period of two years after I first began my research and had been applying MacDonald's theories for sometime. I began to understand that MacDonald had, in fact, misunderstood the jewish mind. The reason that he had misunderstood it because he focuses primarily on jewish-gentile interaction as his gateway into the jewish mind rather than focusing on both jewish intraaction as well as jewish-gentile interaction to give a more rounded picture to understand the two faces, if you will, of the jew.

This lead MacDonald to the understandable conclusion that jews are as a group ethnocentric, because jews as a group tend to be very conscious of their status as jews or even if only part jewish, such as the British actor, comic and writer Stephen Fry (his mother was jewish hence in

halakah he is actually a jew, but in biological terms he is only half jewish). MacDonald's thesis can be simplified down, as he has himself done, into the following question that he conjectures that jews consciously and/or unconsciously ask themselves: *'Is it good for jews?'*

When I began using this conjectural question and trying to explain the actions of what I have termed *'jewish traitors'* I found that the question did not really cover their actions since even if one suggested that becoming a *'jewish anti-Semite'*, if you will, could be understood in terms of *'what is best for jews'* (which is difficult to begin with) the fact that some of these jewish traitors had actually advocated and participated in the genocide of their own people after being slighted by them gave me pause for thought (3). Although I still believed the jist of MacDonald's argument: I found out that I could not reconcile it with this behaviour, even if that behaviour was perhaps an outlier. After all how did these actions benefit the jews as a group? They didn't and there was no way I could find of cogently interpreting such an event in MacDonald's thesis. The fact that the behaviour was unusual had caused MacDonald to overlook it or possibly not know of it, but it still existed and needed to be explained within MacDonald's theory, which I simply couldn't do.

This, of course, troubled me for quite some time in my studies until I hit upon a simple solution to the problem. The conjectural question *'what is good for jews?'* should be transliterated into *'what do I think is good for jews'* and then to simplify the emphasis *'what do I think is good for myself as a jew'* and then further simplified one gets the stark individualistic question: *'what is good for me?'* This allowed me to keep MacDonald's basic and correct observation that jews look ethnocentric as a group, but that there is another far more important motivational layer to their behaviour. That layer is their ego.

If one understood the jews that way then *'jewish traitors'* made sense in that they had originally been conforming jews, whose conformation to the jewish group was a method of ego fulfillment by gaining laurels from the jewish community for being pious jews [and also believing that YHWH would allow them to go straight to Gan Eden (4), because they were particularly special and worthy], but when the community had rejected them in order to restore their damaged egos. These *'jewish traitors'* sought to exercise power and control over the community that rejected them and gain acceptance into a new community by viciously attacking their kinsmen.

This also made sense of Judaism, among many other things in jewish studies, in so far as rather than interpreting Judaism as an method for keeping jews ethnocentric (but not being able to reasonably explain the extremely fractious nature of Judaism or its Diaspora origins) I began interpreting it as the assertion of elite jewish egos over other jewish egos. This is explained very simply by remembering that Judaism is not a religion in the sense of *'someone is saved by a metaphysical entity'*, but rather that the metaphysical entity has laid down a large number of rules that have to be followed and thus are open to interpretation as required by the religious and/or charismatic authorities.

In essence then you have a religion that is not based on going out and *'saving souls'*, but on re-enforcing a system of power, created and staffed by elite jewish egos, on both Israel and non-Israel. The individual and collective ego(s) of Israel are soothed by the assurance that they are YHWH's chosen people and that they are, in essence, already perfect souls that just need to keep

their noses clean. They are also soothed by the knowledge that even if they don't keep their noses clean all that will happen is that they will go to Gehenna (similar to purgatory) and have to spend at most a few years repenting their sins against YHWH before being allowed to enter Gan Eden.

This is materially reinforced by Judaism's view of gentiles as being little more than animals and certainly far less worthy biologically-speaking than jews. This enables jews to believe they have a dual materialistic and spiritual egoistic superiority over gentiles via the belief that they need only adhere to jewish law and that gentile laws do not mean anything (although this attitude is explicitly ruled against in Judaism: in both theory and practice it is commonly adhered to even if lipservice is given to this contra ruling) in addition to their belief that when the jewish messiah turns up: the whole world will submit to the rule of the jews from their rebuilt Temple in Jerusalem (in effect Israel is to rule non-Israel the latter being slaves separated into different classifications in halakah: the most favoured being the Noahides who are pledged, in theory and practice, to serve the jews and through them serve YHWH alone and any who are perceived to be Amalekites are to be exterminated as the deadly hated enemy of all jews).

In essence Judaism is a power structure that allows different classifications of rabbis, tzaddiks et al to rule over their communities like mini-dictators as the rabbi, particularly among the Ashkenazim, combines the roles of community leader, magistrate and religious authority (any who oppose the rabbi's rulings are usually subject to group censure). Of course as in any power structure one finds that rabbis have other rabbis who are their followers and they in turn have either flocks and students. When a rabbi teaches a student then that rabbi effectively holds the power of life or death in the community over his student (and sometimes literally (5)) and the rabbi will inculcate his ideas and doctrines into his student, which he represents as his own additions to his own masters doctrines (creating great family trees that form the rabbinical schools of thought). This is reinforced by the use of a rabbi's daughters as incentive for his students by holding out the prospective of good marriage to them as it became custom for jews in general, and rabbis in particular, to try and marry their sons and daughters to either great rabbinical or wealthy families (as that gives the best evolutionary advantage as well as a considerable amount of ego fulfillment).

It is also a fairly well known jewish custom, that is still practised today among secular and religious jews and mischlinge, to '*hothouse*' their children into being obsessed with success (and the factors that are considered to indicate success such as wealth [hence the jewish obsession with money]) for only that will grant both them and their jewish parents, generally-speaking, the egoistic fulfillment that they crave. In essence one could describe jewish culture generally and Judaism in particular as a massive conflict over who is the best at and/or who has X, Y and Z (i.e. an epidemic version of '*keeping up with the Jones*').

Understanding Judaism like this, i.e. through the lens of egocentrism, gave me a far better degree of insight and way of explaining jewish behaviour than ethnocentrism precisely because it allowed me to explain both the jewish attitude to and interaction with gentiles, the origins and evolution of jewish culture and religion and most importantly the jewish attitude towards other jews. It is worth mentioning that this is the major area that MacDonald misses out in his thesis and one which disproves his theory in so far as jewish organisations and individuals are not a harmonious bunch by any means and have a habit, and long history, of engaging in vicious and

bitter internal struggles against each other. These can be understood in the manner of the conjectural question: '*what is good for jews?*', but then one finds both sides of any conflict are asking that same question and answering it differently. Therefore the conjectural question has to boil down to a '*what do I think is good for jews?*' and one is again forced down the road of looking at the emphasis in that which leads one to the basis of the jewish mind: '*what is good for me?*'

I am not going to go too deeply into my critique of Ethnocentrism and the detailed evidence for my Egocentric thesis as I will present those in time, but I wished to offer a short account of my basic evolution from an Enthocentric to an Egocentric understanding of jews. I have been testing the Egocentric thesis for quite sometime now both in my studies of the jewish question and among friends who have also studied it. I will over the coming months present a series of essays on my Egocentric theory via working through specific areas of jewish studies and historical examples, while looking at the Ethnocentric interpretation and seeing whether it can really give a coherent answer to each covered area of jewish studies and the analysed historical examples.

(1) Earlier expressions of an ethnocentric theory, although not elaborated in any great detail, can be found in the work of the late great Theodor Fritsch (in his works from the 1880s to the 1930s), Edouard Drumont (in his works from the 1880s to the 1900s), Professor John Allego (particularly his 1971 book on the Bar Kochba rebellion: '*The Chosen People*', Hodder & Stoughton: London), Dr. Maximine Portaz (in her 1958, '*Paul de Tarse, ou Christianisme et juiverie*', Self-Published: Calcutta) and in Professor Revilo Oliver's many writings on the jews (1966-1994).

(2) This would be akin to asserting that Karl Marx or Jean Jacques Rousseau were active participants in genocide, because their works formed the basis for two of the greatest evidenced genocides in history (the Red Terror of Lenin/The Purges of Stalin and the results of the French Revolution respectively). We may not like either of these two individuals or their theories, but no one can go so far as to assert that they were responsible for genocide (which would also make Christ responsible for all the deaths of say the Thirty Years War and all the Crusades [Western and Byzantine]).

(3) The 'convert' in question was Nicholas Donin. Who after being rejected and excommunicated by the Paris jewish community, splashed himself with holy water and became a Christian. Taking orders he began a campaign against his own former kin by presenting 35 charges against the jews on the basis of statements made in the Talmud Bavli. This resulted in the burning of all the copies that could be found of the Talmud Bavli in 1242 and the near extermination of all the overt, as opposed to covert i.e. 'converts' like Donin, jews in Anjou, Brittany and Poitiers.

(4) Gan Eden is simply the jewish version of heaven, but unlike the Christian version of heaven: admission is based on one's biological state as a jew and Gan Eden itself is transitional.

(5) *Hemdat yamim, Shabbat 81a*. This is a kabbalistic ethical tale, which demonstrates this trait in Judaism in so far as it tells of a student who laughed in the course of morning prayers at a synagogue and was considered to have disgraced himself by his teacher and the student died soon afterwards. The meaning of the tale being quite clear. An English translation of this tale can be found in Aryeh Wineman, 1988, '*Beyond Appearances: Stories from the Kabbalistic Ethical Writing*', 1st Edition, Jewish Publication Society of America: Philadelphia, pp. 149-150.

No Beauty in a Book

Saturday, 3 April 2010

A Book Review of Mark Glenn, 2005, *'No Beauty in the Beast: Israel without her Mascara'*, 1st Edition, The Barnes Review: Washington D.C.

When I decided to purchase this work I did so, because it was supposedly a detailed review of the subject of Israel from a critical viewpoint. I already knew of Mark Glenn of course and was well aware that he was a crypto-Muslim of sorts and in many ways he is comparable to Christians who insist on for example holding a seder. I hoped in vain for something much more on point and detailed, but Mark Glenn simply doesn't provide anything that is worthwhile reading.

Glenn spends most of the book rambling and ranting on about Israel like a child who has just had a toy stolen by a bigger child. Rather than providing a detailed look at Israel *'without her mascara'* as the book's by-line suggests: all Glenn provides is a badly written narrative devoid of any sourcing for the points he makes. One doesn't know what one can believe and in many ways that is a good thing, because what he does say is coloured by his irrational love for Muslims and his lack of knowledge about Judaism/jews [which was beyond appalling]. For what sources Glenn does use are either only one side of a long-standing argument or are plain useless (either because they have faulty sourcing, general unreliability or due to new information unavailable to the author has changed opinions).

By way of example in his *'Recommended Reading'* at the end of the work Glenn cites Israel Shahak, Frank Britton, Michael Hoffman II, Denis Fahey [Glenn uses 'Dennis'], Michael Collins Piper and Jack Bernstein. Now Shahak's *'Jewish History, Jewish Religion'* is a fairly interesting work on Judaism in Israel, but it suffers from a number of material errors in its citations of books like the Talmud Bavli which have been pointed out by Andrew Mathis.

At least Shahak is a somewhat reasonable source: Frank Britton however is not. The work of Britton's (the only one I am aware of) that Glenn is citing to his readers is *'Behind Communism'*, which is an obscure pamphlet published in 1954 (possibly for an outfit called *'American Nationalists'*, which I recall mention of but cannot remember where I remember reading this assertion). The work, of which I have copy, is a somewhat hysterical attempt to put forth the thesis that the Bolshevik revolution was completely controlled and dominated by jews (this doesn't detract authors from using it however and it is one of the many questionable, even sometimes dubious or invalid, sources that David Duke uses in his *'Jewish Supremacism'*). Many of Britton's 'facts' at the time might have seemed cogent (indeed he reproduces bits from newspapers of the time to provide his sourcing), but today a significant proportion of them are proven falsehoods. It is also noteworthy that what 'facts' Britton does present do not offer support for this thesis of the wholly jewish character of Bolshevism/Communism (one notes a significant shift in the middle of the work from Soviet officialdom to Soviet spies halfway through Britton's chronology so as to allow him to somewhat evidence his position). This isn't to suggest that jews didn't play a significant role in the Bolshevik revolution, the Soviet Union or the revolutionary movements that preceeded or proceeded from that revolution (as they often were integral to it),

but rather to point out that Britton is not proof of that fact and that his 'information' and presentation will put off thinking individuals as well as most of the rest.

Michael Hoffman II is just a plain crank and although he writes a great deal on Judaism and the Jewish question in general: his writing is marred by constant material errors and deliberate misinterpretations, which we have addressed before on Semitic Controversies [several of our contributors have also argued with Hoffman via email and found that his knowledge of Judaism is rather shallow (he is unable to reply after two-three responses and what replies he does make do not exhibit the command of Judaism he professes for himself in various books). One of our contributors has also caught Hoffman outright lying in his '*Judaic Communists*' article and Hoffman refuses to even correct the error or cite any source for it]. Glenn would do far better to actually read say '*The Cambridge Introduction to the Talmud and the Rabbinic Literature*' and the Talmud Bavli himself rather than just citing Hoffman as an 'authority' [which he as anyone who has made even a cursory study of Judaism should know is not the case].

Denis Fahey is, like Shahak, a fairly decent source, but like Britton his work is heavily dated and when he was most active (from the 1920s-1950s) the information and arguments he purported were relatively cogent, because they were based on the best information to hand at the time (but scholarship over time has contradicted him). However his arguments in '*The Kingship of Christ and the Conversion of the Jewish Nation*' (which is his magnum opus) on Jews are often influenced by his belief in the authenticity of '*The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*' and his vision of a Judeo-Masonic conspiracy directed specifically against Christianity and the Roman Catholic Church in particular (which I would stress was and is not an unusual view among conservative Christian clergy and does have some cogent advocates such as the late, great Monsignor Jouin). He also used lists of supposed Jews in the Bolshevik revolution that had been produced by those sympathetic to the Black Hundreds in the Russian Civil War and much of his argument that is not based on theology and philosophy falters upon the problematic sources and assumptions that Fahey used.

Michael Collins Piper is, like Hoffmann, a dubious source at best since Piper is a conspiratorially-obsessed journalist whose books often read like long lists of newspaper cuttings and who, like so many others he associates with, tends to distort evidence to make it fit a preconceived thesis. That said he has written one or two works that are worth something more than as cheap thrills for the uneducated, particularly that concerning the victory of Holocaust revisionism against 'Holocaust survivor' Mel Mermelstein. Piper also provides the preface to '*No Beauty in the Beast*' and the reader begins to feel nauseous when he and Glenn perform some mutual fellation without adding any value to the work what-so-ever.

Jack Bernstein we have discussed in detail in the '*Jewish "Traitors"*' series of articles and we discussed whether or not Bernstein existed. On the basis of his book: we think he was real and was at least in part the author of the book that goes under his name: '*The Life of an American Jew living in Racist Marxist Israel*'. However as to the value of his comments: we have little to say other than some of them are just absurd. For example accusing Ashkenazim of being 'Nazis', because 'Nazi' is in their name (which is so absurdly silly that I don't think anyone but a Jew could write that as a serious argument). Simply put Bernstein is an unreliable source and until we have a substantial, as opposed to a circumstantial, case (which is what one can glean from the

text) for his existence and authorship of *'The Life of an American Jew living in Racist Marxist Israel'* then one should not use his 'testimony'. For example I have not had any response from the kibbutz that he asserts he lived on when much of the events of his booklet occur and the contact details given on their website seem to be incorrect (the email address returns my email and the phone line doesn't work) so I am not expecting to be able to confirm this anytime soon.

In essence then there is nothing really to Glenn's book other than a long 250 page rant about Israel, jews and how wonderful Muslims and Islam are. I am reminded of reading Marxist works, which spill lots of ink on part of a tree but yet say absolutely nothing of value. The 'best' part of the work to be generous is the beginning where Glenn gives quotes from various authors and works, but these are not properly cited either and many of them either from the author detailed above or potentially out-of-context.

Please don't buy this book, at \$25 it is a little steep anyway (I've paid a lot less for high quality works on the jewish question and other matters), as it is an embarrassment for the anti-Semitic cause. Spend your money on something far more factual and which might have some lasting value. Leave Mark Glenn to whine on his own until he grows up and starts writing properly in support of his opinions.

In Brief: Anti-Semitism and Child Abuse

Sunday, 4 April 2010

When you look at news sites currently you see outrage, well sorry feigned 'outrage', about Fr. Raniero Cantalamessa's remarks comparing the common perception of anti-Semitism with the way the media has dealt with the Catholic Church over child abuse allegations (1). Despite all the whining and moaning of jewish groups about how *'incomparable the suffering of jews is'*: I think what Fr. Cantalamessa is getting at is rather simpler and even if you believe all the jewish claims about suffering (most of which have been found to be substantially wanting in scholarship in the past few decades, but continue in the popular imagination (2)) then he could hardly be said to be 'degrading' it, but rather making a valid comparison.

Fr. Cantalamessa is simply comparing the furor of negative media attention over, i.e. actively selected stories by editors who by necessity have suppressed another story to give particular prominence to, lurid tales of child abuse by Catholic priests over the same claims of finding anti-Semitism just about everywhere that are found in mainstream and fringe jewish literature. It is a valid comparison in so far as both stories have been actively selected for media attention: one to villify those who criticise jews in any form (hence the overt and covert assertion made by many Zionist authors that anti-Zionism equates anti-Semitism [the two are distinctly different phenomena but are related via Zionism and Israel's own attitudes], which is like claiming that Francophobia is the same as any criticism of France or the French [i.e. patently absurd]) and the other to villify the Catholic Church over these lurid tales of child abuse (although some of them are likely genuine: they are very hard to prove and most of them as I have said in n. 1 are unlikely to be true but rather *'false memories'* (3)).

This is a valid comparison to make given that all Fr. Cantalamessa is talking about is the way these events were handled by the media and how they were all but orchestrated witch-hunts. However we see once again that the jews are so obsessed with the '*unique nature of anti-Semitism*', which incidentally directly implies from a secular and religious angle that jews are different and also superior/better than non-jews precisely because their victimhood is 'unique' and they have never put a foot wrong, that any comparison to it (such as when Abraham Foxman the Head of the infamous Anti-Defamation League of B'nai Brith claimed that the Armenian genocide wasn't as important as the 'holocaust' and then tried to claim he '*never said that*') is held to depreciate it in some fashion.

One has to ask oneself is this about the child abuse victims (real or supposed) or is about the jews wanting to maintain their status as the 'victims' of a '*unique phenomenon*'? I think the evidence shows it is the latter: since the jews don't give a damn about the victims only themselves.

However in addendum to this I think we might add that jewish organisations have an additional motivation for their feigned 'outrage' over Fr. Cantalamessa in so far as there has been a concerted campaign against the Catholic Church by jewish organisations over its supposed complicity in the 'holocaust'. This is particularly given expression in John Cornwall's libellous book: '*Hitler's Pope*' and has been countered and debunked in detail by several Catholic scholars. The presumed object of this campaign, which has been running for the last decade or two, is to get the Catholic Church to pay millions of dollars to jewish organisations in 'reparations'. Of course the jewish organisations aren't particularly interested in jewish suffering either, but rather wish to extract the most money from a given target (like the Swiss banks in the 90s' when unclaimed jewish assets were only a few million dollars, but the jewish organisations demanded and eventually got several hundred million dollars) (4).

Quite frankly: the jews often wonder what causes anti-Semitism. Most have over-looked the simplest possible solution to that question: jewish behaviour. Is it any wonder people don't like jews after this little kerfuffle? Not really, but of course the jews still won't understand and the cycle of hatred will just go on and on and on.

(1) I am told by a friend of mine who is very close to the upper echelons of the Catholic Church that these are largely false memories and libels concocted by shyster lawyers [with the possible cooperation of the family concerned induced by a large potential pay-out] who then proceed to cause a '*trial by media*' forcing the Catholic Church to settle out of court to avoid the media feeding frenzy (and giving credence to untrue claims: rather like people intentionally slipping on things in shops). I am certainly inclined to believe that this is at least partially true as a rash of claims such as this is rather odd unless there were a number of lawyers taking advantage of the Church's weakness to such claims at present. Perhaps a good analogy would be that blood has been pumped into a shark-infested ocean and we are currently witnessing the resulting feeding frenzy.

(2) For example see Elliot Horowitz, 2007, '*Reckless Rites: Purim and the Legacy of Jewish Violence*', 1st Edition, Princeton University Press: Princeton, which details the reality and religious/secular motivation of jewish attacks on gentiles that have (and do) provoke(d) violence in return upon the jews and how jews still violently attack others, but expect to be treated as the

eternal victim. Also see Norman Finkelstein's, 2001, *'The Holocaust Industry: Reflections on the Exploitation of Jewish Suffering'*, 2nd Edition, Verso: New York.

(3) On this please see the introduction of the phenomenon of confabulation (which includes the creation of 'false memories') on Scholarpedia at the following address:

http://www.scholarpedia.org/article/Confabulation_theory [Accessed: 04/04/2010].

(4) Finkelstein, Op. Cit., pp. 89-175.

Sources on Jews and Communism (Part I)

Friday, 9 April 2010

Introductory Note

What I reproduce here, for ease of reference, is a series of quotations from various sources, contemporary and modern, illustrating the hotly debated connection between jews and revolutionary ideas, particularly marxism. What these sources do not provide is proof positive that the jews and communism or jews and bolshevism are interchangeable (which is my opinion an incorrect and overstated argument), but what they do provide is an easy-to-use archive of properly referenced quotes for the use of those engaged in arguments or research on this question. As many of the books I cite are academic in nature and/or are out-of-print: I thought it would be appropriate to provide my readers and the public in general with decent, as opposed to the silly [which proliferate on 'far right' discussion boards and destroy the credibility of those arguing a connection between the two], quotations on this most debated question.

I have also marked (inside the [] at the end of) the quotations for particular characteristics, which I provide a key to below:

* = Makes observations on the basis of their own visit to the Soviet Union.

+ = Makes observations on the basis of their experiences in Imperial Russia and/or during the Russian Civil War.

= Makes observations on the basis of their own experiences in other countries that has Soviet/marxist style revolutions or attempted revolutions.

- = The author is of questionable reliability.

J = The author is a jew or jewess.

Any additional notes that maybe required for purposes of explanation and context have been made after the full citation in the references.

If you have any additional quotes that you can properly reference and believe them to be of value then please do not hesitate to send them to me at the usual address:

Semitic.Controversies@googlemail.com.

Part I

'The censorship department, and that means the whole machine for controlling the home and

muzzling the foreign press, was entirely staffed by Jews.' (1) [*]

'There seemed not to be a single non-Jewish official in the whole outfit, and they were just the same Jews as you met in New York, Berlin, Vienna and Prague - well-manicured, well-fed, dressed with a touch of the dandy. I was told that the proportion of Jews in Government is small, but in this one department that I got to know intimately they seemed to have a monopoly, and I asked myself, where were the Russians?' (2) [*]

'How is it possible for the Jewish press to pretend that a connexion between Jews and Bolshevism is a malicious invention of the "anti-Semites"? That all Jews are not Bolsheviks and that all Bolsheviks are not Jews is of course obvious; but that Jews are playing a preponderating part in Bolshevism is absurd to deny.' (3)

'The same report publishes a list of seventy-six men prosecuted by the Committee on the charge of criminal anarchy in America at the beginning of 1920, of which the overwhelming majority are seen by their names to be Jewish.' (4) [-]

'These ninety thousand exiles constituted the heart of the approaching Bolshevik revolution. They were almost to the last man professional revolutionaries, and with few exceptions they were Jewish.' (5) [-]

'In addition to the general tendency to play down the influence and number of Russian revolutionary Jews due to antisemitic demagoguery reaching back to tsarist times, research on Jewish participants in Populist organizations and parties has suffered from the preconceived idea that Populism, as an indigenous Russian ideology, was alien to the Jewish character both in Weltanschauung and revolutionary practice. Accordingly, Jewish historians have argued that this variant of Russian socialism held no attraction for Jews. Unlike latter-day Russian Social Democracy, which appealed to the Jewish psyche with its Marxist internationalism, messianic determinism, and proletarian universalism, there was nothing in Populism a Jew could identify with. Hence, in the opinion of Lev Deich, Elias Tscherikower, and Leonard Shapiro, who have done most to shape our perceptions on the subject, the national particularism, reactionary traditionalism, and archaic peasantism of the Russian Populists precluded meaning participation by Jews in the revolutionary movement of the 1870s and 1880s. This, they assert, is reflected in the supposedly miniscule Jewish involvement in the Populist circles and organizations of these two decades. Close investigation bears out none of this. My findings indicate that Jews flocked as much to the revolutionary standard of Populism as to that of Marxism later on; and they did so for the same motives, which were rooted in their Jewish upbringing and Jewish cosmopolitan desire to better the world.' (6)

'The number of Jews occupying high positions in the Soviet Government is probably larger than the Jewish community is entitled to either on account of its numbers or its higher education standard. But even in Russia, there are many Jewish anti-Bolsheviks; and several of the leading Commissars are very anti-Jewish. Chicherin is Russian, though several of his assistants are Jews. Derzhinsky, the head of the Extraordinary Commission, is either Russian or Polish, and none of the people whom I met in that institution were Jews. Derzhinsky's right-hand man, Mogilevsky, with whom I was brought into close and unpleasant relations, is very anti-Jewish,

and is at present trying to get hold of a Jew in Moscow who supplied Mr. North, it is alleged, with large sums of money for anti-Bolshevik agitation.

There must be many such anti-Bolshevik Jews who are probably opposed to Lenin on account of his ingenious scheme of inflating the currency until money becomes valueless. One can quite understand that a race with the financial ability of the Hebrews should dislike such a project.' (7) [+]

"Those at present active in nuclei work are primarily English, Jewish, and German, and here and there Finnish comrades. From the other nationalities there are very few who participate in this work.' (8)

'After leaving the Embassy I went to the Ours and had luncheon with Frasso, who had been at the Duma till 5 yesterday. He had nothing new to tell. In the afternoon found Madame Polovtsov just going out, so we went together down the Morskaia - Jewish students were pulling down the eagles over the shops and over the Yacht Club.' (9) [+]

'As I happened to be at the last representation of the Imperial ballet, I went this evening to the first representation of the ballet under the new order. I was there before the curtain went up, at 7, an hour earlier than formerly. In the ground floor Imperial stage box on the left, where the Grand Dukes always sat, were several lady dancers and one man. Over their head, in the first box, where the children of the Grand Dukes used to go, were a Jew and a Jewess.' (10) [+]

'The Jews are working openly for Germany. They are buying up house property, which is being sold much below its value for fear of worse days.' (11) [+]

'In Budapest the working masses became threateningly restless; near the communal food-shops and other stores the waiting crowd was no longer patient and silent. I stopped often at the edge of the pavement and listened to what they said. The shabby, waiting rows of tired people struggled for hours between two wedges. In the shop the profiteers sucked their life blood; in the street paid agitators incited them cunningly, clandestinely against "the gentle-folk." "If it all depends on us how long we stand we stand it. After all we are the majority, not they."

The crowd approved and failed to notice that the Semitic race was only to be found at the two ends of the queue, and that not a single representative of it could be seen as a buyer among the crowding, the poor, and the starving... This was symbolical, a condensed picture of Budapest. The sellers, the agitators were Jews. The buyers and the misguided were the people of the capital.' (12) [#]

'As if executing a pre-arranged plan, at an inaudible command, the Jewish leaders of the trade-unions, the Jewish officials of the workmen's clubs, usurped authority.' (13) [#]

'A goodly proportion of the hundred Jews who came out of Germany with Lenin, and the hundred who came from Chicago, deserve to be included in this gallery, for they undoubtedly held Russia under their sway.' (14) [+]

References for Part I

(1) Douglas Reed, 1938, *'Insanity Fair'*, 1st Edition, Jonathan Cape: London, p. 195. Reed might be considered by some to be an unreliable source in view of his later well-documented anti-Semitic writing (i.e. *'The Controversy of Zion'*), but when he wrote *'Insanity Fair'* and his other travel books in the 1930s: he was if anything rather pro-jewish as one can ascertain from reading his writings, which are still freely available on the antiquarian book market. I would assert that we have no reason to doubt Reed's writings or his observations since as one can ascertain from the quoted passages above: they might seem overly anti-Semitic, but when one looks at the qualifiers in his sentences one finds that he is actually giving the jews the benefit of the doubt.

(2) Ibid.

(3) Nesta Webster, N.D., [1924], *'Secret Societies and Subversive Movements'*, 1st Edition, Omni: Palmdale, p. 387. Webster is often defamed by odious critics (who usually haven't bothered to read or accurately represent her views, which were more rational and well-researched than they present them as), but as she worked purely from secondary sources her work was heavily coloured by what information she had to hand, which is why I cite only those passages that have lasting value.

(4) Ibid. The report Webster is referring to is the Lusk Report of 1920. I have marked this to be of questionable reliability, because of the methodology that Webster professes to use [i.e. 'jewish names'], which is not a cogent general indicator of racial origin.

(5) Frank Britton, 1954, *'Behind Communism'*, 1st Edition, Self-Published (possibly *'American Nationalists'*): Unknown, p. 45. This is the repetition of an old *'White Guard'* rumour that gained currency in anti-Communist and anti-Semitic circles. It has widely been discredited, but I provide it for the sake of completeness and because any collection of this kind without noting this widely-credited rumour would certainly be remiss. A variant of this rumour can be seen cited in Revilo Oliver, 1966, *'All America Must Know The Terror That Is Upon Us'*, 1st Edition, Conservative Viewpoint: Bakersfield, p. 15 n. 1; pp. 22-23 n. 21. It is worth noting that Oliver notes the same sources used to substantiate this rumour by Denis Fahey (who Oliver cites as well) and Nesta Webster (Britton likely is using these widely-circulated sources as factual cribs as well).

(6) Erich Haberer, 2004, [1995], *'Jews and Revolution in Nineteenth-Century Russia'*, 1st Edition, Cambridge University Press: New York, p. xii. This is a summary of Haberer's findings that he himself gives in his preface, which serves to indicate in a short, useful quotation the long evidenced argument he makes (but it does not include the qualifiers that he himself makes for which you will have to either purchase or borrow this excellent work).

(7) Francis McCullagh, 1922, *'A Prisoner of the Reds: The Story of a British Officer Captured in Siberia'*, 1st Edition, E. P. Dutton: New York, pp. 267-268.

(8) R. Whitney, 1924, *'Reds in America'*, 1st Edition, The Beckwith Press: New York, p. 135. This is a quotation from the second captured report from the raid on the Communist Party convention at Bridgman, Michigan on the 22nd August 1922. For additional confirmation of this general point see Pierre Huss, George Carpozi Jr., 1965, *'Red Spies in the UN'*, 1st Edition, Coward-McCann: New York particularly the case of the jewess Judith Coplon on pp. 16-40 (whose husband and family own and a well-know prosperous jewish legal practice in New York to this day [Coplon was never imprisoned for the espionage she carried out for the Soviet Union on the basis of legal technicalities]) [also mentioned by Britton, Op. Cit., p. 76]. Also see Whittaker Chambers, 1952, *'Witness'*, 1st Edition, Random House: New York, which is

Chambers' semi-autobiographical exposition of Soviet espionage in the United States (Chambers had himself been an important spy and helped run a major Soviet spy ring with Elisabeth Bentley: hence can be reasonably relied upon) and contains many accounts of Jewish Soviet spies in the United States. Chambers' own wife (one Esther Shemitz), according to Britton (Op. Cit., p 91), was a communist Jewess and this seems to be probable even if I have been unable to undeniably confirm it [Britton, as usual, cites no sources and doesn't even mention Chambers' wife's name, but I have found it via an internet search].

(9) Anon., 1919, *The Russian Diary of an Englishman: Petrograd, 1915-1917*, 1st Edition, Robert McBride: New York p. 120. I have listed this as unreliable, because the author is unnamed and hence I cannot confirm whether this account is really first-hand or whether it is a literary invention (a bit like your average 'holocaust survivor' tale if you will). The passage in question states (on p. 119) that it is from Friday the 16th of March 1917: it does however seem to be a genuine diary as opposed to a literary invention (but without close investigation one cannot know for sure).

(10) Ibid., p. 137. The entry is listed as that for Wednesday the 28th of March 1917.

(11) Ibid., pp. 156-157. The entry is listed as that for the 20th of April 1917 on p. 152. It is necessary to note that the claim that *'the Jews are working openly for Germany'* is probably a veiled reference to the anti-war agitation that was being conducted at the time, which was probably of a socialistic, populist, liberal and/or Marxist nature (i.e. the logic is: if one is a pacifist then one is working for German victory in the First World War). It should not be taken literally. It is also unlikely to be a reference to Lenin's *'closed carriage'* through Germany to agitate against the war in Russia as Lenin was not at this point an important individual, but only a minor player in Russian politics.

(12) Cecile Tormay, 1923, *An Outlaw's Diary: Revolution*, 1st Edition, Philip Allan: London, p. 45.

(13) Ibid., p. 88. I have marked this passage as potentially unreliable, because Tormay suggests throughout, but particularly in this quoted passage, that the Jews were as a group behind the whole communist revolution in Hungary and this is a discredited (not to mention unrealistic) point of view, but it does have some truth to it in that Jews were proportionally higher in the short-lived Communist coup in Hungary by Bela Kuhn than in the Soviet Union of the early years (one finds this view reflected by Tormay on p. 89 where she lists Jewish communist leaders and Jewish aides she knows of to evidence her thesis. I have not listed these as they are probably conjecture as opposed to knowns from her experiences).

(14) Robert Wilton, 1920, *The Last Days of the Romanovs: From 15th March, 1917*, 1st Edition, Thornton Butterworth: London, p. 27. Wilton is not a reliable source, but as he was present in Russia during the communist revolution it is worth including appropriate parts of his testimony as it is a legitimate, if very inaccurate, source (for the same reasons, outlined in n. 5 above, that I have quoted Frank Britton's work). For a more detailed review of the problems of Wilton's book please see our article: *'A Judeo-Bolshevik Debacle'*

(<http://semiticcontroversies.blogspot.com/2008/10/judeo-bolshevik-debacle.html>).

Sources on Jews and Communism (Part II)

Sunday, 11 April 2010

Part II

'To-day one meets the citizens of all countries on the steamers, especially Russians on ships which ply between America and Russia. Since the Russian revolution thousands of Russians have crossed the Pacific and these men and women who were residents of New York, Seattle, Chicago and Newark have flocked to the land of their birth to become officials and businessmen. One of the Bolshevik commissars of Khabarovsk, the capital of the Amur, was a Chicago lawyer. Petrograd and Moscow were filled with political agitators from New York and New Jersey. In nearly every Siberian city were refugees from cities on our western coast. On the Nippon Maru were more of these Russian-Americans en route to their native land, Bolshevik, Menshevik, and Monarchist, plotter and peaceful citizen.

Walking the deck one evening I met a young Russian Jew from one of the communicating suburbs of New York. He had been in the United States three years, and was now en route to Russia in search for his family which he had left in a small town near Moscow.

"I don't know ver my vife iss," he said. "I half not heard about her or my children since April."

"You have an American passport?" I asked.

"No, a Russian."

"Were you in sympathy with the revolution?"

"Certainly," was his quick answer. He was a keen, determined fellow and his English, while not perfect, showed that he had been utilizing every opportunity to improve it in his humble circumstances because he had been working in a junk-shop near Newark, and had saved five thousand dollars in three years!" (15) [+]

'Having feasted and entertained us to good Russian music, admonished us and put our passports in order, the kind-hearted Gowkovsky packed us off to Petrograd in charge of half a dozen or more of his trusty henchmen. Several of these were Jews - clever, brainy, shrewed, dogmatic; excellent linguists, perfect interpreters.

One of the facts we marked very soon in our adventurous career was the large number of Jews who occupy positions of trust and influence in the Revolutionary Administration. We remarked upon it to the Jews themselves. We were informed that only two of the seventeen People's Commissars were Jews, but that very considerable numbers indeed were employed in administrative posts, both nationally and locally, and by the Extraordinary Commission. As the membership and activity of large numbers of Jews is a feature of continental Socialist societies, particularly in Central and Eastern Europe, it is worth considering for a moment why this should be so.' (16) [+]

'Said one of the best-known Jewish leaders in Russia to me when I had gently complained of too much discipline and too little freedom:

"But the Russian people are like children. They are not educated. They know nothing. They have been accustomed for centuries to slavery and dictation. Would you have us allow them to destroy themselves by their own incapacity and inexperience? Would you give a vote to each of those millions of ignorant peasants? It would be like putting a knife into the hands of a baby."

How familiar it all sounded to me, as reminiscences of the Woman Suffrage fight in England came to my mind, and I recalled the fact that this baby and carving-knife argument was one of the pet excuses for denying women their freedom.

None the less it is true that the Russian people in the main are unaccustomed to freedom, and by their nature and temperament are proper material for the exercise of power by the educated, dominating Jew. It would not be fair, however, to neglect to say that of those persons who spoke to me privately in condemnation of the Bolsheviki, a very considerable number, if not the majority, were also Jews. One is driven to the conclusion that it is the activity and strength of his mind, and not necessarily a proclivity for Bolshevik theory which is chiefly responsible for the commanding position of the Jew in the political affairs of Europe in general and of Russia in particular.

Another Jew, a fair-haired, blue-eyed Jew from the United States, met us on the Russian frontier, and offered us greetings in the name of the Soviet Republic. He was an interesting personality, whose history as a leader of strikes in America he unfolded to us on the journey from the frontier to Petrograd.' (17) [+]

'One of the very ablest of the People's Commissars is the Acting-Commissar for Ways and Communications, Sverdloff. We travelled in his company from Nijini-Novgorod to Astrakhan. He it was who kindly put at our disposal the train de luxe which carried our sick friend from Saratov to Reval, and whose considerate kindness on the ship enabled us to save his life.

He is in appearance slight and pale, of Jewish birth, with dark expressive eyes and rather autocratic manner. He has been many times in prison for his political faith, although his revolutionary record appears to have been less lurid than that of his brother who recently died of the pestilence. He was in exile in America and England for some years, and studied with acute intelligence American business methods, particularly American business discipline.' (18) [+]

'To begin with, these excesses are not organized by Russians, but by Jews and they are carried out by Letts and soldiers of the Central Powers in Russian uniform.' (19) [+]

'We arrived at Divisional Headquarters the following day, and were lodged in the loft of a warehouse. The ground floor was a guard room, the second floor was a place of detention for Russian soldiers, and our loft was shared by spies - mostly Jews.' (20) [+]

'The hospital kitchen was in the hands of a Polish Jew and his wife. They had begun the war with almost nothing, and they were now said to be worth thousands of pounds. No money by the kitchen but some stuck to their palms. His staff collected money for a water carrier, and gave it to him to disburse. He put it in his own pocket, and used to pay the man out of Government funds. His soldiers were so angry with him that at the outbreak of the Revolution he was one of

the first they impeached. He was sent to Irkutsk to await his trial, but the case dragged on interminably. After the Bolsheviks came in he was released, and when I last heard of him he was occupying some position under their Government.' (21) [+]

'The Bolshevik leaders themselves can be divided into two classes, idealists and adventurers. Some of them are Jews, hiding under a Russian alias and taking a revengeful toll for their centuries of oppression; others are Letts, Poles, Armenians, or members of the conquered races.' (22) [-]

'It is not the fact that all Jews are Bolshevik; on the contrary, very many of them have suffered bitterly from the terror. This could not be otherwise, when it is reflected that the legal profession and journalism in Russia are largely recruited from among men of Jewish blood, and that the Press and the law courts have been abolished by the Bolsheviks. The journalists especially did good and dangerous work for Russia until they were finally muzzled. But it is the fact that almost all the Bolshevik leaders are Jews or have intimate Jewish connections.' (23) [-]

'Spies of the Extraordinary Commission for Combating Counter-revolution, the mechanism for maintaining and spreading terror, receive a salary and ten per cent of their victim's property. By such means the Russian nation has been reduced to a condition of complete subservience to the rule of a comparatively small number of men of almost exclusively Jewish extraction, aliens, that is, in blood, in education, in ideals, and supported by alien force. The extent to which this is generally recognised is shown by the common gibe in Petrograd: "Are you a Commissar or do you belong to the Orthodox religion?"' (24) [-]

'I asked a Jewish acquaintance to get my ticket for me. How this remarkable race manages, no one knows, but it is a fact that Jews are always able to get railway tickets, and never have to stand in food queues. And, sure enough, on the morrow I had a ticket to Saratov and a reserved seat to Moscow without having to pay more than a few roubles above the proper rate.' (25) [+]

'It is noticeable that under Bolshevik conditions, hardly anyone but Jews and Red Army people travel.' (26) [+/-]

'The Russian Jews have always hated the Government; they did much to foment the Revolution, and played a leading part in bringing about the subsequent disasters.' (27)

'The very moment the Duma elected an Executive Committee, a Council of the Petrograd workmen sprang up as by magic; and it is to be noted that most of its members were Jews, some of them with assumed Russian names.' (28) [-]

'The 3rd squadron very soon underwent a change, due to the influence of proceedings at Rovno, where the population, which consisted chiefly of Jews was indulging in noisy celebrations of the Revolution.' (29) [-]

References for Part II

(15) Carl Ackerman, 1919, *Trailing The Bolsheviks: Twelve Thousand Miles with the Allies in*

Siberia', 1st Edition, Charles Scribner's Sons: New York, p. 7. It should be noted that the jew Ackerman quotes goes on to say on p. 8 that he is '*not a socialist*', but this is still useful in demonstrating the sympathy for far left politics among jews who were professed (in this case implied) capitalists in economic ideology.

(16) Mrs Philip Snowden, 1920, '*Through Bolshevik Russia*', 1st Edition, Cassell and Company: London, pp. 27-28. The author was the Viscountess of Snowden when this book was written and this particular passage leads into a short apology on behalf of jews and an attempt to justify Snowden's observation of the number of jews who were in ranking positions in the Bolshevik administration via suggesting that they were the majority of the '*educated Russians*'.

(17) Ibid., pp. 29-30.

(18) Ibid., pp. 124-125.

(19) Hereward Price, 1919, '*Boche & Bolshevik: Experiences of an Englishman in the German Army and in Russian Prisons*', 1st Edition, John Murray: London, p. 96. I have noted this source as being potentially unreliable, because Price seems to just repeat what he had heard, rather than what he had seen, on this point.

(20) Ibid., p. 100. I have noted this source as being potentially unreliable, because Price doesn't indicate how he knew the spies were jews, which weakens his credibility as a source.

(21) Ibid., p. 163.

(22) G. E. Raine, Edouard Luboff, 1920, '*Bolshevik Russia*', 1st Edition, Nisbet & Co: London, p. 48. I have marked this as a potentially unreliable source on the grounds that it seems to refer to the '*Commissar Lists*', which were commonly reprinted and believed at the time of writing and publishing.

(23) John Pollock, 1919, '*The Bolshevik Adventure*', 1st Edition, Constable and Company: London, p. xx. I have marked this as a potentially unreliable source on the grounds that it seems to refer to the '*Commissar Lists*', that were commonly reprinted and believed at the time of writing and publishing.

(24) Ibid. p. 104.

(25) Ibid. p. 208.

(26) Ibid. p. 217. I have marked this as a potentially unreliable source on the grounds that Pollock does not detail how he knew the non-Red Army railways users were jews and hence damages his credibility.

(27) Baron P. Graevenitz, 1918, '*From Autocracy to Bolshevism*', 1st Edition, George Allen & Unwin: London, p. 19.

(28) Ibid. p. 84. I have marked this as a potentially unreliable source on the grounds that it seems to refer to the '*Commissar Lists*', which were commonly reprinted and believed at the time of writing and publishing.

(29) Ibid., p. 97.

Sources on Jews and Communism (Part III)

Monday, 26 April 2010

Part III

'I can imagine that in New York and throughout the United States the Jews are holding pow-

wows all night long now that they have been granted free and equal rights in Russia.' (30) [+]

'I then asked Boris to take me to the Jewish market. This is one of the sights of Petrograd. It covers about four blocks and is full of little shops owned by Jews. You can buy everything under the sun there. Everything stolen is brought there, and if you want to buy a machine-gun, a rifle, or anything else, you can find it. This is one reason why the Jews in Russia have such a hard time. They will buy anything they think they can make money on. The people say they are buying up army guns and that they are in the pay of the Germans.

I saw thousands of soldiers in the old clothes section selling their uniforms, underwear, shoes and whatever they had. You can trade a pair of new shoes for a pair not so good and get a little money on the side. We spent a whole morning in this place. I looked at a great many pieces of jewelry. Most of this is loot, stolen during the revolution. I saw a watch that had blood-stains on it. A diamond necklace I could have bought for one-tenth of its value.' (31) [+]

'Jewish Chaplains are now at the front and we also see daily Jewish officers in the army. At the front I have seen thousands of Jews in uniform and ten per cent of the Death Battalions are Jews.' (32) [+/-]

'My husband, without trying any byways or protections, intrigues or bribes, had merely spoken with the hotel man who looked after such documents for those living in the house. They had ended by driving together to Smolny one morning, to ask the permission necessary, before applying to the municipal police for passports to go beyond the frontiers. At Smolny, where they had been scarcely noticed, a soldier had directed them to a large room, on the door of which they saw written "Passports." Here they had knocked, been admitted, and found themselves opposite a Jewess, who wrote out the application which Cantacuzene had signed.' (33) [+]

'To-day Gebhard lunched with Graf Oppersdorff to meet the Russian revolutionary representative Joffe. It was very interesting, of course, although they had to avoid politics. Gebhard describes him as a clever, ordinary international Jew, who has been all over the world and speaks every language. He praised England tremendously, admiring especially the methods of English politics and colonization.

How curious it is to note the immense power which a handful of Jews have suddenly gained in the country which until now was the seat of absolute despotism, and where for centuries the Jews have suffered such a martyrdom of cruel oppression. It almost looks sometimes as if our little continent were destined to be the bone for America and the Jews to pick.' (34) [-]

'I recently became well acquainted with Mr. Morris Gordin, an idealistic Russian-born Jew, who came to Chicago years ago and was a protégé in radicalism of Jane Addams' Hull House. (His statement that no one could get far in the Red movement without the approval of the Hull House group supports my own impressions from research.) From Hull House, he was sent to live at the home of a University of Chicago professor whose heiress wife was supplying \$1,000 a week to Red strikers, for further tutelage. He organized for the pro-Soviet Amalgamated Clothing Workers' Union under Sidney Hillman, now of Roosevelt's National Labor Board (see pages 104 and 290 of "The Red Network"), and left from the Communist Party of Chicago to go

to Russia, where he acted as Press Commissar of the Comintern and as a Party leader in the Ukraine.’ (35)

‘Under Roosevelt’s inspiration and promises of rapid unionization under Section 81 of the NRA, the A. F. of L. took back the left wing pro-Soviet Amalgamated Clothing Workers’ Union headed by Sidney Hillman., Roosevelt’s Labor Board appointee, which had been ejected by the A. F. of L. in 1914 for radicalism.

The subsequent election of a Socialist Party leader, David Dubinsky, head of the socialist International Ladies Garment Workers’ Union, member of the Jewish Socialist Verband, formerly exiled to Siberia for Red revolutionary activities, as vice-president of the A. F. of L., was a lamentable, historic turn to the left.’ (36)

‘Another or Mrs. Roosevelt’s fellow committee members was Mary Van Kleeck, associate with Communist Party leaders on various committees and author of a Communist Party pamphlet in conjunction with Earl Browder, secretary of the Communist Party; another was Russian-born Jacob Billikopf, active in Jewish organizations, trustee of “The Nation” (revolutionary Socialist magazine) and “The Survey” (socialistic magazine), trustee of Harvard University (censured for its communistic trend and Government-supported), vice president of the socialistic American Association for Old Age Security, and now according to the communist Daily Worker (5/6/36), chairman of Roosevelt’s National Labor Relations Board. The Daily Worker reported that he was to preside at a meeting of the communist Friends of the Soviet Union, 5/8/36, at which James Waterman Wise (son of Rabbi Stephen S. Wise) of the communist People’s Press was to speak on the subject “The Jew in Soviet Russia”.’ (37)

‘It is not strange that the “spade work” which was done by the immigrant Red revolutionary, Russian-Jewish exiles, who in 1915, over twenty years ago, had already organized 500,000 of their race in the United States, is also bearing fruit, and that this long-time agitation for radicalism in Jewish organizations’ should be giving rise to the unjust impression that every Jew is naturally a Communist-Socialist.

It was 300,000 of this Socialist Jewish bloc who organized support for La Follette and Wheeler in 1924 on the Socialist-Progressive ticket, which polled nearly five million votes, and it is this same bloc which is now backing Roosevelt, led by Socialists Sidney Hillman, David Dubinsky (exiled to Siberia for Russian revolutionary activities), etc, in Labor’s Non-Partisan League.’ (38)

‘Thus the Morning Freiheit, alone, catering solely to Communist Yiddish-speaking Jews, claimed then about one-fifth of the paid circulation of the entire Communist press.

When a well-meaning Christian writer attempted to combat anti-Semitism by stating that the Jews play a negligible role in the Communist party, he supported this with the worst possible argument that the Jewish Federation of the Communist Party has but 15,000 members, since, if this is correct, it means that of the 40,000 members admitted by the Party in 1936 over one-third are Jewish.

But, as Francis Ralston Welsh has said, even if most of the Communists are Jews, it does not follow that most of the Jews are Communists.’ (39)

‘It was no accident that German fascist opposition to Communism became anti-Semitic, whereas Italian fascist opposition did not. The Reds in Italy, unlike Germany, were not predominately Jewish.’ (40) [-]

‘To quote the “Call of youth”, organ of the youth branch of the Jewish Socialist Workmen’s Circle (March, 1936):

“A great percentage of young Jews in the Soviet are officials, and are thus arousing the envy of our groups of the Russian population who still remember the ‘rightless’ status of the Jews in the former regime.”’ (41)

“‘In the spring of 1933 some 75 families, principally Jewish, hailing from New York, Chicago, Detroit, and other cities took over some 9,000 acres of reclaimed land, of the Owosso Sugar Beet Plantation, near Alicia, Michigan, and organized the Sunrise Cooperative Farm. The present secretary of the commune is Joseph Cohen, who is its motivating power, and principal spokesman.’ (42)

‘Socialism has made terrible inroads among the Jews.’ (43)

“‘Parvus” is the pseudonym of one of the most sinister figures in the history of the Socialist movement, Dr. Alexander Helfand. Born at Odessa, of German-Jewish descent, he studied in Germany and in the early eighteen-nineties attained prominence as a prolific and brilliant contributor to the German Socialist review, Die Neue Zeit. He was early “exiled” from Russia, but it was suspect by a great many Socialists that in reality his “exile” was simply a device to cover employment in the Russian Secret Service as a spy and informer, for which the prestige he had gained in Socialist circles was a valuable aid.’ (44)

‘The headquarters of the Mission, then, arrived at Andijan, in the train, early one morning, when nobody was about, only to be pounced upon by a patrol of Bolsheviks, commanded by a Galician Jew. The truculent tone and manner of this wretch made it quite clear to us that he had telegraphic instructions from the Tashkend Soviet to “double-cross” us.’ (45) [+]

‘In the revolution his brother was barbarously murdered by a Jew commissar, and now he himself was in our service: officially described as “umptieth Tiflis Grenadiers, attached Guides.”’ (46) [+]

‘The real seat of trouble at this time was at Petrograd. There the German agents swarmed. One could hear them talk at the street-corners, in every assembly, and in every committee. By this time they were quite brazen in their statements. The most radical of these agents were Russian Jews who had returned from America.’ (47) [+]

‘I was in the hands of two sailors, a soldier and the Jewish chief agents of the Extraordinary Committee to Combat the Counter-Revolution, which is the Bolshevik’s chief weapon for

maintaining and spreading the Red Reign of Terror.’ (48) [+]

‘At the Foreign Office we met a Jew named Contorovitch, who spoke English fluently. He furnished me with rooms at the Foreign Office Guest House at No. 10 Mala Haritonofskaya, which formerly was the home of a wealthy German merchant.’ (49) [+]

‘In arranging for my passport to be vised for England I came into close contact with one Rosenberg, a Jew, who had spent several years in London as a master tailor in an East End sweatshop. In 1917 he was secretary to Raymond Robins of the American Red Cross in Petrograd. When I arrived in Moscow he was in charge of the Western Section of the Foreign Office, and as the agent of the Vetchika had the handling of all foreigners in Russia.’ (50) [+]

References for Part III

(30) Donald Thompson, 1918, *‘Donald Thompson in Russia’*, 1st Edition, The Century Co.: New York, pp. 123-124.

(31) Ibid., pp. 166-167. The mention of the rumour that the jews were in league with the Germans should not be taken literally, but rather as the idea that the jews were natural traitors and would look to anyone or anything who could better their personal and/or collective situation (i.e. hence *‘in league with the Germans’* who were then, or rather had been until recently, *‘the enemy’*).

(32) Ibid. p. 282. I have marked this source as potentially problematic, because Thompson is telling us about his knowledge of the front, but does not tell us how he knew these things or how he could tell that *‘thousands of jews were in uniform’*. This is likely second-hand information that Thompson is passing along as first-hand information (and also applies to his assertion about the percentage of jews in the *‘Death Squads’*).

(33) Princess Cantacuzene, 1919, *‘Revolutionary Days: Recollections of Romanoffs and Bolsheviki 1914-1917’*, 1st Edition, Small, Maynard & Company: Boston, p. 358

(34) Princess Evelyn Bluecher, 1920, *‘An English Wife in Berlin: A Private Memoir of Events, Politics, and Daily Life in Germany Throughout the War and the Social Revolution of 1918’*, 1st Edition, Constable: London, p. 246. I have marked this as potentially unreliable as Bluecher seems to be merely reporting what she had heard rather than what she has observed herself to be true.

(35) Elizabeth Dilling, 1936, *‘The Roosevelt Red Record And Its Background’*, 1st Edition, Self-Published: Chicago, p. 8. It is worth noting that Sidney Hillman who is mentioned by Dilling in the quotation was also jewish and a prominent *‘labour activist’* in the United States. One should also note that when Dilling wrote *‘The Roosevelt Red Record And Its Background’* she was overtly sympathetic to jews and had in fact destroyed a prominent anti-Communist organisation, the Paul Reveres of Colonel Edwin Hadley, because she regarded its founder, Hadley, as an anti-Semite (which is debateable, but he certainly had a marked aversion to jews and was an adherent [possibly indirectly] of the Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion having either read Henry Ford’s *‘The International Jew’* or L. Fry’s *‘Waters Flowing Eastwards’*, which put forth the theories he uses in some of his somewhat obscure pamphlets) and could not work with him, because of it. That she changed her views later and published anti-Semitic work in the 1950s and 1960s is irrelevant to her value as a secondary source.

(36) Ibid., p. 41. When Dilling speaks of the A. F. of L. she means the American Federation of

Labor.

(37) Ibid., p. 79. Rabbi Stephen S. Wise was a very prominent Zionist Reform rabbi in the United States and among his many claims to fame is the fact that he co-founded the NAACP (National Association for the Advancement of Colored People). For more information about Wise and his views see his autobiography Stephen Wise, 1949, *'Challenging Years: The Autobiography of Stephen Wise'*, 1st Edition, G. P. Putnam's Sons: New York, which is rather revealing. It also contains some useful quotations and illuminating comments.

(38) Ibid., p. 156. We should note that the source for the 500,000 jews (given on pp. 158-159 of the same work) is the 1917-1918 *'Jewish Communal Register'*, pp. 1447-1454, and her assertion about the 300,000 jews supporting La Follette and Wheeler is sourced from the *'New York Times'* of the 22nd of July 1924, which is stated on p. 98 of the same work. We should incidentally remind ourselves that Hillman and Dubinsky were both jewish. It is also worth noting that later on pp. 156-161 Dilling describes jewish anti-Communists and her support of them as well as an odd conspiracy theory about communist jews deliberately encouraging anti-Semitism (so nobody can reasonably accuse her of anti-Semitism at this point in her career).

(39) Ibid., p. 160. Dilling here is using as her source Hamilton Fish's findings in House Report 2290 in 1930.

(40) Ibid., p. 161. I have marked this quotation as potentially problematic because the KPD, to which we may presume Dilling is alluding, was not predominately Jewish: although many of those involved in its founding were. For an overtly sympathetic version of these events, which adequately covers the numerous jews involved in the marxist risings and the foundation of the KPD, please see Chris Harman's, 1997, [1982], *'The Lost Revolution: Germany 1918-23'*, 2nd Edition, Bookmarks: London.

(41) Ibid., p. 162

(42) Ibid., p. 307. The source that Dilling is citing is the *'Advisor'* for the 27th of May 1936.

(43) Joseph Mereto, 1920, *'The Red Conspiracy'*, 1st Edition, The National Historical Society: New York, p. 379

(44) John Spargo, 1919, *'Bolshevism: The Enemy of Political and Industrial Democracy'*, 1st Edition, Harper & Brothers: New York, pp. 311-312

(45) L. Blacker, 1922, *'On Secret Patrol in High Asia'*, 1st Edition, John Murray: London, pp. 34-35

(46) Ibid., pp. 221-222. I have marked this quotation as potentially unreliable, because it is not explained how Blacker or Abdulla Shah (the man whose brother had been murdered) knew that the commissar was a jew and with the *'White'* propaganda asserting that nearly all commissars were jews at this time: it would be normal for both Blacker and Shah to label the commissar a jew without knowing whether he (or she) was or not.

(47) Florence MacLeod Harper, 1918, *'Runaway Russia'*, 1st Edition, The Century Co.: New York, p. 223. It should be noted that when MacLeod Harper talks of *'German agents'* she is simply referring to the Germans as *'the enemy'* on the logic that anybody who worked against Imperial Russia was therefore pro-German.

(48) Charles Edward Russell, 1919, *'Bolshevism and the United States'*, 1st Edition, The Bobbs-Merrill Company: Indianapolis, p. 266

(49) Arno Dosch-Fleurot, Hector Boon, 1921, *'How Much Bolshevism Is There in America?/Russia from the Inside'*, 1st Edition, Press Publishing Co. (New York World): New York, p. 33

(50) Ibid., p. 34

Sources on Jews and Communism (Part IV)

Monday, 26 April 2010

Part IV

'As the Bolsheviks also believed in violence, the Bolsheviks and Maximalists formed an alliance. It is known that many of the old Terrorists were Jews, clever unscrupulous men who made a profession of this business. They were now in power in the Petrograd Soviet or Council, bearing Russian names.' (51) [-]

'On the second day the bank staff again appeared outside the premises, and after discussing the situation left for home. This took place day after day without intermission, whilst there suddenly appeared a Jewish commissar with several assistants, who announced himself to be in charge of the bank, and spent several hours each day in the manager's cabinet. This individual was, however, quite inaccessible, unless the guards were at the moment surrounded by a crowd and in such a heated argument with a number of outsiders as to fail to notice your entry by stealth.' (52) [+/-]

'To the position of textile president was appointed a workman who was known to be a former textile worker, his first secretary and most of the staff were Jews. Similar conditions prevailed in other departments.' (53) [+]

'When it is remembered that the people mainly responsible for all poor Russia has suffered are for the most part Jews with changed names it is perhaps hardly surprising that the greatest pacifist has in those parts become fiercely vengeful against those morally responsible for all his trouble, and without whose intellectual powers the whole show would have long since collapsed.' (54) [+/-]

'In autumn, 1946, Archbishop Stepinac was arrested and placed on trial. He was accused of treachery committed in the war by collaboration with the Germans and the Quisling Croatian government of Pavelic and of approving the cruelties of the Ustase against the civilian population. His defense was as bold and courageous as his preaching. He did not shrink before the threats. The court which was presided over by a young Communist judge, whose Jewish mother Stepinac has personally saved from the Nazi fury, condemned him to sixteen years of hard labor in prison.' (55)

'Among other deeds of the NKVD during this initial period of the war was the execution of two Polish-Jewish leaders, Henryk Erlich and Victor Alter. Erlich served on the Warsaw City Council and edited a Polish-Jewish newspaper; he and Alter, a writer, were also leaders of the General Jewish Workers Union in Poland. Although Socialist-orientated rather than Communist, Erlich and Alter had been advocating that Poland and the West collaborate with the Soviet Union in foreign affairs in view of the Nazi danger.' (56)

'The atheist movement has become a mass movement even beyond the confines of the Soviet Union. A number of facts go to prove that this movement is gaining ground also in other countries. A growth in the antireligious movement is observed particularly among the great masses of working class Jews in Poland, Latvia, Lithuania, Belgium, England, America, Germany and other countries. In Warsaw, for example, on the Jewish New Year's Day, 15 mass demonstrations were held, which were dispersed by the police.' (57)

'On January 15, 1936, Mikhail N. Tukhachevsky, Marshall of the Soviet Union and Assistant People's Commissar of Defense, presented the following report to the Central Executive Committee of the U. S. S. R. Eighteen months later, he was shot, along with seven other leading Russian generals, for alleged conspiracy with the Nazis. The absurdity of this charge may be partially judged from the fact that 2 of the 8 generals were Jews.' (58)

'While the following petition declared that not a single Jew would die without vengeance being taken upon the Nazis, it carefully neglected to state in whose behalf this vengeance would be wreaked. In a study made for the American Jewish Committee, Solomon Schwarz shows how the Soviet Government not only did not encourage Jews to flee before the advancing Nazi armies, but actually prevented more than a third of them from escaping to the "security" of Siberia and central Asia. Neither did it make any serious effort to counteract the flood of anti-Semite propaganda which the Nazis poured into the occupied territory of the U. S. S. R.

Schwarz further establishes the fact that claims made on behalf of the August 24, 1941, Moscow Conference were unfounded. Once the Soviet-controlled Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee has been milked dry for the benefit of the Great Russians, it was completely suppressed. According to Igor Gouzenko, the Soviet code clerk who defected to the Canadian Government on September 5, 1945 (this section, exhibit No. 46), secret directives issued in Moscow had ordered the removal of Jews from influential positions in the Soviet Union at the very same time that foreign Jews were being exploited as expendable espionage agents.' (59)

'Also according to statements made to me by Tim Shay, his relationship toward the end of my stay here in Detroit, with the Communist Party became a little strained. It seemed that an argument developed between Tim Shay and several members, functionaries of district 7 of the Communist Party, U.S.A., State of Michigan. Shay contended that the Jewish people were taking over the top-level jobs in the national and State organizations, and at a local level, too. He felt that the Jewish people were attempting to use the Communist Party as a political party for their own interests, and he had gone to the district and had quite an argument with Helen Allison. She threatened to have him cited for anti-Semitism and expelled from the party.

Of course, Shay backed down and from then on, he was dissatisfied, and there was quite an amount of rumbling.

Milton Freeman, F-r-e-e-m-a-n, was a member of the Midtown Club of the Communist Party, and his address at that time was 531 Illinois Street, Detroit, Mich.

Milton Freeman, F-r-e-e-m-a-n, was a member of the Midtown Club of the Communist Party, was the husband of Sis Cunningham, and during his stay here in Detroit was employed by the

Detroit Times as a reporter.

Carmelia Fordham was press director of the East Side Council of district 7, Communist Party, State of Michigan.

Harry Glassgold was a member of the Midtown Club of the Communist Party, district 7, and also –’ (60) [#]

‘I was then president of the Jewish Peoples Fraternal Order and was very glad to take that opportunity to speak on that question because anti-Semitism was a crime against the state in the Soviet Union, and I felt that the Jewish people had been treated extraordinarily well in the Soviet Union, and so I was very glad of the opportunity to express that point of view.’ (61) [+J]

‘The centre decided to send a delegation to make this proposal to Soviet military command now advancing rapidly eastward; and it prudently invited the leaders of the Irkutsk Bolsheviks, Krasnoshchekov, to accompany the delegation. Krasnoshchekov, who was of Russian Jewish birth, had spent many years in Chicago and returned to Siberia after the February revolution.’ (62)

‘Krasnoshchekov, laying down his diplomatic role, became prime minister and minister for foreign affairs in the Far Eastern Government. One of his associates was “Bill” Shatov, a well-known American revolutionary leader, also of Russian Jewish birth.’ (63)

‘It is indeed not certain that, when lists of members of “national” governments are produced showing a majority of Russian names, the bearers of those names were necessarily Russians; Russian names, and names with Russian forms, were current among many of the non-Russian nationalities. But there are authenticated cases such as the appointment of Dimanshtein, the Jewish member of the collegium of Narkomnats, as a member of the first Kazakh military-revolutionary committee, and of Vainshtein, one of the leaders of the Jewish Bund, as first president of the TsIK of the Bashkir Autonomous SSR; and these were certainly not isolated instances in the earlier years, when frequent transfers of party workers from one field to another were common practice.’ (64)

‘The very utmost that can be said is that the Jews are found among the prominent men of the Soviet Republic to an extent greater than the proportion they bear to the entire population.’ (65) [+]

‘There is a sort of Jacobin court which meets in a street whose name is now infamous to the ears of Russians – the Garochovaia, or Street of Peas. The chief judge is an obese Jewess with oiled locks who lolls on a seat while all around her press her crew of Soviet delegates, largely consisting of more or less self-designated members. This court is called “the extraordinary committee fighting the counter revolution, speculation and sabotage.”’ (66) [-]

‘J. Vostron, organizer of the Jewish Carpenters’ Union, later a Bolshevik organizer in Moscow.’ (67)

'On Nov. 15, 1917, at Cooper Union, New York, Elmer Ronseberg, a Socialist Assemblyman elect, at a celebration of the Jewish Socialist Federation, prophesied a revolution in America.' (68)

'Here the first person we met was a young Jew from America, one of the followers of Emma Goldman, who was deported with her on the "Burford." He had little sympathy for Marxism in any shape or form, but offered no alternative policy to suit Russian conditions.' (69) [+]

'Jews in Russia are now not at any rate subject to the persecutions of former days, and possibly on account of their big share in the inception of the Bolshevik movement a great many Jews are in control of Russia.' (70) [+]

References for Part IV

(51) E. P. Stebbing, 1918, *'From Czar to Bolshevik'*, 1st Edition, John Lane: London, p. 26. I have marked this quotation as potentially unreliable, because it seems to reference the *'Commissar Lists'*, which were widely believed at the time the work was written and published, but which have subsequently been debunked by scholars as being without value.

(52) W. Daniel, n.d., *'Russia: 1918: Bolshevism in Practice'*, 1st Edition, Self-Published: Stockport, p. 11. I have indicated that this quotation is essentially problematic, because Daniel doesn't explain how he know the commissar was a jew and with the claims about all commissars being jewish that were widely circulated and believed at this time it is likely that Daniel simply assumed the commissar was jewish because he was a commissar rather than because he knew it to be the case.

(53) Ibid., p. 22

(54) Ibid., p. 54. I have marked this quotation as potentially unreliable, because it seems to reference the *'Commissar Lists'*, which were widely believed at the time the work was written and published, but which have subsequently been debunked by scholars as being without value.

(55) Josef Korbel, 1951, *'Tito's Communism'*, 1st Edition, University of Denver Press: Denver, p. 157

(56) House Committee on Un-American Activities, 1960, *'Facts on Communism: The Soviet Union from Lenin to Khrushchev'*, Vol. II, 1st Edition, US Government Printing Office: Washington D.C., p. 221

(57) House Committee on Un-American Activities, 1956, *'The Communist Conspiracy: Strategy and Tactics of World Communism'*, Part I, Section B, 1st Edition, US Government Printing Office: Washington D.C., pp. 277-278

(58) Ibid., pp. 317-318

(59) Ibid., p. 433

(60) House Committee on Un-American Activities, 1952, *'Communism in the Detroit Area – Part I: Hearings before the Committee on Un-American Activities House of Representatives Eighty-Second Congress Second Session'*, 1st Edition, US Government Printing Office: Washington D.C., pp. 2741-2742. The reference to three individuals and their association with the CPUSA in the Detroit area is possibly meant to refer to all three as jews: hence its inclusion in the quotation.

(61) Senate Committee on the Judiciary, 1955, *'Strategy and Tactics of World Communism: The Significance of the Matusow Case: Hearing before the Subcommittee to Investigate the*

Administration of the Internal Security Act and other Internal Security Laws of the Committee of the Judiciary of the United States Senate Eighty-Fourth Congress First Session pursuant to Senate Resolution 58, Part 5, 1st Edition, US Government Printing Office: Washington D.C., p. 568

(62) Edward Hallett Carr, 1950, *'A History of Soviet Russia: The Bolshevik Revolution 1917-1923'*, Vol. 1, 1st Edition, MacMillan: New York, p. 355

(63) Ibid., p. 356

(64) Ibid., p. 376

(65) William Goode, 1920, *'Bolshevism at Work'*, 1st Edition, Harcourt, Brace and Howe: New York, p. 122

(66) William Hornaday, 1919, *'The Lying Lure of Bolshevism'*, 1st Edition, American Defense Society: New York, p. 13. This quotation has been marked as potentially unreliable since it seems to have been written in Warsaw and seems to be almost comic in nature, but we would be remiss if we did not include it as it is a valid, if unreliable, source and commentary on the situation in Petrograd.

(67) Ibid., p. 16

(68) Ibid., p. 23

(69) John Clarke, 1921, *'Pen Pictures of Russia Under the "Red Terror": Reminiscences of a surreptitious journey to Russia to attend the Second Congress of the Third International'*, 1st Edition, National Workers' Committees: Glasgow, p. 162. It should be noted that Emma Goldman, the anarchist thinker and ideologue, was herself jewish.

(70) Cecil Malone, 1920, *'The Russian Republic'*, 1st Edition, Harcourt, Brace and Howe: New York, pp. 65-66. Malone was a sitting Member of Parliament and held the military rank of colonel at the time he wrote these words.

Sources on Jews and Communism (Part V)

Monday, 26 April 2010

Part V

'The leader of the rising is one Ochel, who was before the war a marriage broker, during the war a deserter, and who has lately published in Holland a violent pamphlet of his own. A Russian Jewess called Feuerstein, who came to Dusseldorf in some capacity connected with the Bolshevik news agency in Germany, is believed to provide a link with Petrograd.' (71)

'The names of the "Red Five" of Canada are R. T. Jones, of Winnipeg; W. A. Pritchard, of Vancouver; Joseph Knight, of Edmonton; V. R. Midgley, of Vancouver; and Joseph Maylor, of Cumberland. Most of them had been opponents to conscription. Warrants have been issued in June for the arrest, besides the first two, of Sam Blumenberg and B. Drivatkin, while the four aliens charged in July for sedition were Blumenberg, Kharitonov, Almazov and Schoppeltrel. The last five names are evidently Russian and Jewish. Inspector Guthrie, of the Toronto detective force, stated (end of May) that there were three Bolshevik societies in the city which were working secretly to encourage and maintain the industrial unrest. Of these the membership was 90 per cent foreign and 75 per cent Russian. They were careful not to appear on strike

committees, but were busy sowing the seeds of revolution. There were, undoubtedly, similar organizations at Vancouver, Victoria, and Winnipeg.' (72) [-]

'The fact is that there were by far more than 450 Russian (Jewish) refugees who left America for Russia after the beginning of the Russian Revolution, to play a very important part in the development of Bolshevism in Russia. This fact explains many things which happened since. To make clear the part of American propagandists in Russia I may quote some testimonies of the American eye-witnesses given before the Senate Sub-committee. Here is the testimony of Mr. R. B. Dennis, a teacher in North-Western University, who had worked in Russia from November 1917 to September 1918, first for the American Y.M.C.A., and since April in the Consular Service. He had been all over Russia, in Rostov, Kharkoff, Moscow, Nijni Novgorod, and Petrograd. This is what he says:

... A thing that interested me very much was to discover a number of men in positions of power, Commissaries in the cities here and there in Russia, who had lived in America... in the industrial centres. I met a number of them, and I sat around and listened to attacks upon America that I would not take from any man in this country.

Senator Wolcott: In the main, of what nationality were they?

Mr. Dennis: Russian Hebrews. The men that I met there had lived in America, according to their stories, anywhere from three to twelve years...

Senator Overman: Are these people over there, who have lived in the United States, taking part in the Bolshevik movement?

Mr. Dennis: This is the thing that, in my opinion, backed up by opinions of other Americans, Englishmen, and Frenchmen with whom I talked when we got into Moscow, and were waiting there three weeks before we got out, and comparing notes, seems more interesting than the fact that they are there in positions of power; that these men were the most bitter and implacable men in Russia on the programme of the extermination, if necessary, of the bourgeois class. I never met a more implacable individual than a man that they called the War Commissary in Nijni-Novgorod; he has been in this country a number of years. Our general in Moscow was, that anywhere from 20 to 25 per cent of Commissaries in Soviet Russia had lived in America.

Senator Overman: Do you know any of them that have been naturalized in this country?

Mr. Dennis: No... I asked two, I recall, and they said they had not... One man, when I bade him good-bye, said: "Good-bye, I will see you in about ten years. We are coming over to America to pull off this same show."

The same impressions are given by a man of a very different set of opinions, Mr. Raymond Robins, the head of the American Red Cross Mission in Russia, who functioned as unofficial representative of the American Ambassador, David K. Francis, with the Soviet Government. Says Mr. Robins:

There was another fact of importance. There returned to Russia, immediately at the beginning of the Revolution, great numbers of Russians from America, immigrants, both Gentile and Jew... They represented genuine honest men who had met America at America's worst... then came back to Russia and spoke... [they] interpreted America as the capitalist's heaven and the workman's hell. That was perfectly false, but it carried influence, because those men spoke the language, and they came back with that interpretation; and man after man, when I was fighting against the rise of Bolshevism, said: "We do not care for your democracy; we do not want political democracy; we are going to have a real economic Revolution. We did not depose our Tsar to get twenty Tsars; we are not going to a Tsar of oil, a Tsar of coal, a Tsar of the railroads." ... To this group (of honest men) were added the agitators who were the paid agents of Germany or doctrinaire Socialists of the destructive groups, such as the I.W.W.

It is now known that it was Colonel Raymond Robins who, through his private secretary, one of these Russian Jews from America, Mr. Alexander Gumberg, got possession of the documents serving to reveal the German pecuniary connections with the Bolsheviks, both before and after the Russian Revolution. Mr. Gumberg's antecedents are particularly interesting. To my knowledge (I have the following from a Russian witness closely connected with Mr. Gumberg), Mr. Gumberg had lived in New York for about fifteen years, and he contributed to the New World (Trotsky's newspaper). His brother, known under the name of the Commissary Zorin; lived in the same room with Trotsky during his stay in New York, a year before the Revolution of 1917. This also explains the good relations between Mr. Robins and the Bolshevik authorities. Mr. Francis, in his testimony, wondered what Colonel Robins meant by saying: "I have the goods on my person," while leaving Russia via Vladivostok. My informant helped me to solve the riddle: it was platinum brought from the Bolsheviks through the intermediary of Alexander Gumberg. Intimate relations of Colonel Robins with that group of the Bolsheviks are also proven by the fact that Radek, Trotsky, and his lady secretary, saw the Americans off in Moscow, and Radek said he hoped that the "materials" given to them, and filling up quite a railway carriage, would reach their destination, and that "soon they will accomplish the American revolution."'
(73)

'Alexander Gumberg, Robins' secretary, performed in Moscow the functions of the chief censor of telegrams despatched by foreign journalists to America, England, and France. No telegram passed without being controlled by Gumberg. After his return to America, Gumberg was appointed president and chief manager of the Russian Telegraphic Agency (Rosta) in New York. On December 23, 1917, a decree appropriated 2,000,000 roubles for the needs of the revolutionary international movement and for the purpose of carrying on the work of the Soviet Governments in other countries besides Russia. The bureau of international revolutionary propaganda was attached to the Commissary for Foreign Affairs, and another Russo-American Jew, Mr. Reinstein, was appointed as its head, under Radek.' (74)

'It is only natural that in a country like the pre-revolutionary Russia a large percentage of such men should be found among the Jewish population, and there is no doubt that Jews to a very large extent control and provide the working machinery of the Bolshevik party. Of the twelve leading Bolshevik commissars eight are Jews, and there is a certain significance in the fact that they have seen fit to retain even to-day the Russian pseudonyms which they had formerly adopted as a measure of protection from the police. Amongst the smaller officials of the

Bolshevik commissariats the percentage of Jews is probably even higher. To avoid any misinterpretation it should be pointed out that there is also a high percentage of Jews both in the Menshevik and social-revolutionary parties and also in the Cadet party, while it is interesting to note that the assassination of Count Mirbach and the Bolshevik commissar Uritsky and the attempt of Lenin's life were in each instance carried out by anti-Bolshevik Jewish Socialists.' (75) [-]

'Trotsky heard my answer, "to repair some machine in a Russian factory," the permit was signed and I was again conducted by the two Guards back to the waiting-room and a pass handed me without which it would have been impossible for me to leave the building. I may add that this permit was not considered sufficient by the lady of Jewish extraction who presided at that time over the Petrograd evacuation committee at the Marine Palace, and I was compelled after all to get another permit signed by the Commissar for foreign affairs before I received the final permit which enabled me to take my place in the queue waiting to buy railway tickets.' (76) [+]

'So it was at the beginning of our century that "Red ruin and the breaking up of laws" was well on its way sweeping out what little belief many talented "after Christians" still cherished in the supernatural life, who together with atheist Jews – God save the mark! – and a few renegade Catholics formed a force that had already become a powerful factor, here, too, in America in opposition to those right principles and sound institutions that are our proud inheritance as a free people.' (77) [J]

'The Arbeiter Ring (Workmen's Circle) a Jewish fraternal, beneficial propaganda society, having some 600 branches with over 71,000 members, mostly in and around New York City, has been foremost in organizing Socialist Sunday Schools. These schools are established in many cities in our country and they are now being chartered by the Yipsels.' (78) [J]

'August 7. – I called at temporary prison and saw Greenep, Whishaw, and Jerram. They are well treated by their guards who are real Russians, unlike most of their leaders, who are either fanatics or Jewish adventurers like Trotsky or Radek.' (79) [+]

'Sir, - On 30th August I left for Moscow, largely in connection with negotiations for evacuation of British subjects from Russia. The same day Uritski Commissary at Petrograd, for combating counter-revolution, was assassinated by a Jewish student Kanegiesser, whose father is a wealthy engineer and holds a very good position at Petrograd.' (80) [+]

'The Extraordinary Commission of Petrograd had on the orders of the day of one of their sittings the question of the application of torture. It is common knowledge that the unfortunate Jewish student who killed Britozsky was tortured three or four times before his execution.' (81) [+]

'The Bolsheviks can no longer be described as a political party holding extreme communistic view. They form relatively small privileged class which is able to terrorise the rest of the population because it has a monopoly both of arms and of food supplies. This class consists chiefly of workmen and soldiers, and included a large non-Russian element, such as Letts and

Esthonians and Jews; the latter are especially numerous in higher posts. Members of this class are allowed complete licence, and commit crime against other sections of society.’ (82) [+]

‘Following from consul at Ekaterinburg, 6th February: -

“From examination of several labourer and peasant witnesses I have evidence to the effect that very smallest percentage of this district were pro-Bolshevik, majority of labourers sympathising with summoning of Constituent Assembly. Witnesses further stated that Bolshevik leaders did not represent Russian working classes, most of them being Jews.’ (83) [+]

‘I have been for ten years in Russia, and have been in Petrograd though the whole of the revolution.

I spent six weeks in the Fortress of Peter and Paul, acted as chaplain to His Majesty’s submarines in the Baltic for four years, and was in contact with the 9th (Russian) Army in Romania during the autumn of 1917 whilst visiting British Missions and hospitals, and had ample opportunity of studying Bolshevik methods.

It originated in German propaganda, and was, and is being, carried out by international Jews.’ (84) [+]

‘So effective is the Terror that no one dares to engage in anti-Bolshevik propaganda. People have been arrested for a simple telephonic conversation, in which the terms seemed ambiguous or could be interpreted as adverse to the Bolsheviks. An arrest is the prelude to every kind of corruption; the rich have to pay huge exactions to intermediaries, who are usually Jews, before they can obtain their release.’ (85) [+]

‘At the Putilov Works anti-Semitism is growing, probably because the food supply committees are entirely in the hands of Jews and voices can be heard sometimes calling for a “pogrom.”’ (86) [+]

‘Bolshevism is non-national and non-democratic. It is non-national; in April of 1918 Lenine’s and Trotsky’s government included 384 men, represented by two negroes, thirteen Russians, fifteen Chinamen, twenty-two Armenians and Georgians, sixty Russian Jews, and two hundred and sixty-four apostate Jews who had come to Russia from the United States and who belong to Trotsky’s group organized in New York.’ (87) [-]

‘Trotsky and Lenine placed their friends over the various administrative provinces of Russia. One apostate Jew was made tax collector, another made sheriff, to arrest any one who attacked the tax collector; a third was appointed judge, to clear the tax collector, and a fourth was made military governor, to use the Red soldiers to protect the tax collector.’ (88) [-]

‘In some instances the Bolsheviks instigated the peasants to massacre hundreds of innocent people in adjacent villages and towns. They did not stop, or even protest against, the most savage anti-Jewish pogroms.’ (89)

'In inventing the most refined methods of torturing the victim, Dzerjinsky's imagination has no limits. It is probably only his companion, the Jewess Braude of the Moscow Cheka, who can compete with him in these fields.' (90)

References for Part V

(71) Paul Miliukov, 1920, *'Bolshevism: An International Danger'*, 1st Edition, George Allen & Unwin: London, p. 140. It should be noted that Miliukov is here quoting H. E. Bailey in the *'Daily Telegraph'* for January the 13th 1919. He also notes that Feuerstein is also mentioned as a jewish Bolshevik agent by M. W. Nevinston in the *'Daily News'* for January the 13th 1919. These stories are of the same event and differ slightly in their specifics, but both agree that Feuerstein was a jewess and that she was a Bolshevik agent.

(72) Ibid., p. 265. I have marked this quote as potentially unreliable because it relies on Miliukov's assumption of what a jewish name is and as names are not a good indicator, generally-speaking, of whether someone is jewish or not we must own that Miliukov's assertion must be treated very cautiously.

(73) Ibid., pp. 272-276

(74) Ibid, p. 279

(75) Anon., 1919, *'Bolshevik Aims and Ideals and Russia's Revolt against Bolshevism'*, 1st Edition, MacMillan: New York, p. 16. I have marked this quotation as potentially unreliable, because it seems to reference the *'Commissar Lists'*, which were widely believed at the time the work was written and published, but which subsequently have been debunked by scholars as being without value.

(76) H. V. Keeling, 1919, *'Bolshevism: Mr. Keeling's Five Years in Russia'*, 1st Edition, Hodder and Stoughton: New York, p. 150. I have marked this quotation as potentially unreliable given that Keeling does not tell us how he knew that the lady in question was of jewish extraction.

(77) David Goldstein, Martha Moore Avery, 1919, *'Bolshevism: Its Cure'*, 1st Edition, Boston School of Political Economy: Boston, p. 19

(78) Ibid, p. 244

(79) HMSO, 1919, *'Collection of Reports on Bolshevism in Russia'*, 2nd Edition, His Majesty's Stationary Office: London, p. 2/Doc. 2. The author of this report was Sir E. Howard. I have marked this quotation as potentially unreliable, because it seems to reference the *'Commissar Lists'*, which were widely believed at the time the work was written and published, but which subsequently have been debunked by scholars as being without value.

(80) Ibid., p. 4/Doc. 5. The author of this report was Sir M. Findlay. It is worth noting that Uritsky was himself jewish.

(81) Ibid, p. 26/Doc. 12. The author of this report was a *'Mr. G'*. The name of the individual was censored by HMSO.

(82) Ibid, p. 33/Doc. 26. The author of this report was Mr. Alston. This document may or may not be referencing the *'Commissar Lists'*, but on balance I have decided to give it the benefit of the doubt.

(83) Ibid., p. 38/Doc. 33. The author of this report was Mr. Alston. This document may or may not be referencing the *'Commissar Lists'*, but on balance I have decided to give it the benefit of the doubt.

(84) Ibid., p. 67/Doc. 56. The author of this report was the Rev. B. S. Lombard. This document may or may not be referencing the *'Commissar Lists'*, but on balance I have decided to give it

the benefit of the doubt.

(85) Ibid., p. 79/Doc. 58. The author of this report was a 'Mr. B'. The name of the individual was censored by HMSO.

(86) Ibid., p. 83/Doc. 59. The author of this report was a 'Mr. B'. The name of the individual was censored by HMSO.

(87) Newell Dwight Hillis, 1920, *Rebuilding Europe in the Face of World-Wide Bolshevism: A Study of Repopulation*, 1st Edition, Fleming H. Revell: Chicago, p. 96. I have marked this quotation as unreliable, because it references the 'Commissar Lists', which were widely believed at the time the work was written and published, but which subsequently have been debunked by scholars as being without value.

(88) Ibid, pp. 190-191. I have marked this quotation as unreliable, because it references the 'Commissar Lists', which were widely believed at the time the work was written and published, but which subsequently have been debunked by scholars as being without value.

(89) John Spargo, 1920, *"The Greatest Failure in all History": A Critical Examination of the Actual Workings of Bolshevism in Russia*, 1st Edition, Harper & Brothers: New York, p. 103

(90) Boris Brasol, 1922, *The Balance Sheet of Sovietism*, 1st Edition, Duffield and Company: New York, p. 15

A Pleasant Surprise: John Beaty's 'The Iron Curtain over America'

Tuesday, 4 May 2010

John Beaty's *The Iron Curtain over America*, which was published in 1951 and which has been reissued in new editions at least five times and had been reprinted eleven times between 1951 and 1954 according to the undated 5th edition that I have acquired in PDF (hence the lack of a full reference), is unusual in English-language anti-Semitic literature and especially so in that genre after the conclusion of the Second World War. What makes it unusual is firstly the obvious erudition of the author, in that Beaty himself had acquired a PhD before the outbreak of said war and the amount of research that went into and is evident in *The Iron Curtain over America* is considerable. Most post-Second World War anti-Semitic treatises are largely unreferenced and obviously lack any serious research into their subject matter in that they make use of commonly known anti-Semitic charges and the evidence to support them without trying to innovate or check their case only contributing at maximum a few newspaper references or reproductions in an attempt to appeal to the contemporary reader.

Beaty is decidedly different throughout *The Iron Curtain over America*. I was surprised, and rather pleased, to find that Beaty had used excellent sources for his case in so far as he quotes standard works such as the Jewish Encyclopedias, authoritative books on everything from the history of Russia and the Ukraine to the Haskalah movement and he doesn't make any charges that he does not substantiate with some evidence. It is also of note that Beaty does not simply drag out old accusations, but rather creates a new thesis using parts of old evidence combined with new evidence. Whether we believe those charges nearly sixty years on is quite another matter, but Beaty has shown himself truly worthy of some attention because he bucks the trend for post-war English language anti-Semitic literature.

The key to Beaty's thesis is simple in that he believes and offers evidence for the theory that firstly the Ashkenazi jews are not really Semites at all, but rather descendents of the Khazar Khanate (what we generally call Kharazia) which in Beaty's opinion means that Zionism's case for the creation of Israel boiled down to a historical fabrication at best and an outright lie at worst. Secondly Beaty asserts, using Robert Wilton (as cited by Denis Fahey) and Nesta Webster [who may have also relied partly on Wilton and who certainly relied on sources similar to Wilton], that the Bolshevik revolution was almost entirely dominated by Ashkenazi jews and therefore can be considered a jewish revolution. Then Beaty moves onto the third part of his thesis and offers evidence, if at times somewhat thin, that Ashkenazi jews are heavily involved in working for the Soviet Union in the United States and are therefore a subversive threat to the United States and need to be dealt with accordingly where he concludes his thesis not taking it any further. Beaty also asserts, as an ancillary point, that US involvement in the Second World War was contrived and forced upon the country by Franklin D. Roosevelt and his cronies to support which he uses several published memories by senior members of Roosevelt's administration, such as those by James Forrestal, as well as several works by leading historians of the time such as Charles Beard and Harry Elmer Barnes.

When Beaty wrote *'The Iron Curtain over America'* the Khazar thesis was a somewhat esoteric idea among scholars of the jewish question and had been debated for many years in both the philo-Semitic and the anti-Semitic literature (at both the popular and academic levels). The Khazar thesis at the time that Beaty wrote was not a mainstay of anti-Semitic literature precisely (although it was part of the strongly Christian sub-genre), because it was viewed as rather irrelevant and it also suggested, in an age when intellectuals in general didn't ignore the direct implications of evolution on humanity, that the [Ashkenazi] jews were just a bunch of either Slavs, Turks or Tartars. The Khazar thesis began to gain popularity from the formation of Israel in 1948 to provide anti-Semites with a way of attacking the jewish right to colonise Palestine and change it from an Arab country to a jewish country.

In effect anti-Semites realised that the basis of all Zionist ideology was the link between their Semitic heritage and the territory of Palestine so in order to attack this anti-Semites began switching to the Khazaria thesis for the origins of the Ashkenazim. It should also be noted that since before the Second World War anti-Semites had begun to largely ignore the two other major parts of the jewish community: the Sephardim and the Mizrahim.

This habit of focusing, to the exclusion of other jewish groups, on the Ashkenazim is of uncertain origin (as no author I have read or heard of has commented on this particular point), but is very likely the result of the reports of the jewish origin of the Bolshevik revolution in Russia combined with the large emigration of Ashkenazim from the Russian Empire from 1881 to 1914, which placed the Ashkenazim both at the centre of a shocking event [communist revolution and the destruction of the old order as well as a challenge to Western destiny] and also as an alien and often subversive mass at home (i.e. the habit of jews of confining themselves in self-created ghettos as well as providing considerable numbers of communist and left-wing activists and supporters). This combined with the lack of Mizrahim in Europe and the highly assimilated nature of the Sephardim lead to the focus being distorted and wholly aimed at the Ashkenazim who, although the largest of the jewish groups, were only part of the problem.

Once this focus became established in anti-Semitic thought the path was laid for anti-Semites to be able to adopt the Khazaria thesis without compromising their logic or focus (since the Sephardim and Mizrahim are of uncontested Semitic origin) to attack Israel. It is quite probable that with the lucid presentation of the Khazaria thesis, the link with communism (at a time when strong anti-Communism was expected among the 'right wing' in general and there was a strong belief in the conspiratorial nature of communism) and the large circulation of *'The Iron Curtain over America'* that Beaty played a significant, perhaps key, part in spreading the Khazaria thesis among English-speaking anti-Semites. This is suggested by the fact that non-English language post Second World War anti-Semitic literature has far less of a focus on the Khazaria thesis and often doesn't mention it at all. Like English language anti-Semitic literature before the Second World War there is a sub-genre of Christian anti-Semitic literature where mentions are more frequent (i.e. because the Khazaria thesis can be used to attack the notion that the [Ashkenazi] jews are 'the Chosen people' of YHWH/Hashem). As I have encountered (or have heard of) no major anti-Semitic treatises, let alone popular ones, that were purporting the Khazaria thesis: I am forced to conclude that Beaty must have had a significant role in popularising this argument among anti-Semites particularly in relation to their arguments regarding the Ashkenazim and Israel.

The Khazar thesis continues to this day to be a standard anti-Semitic argument used particularly against the Ashkenazim and Israel, but unfortunately the Khazaria thesis for the origin of the Ashkenazim after a period of scholarly controversy from the 1960s to the 1980s has largely been discarded on the basis that genetic studies of Ashkenazim show little or no trace of potential Khazar genetic material, but rather a clear majority of Semitic genetic material (to the extent that some have asserted that the Ashkenazim are the genetic cousins of the Arabs of Palestine, which is a fairly logical position). This has all been neatly and ably summarised by the lay authority on the Khazars; Kevin Alan Brook, who concludes, in his authoritative summary work on Khazaria (1), that there is very little real evidence for this thesis beyond the original cause of its creation: i.e. scholarly conjecture concerning the historical documents, which the genetic evidence has discredited (as well as fresh scholarly analysis which has, persuasively, argued that the Khazar conversion to Judaism only affected the elite and that the population in general maintained their beliefs, which were largely pagan but Islam and Nestorian Christianity were also strongly represented). Brook states this in spite of his overt sympathy for the Khazaria thesis for the origin of the Ashkenazim and as any good scholar: he refuses to let his personal feelings get in the way of his scholarship (an all too common occurrence among the slums of academia).

Unfortunately modern anti-Semites in general are not as intellectually rigorous as Beaty was in his time, we after all cannot blame him for using the Khazaria thesis since it was a valid intellectual position that could be supported by the academic research of the time, and have not investigated what they purport as thoroughly as Beaty looked into his arguments before he made them. Had they done so then they would look to evolve their arguments in the face of the literature that had discredited the Khazaria thesis and sought instead to deal with the scholarly reality rather than try to use Arthur Koestler's *'The Thirteenth Tribe'* (which Brook often addresses in his *'The Jews of Khazaria'*) and the jew Benjamin Freedman's *'Facts are Facts'*, which is largely just a rehash of the Khazaria thesis that predates Beaty by four years but was not as popular or as mainstream [i.e. Freedman's work at this time was largely circulated around

Conde McGinley's '*Common Sense*' milieu of which he was a financial supporter as a so-called '*former jew*', as evidence. Freedman's work in particular relies not on the presentation of evidence, but rather on his habit of claiming that as a jew and '*insider in the jewish conspiracy*' he had a particular authority to comment on such matters (without evidence and often strangely [yes I am being sarcastic] rehashing and giving credence to old, often incorrect, anti-Semitic arguments against the Babylonian Talmud).

I am tempted to think that modern anti-Semites are just incredibly lazy and don't want to do serious research into the jewish question. As if they weren't lazy then they wouldn't still be producing the same old arguments with the same evidence as was innovated in some cases as long ago as the early 18th century [I am specifically thinking of the old anti-Babylonian Talmud arguments here, which were originally made by the learned Johann Andreas Eisenmenger in his '*Entdecktes Judenthum*' and then popularised over a century later by August Roehling in his '*Der Talmudjude*'!] However then I remember that even in earlier epochs when serious research was more common among anti-Semites: the majority of anti-Semitic works simply repeated old charges, particularly those deriving from Christianity, such as deicide [not that I am unsympathetic to the charge, but it isn't exactly a useful argument in this day and age], and did not innovate new ones. The ones that innovated were the ones we tend to remember and that receive prominence in the discussions of anti-Semitic literature that are so common today in academia: what do not receive prominence at those works that simply repeated old arguments that were so common in Germany and France in the 19th century. It therefore seems that anti-Semites throughout the ages rely on a relative few to do the research, while they bawl out their old arguments and a few new ones at the top of their lungs.

We have a similar issue when we come to the second part of Beaty's thesis in that much of his argument, although sourced, is dubious in the light of modern research. The '*jewish bolshevik*' lists of Wilton have been addressed by Semitic Controversies at an earlier date (2): hence there is a need to go back over them in detail with the exception of saying that prior to previous assertions Lenin does indeed appear to have been part jewish on his mother's side (his maternal grandfather to be precise). They are however completely unreliable as they bring together large amounts of individuals from different time periods between 1917-1921 without putting them in the context of their individual administration, invent ministries and individuals and misstate the activity, position and/or importance of many of the individuals that did in fact exist.

This doesn't stop these lists of being a normal anti-Semitic argument and being used as '*proof*' of the '*jewish nature*' of bolshevism. This rather obscures the intellectually valid that jews were significantly overrepresented in the both the Russian revolutions of 1917 and has allowed numerous jewish academics writing on the subject in detail or in passing to assert that jewish involvement was minimal, which has been put down rather generously by Erich Haberer to be a reaction to '*anti-Semitic demagoguery*' (3). Where-as on a personal level I would ascribe it in part to this, but more to the conscious need to reduce the role of the jews in such a controversial event to prevent harm from coming to the jewish academics themselves as well as the additional consideration of providing a way to promote their work as being '*anti-anti-Semitic*' (and hence being cited, lauded and purchased by those seeking to discredit the anti-Semitic arguments and evidence on this point).

Beaty here is simply repeating what had been argued for over thirty years before the publication of *'The Iron Curtain over America'* and was then still regarded as quite probably true given that the information was from eyewitnesses who had been there at the time (4) and the Soviet Union of Joseph Stalin wasn't exactly forthcoming about the role of jews in the Bolshevik revolution. It also worth noting that Beaty's book was published just before the beginning of the *'purge'* trials of 1952-53, which were directed towards *'rootless cosmopolitans'*, which included a significant proportion of communist jews. Therefore we cannot blame Beaty for giving credence to these assertions as the sources he cites were good quality at the time (as both Denis Fahey and Nesta Webster were amongst the minority of anti-Semitic authors who spent a considerable amount of time meticulously researching their work [and hence should be respected for doing so]), but their evidence has only been called into question and debunked in the decades after Beaty published *'The Iron Curtain over America'* in 1951.

Therefore although we can't fault Beaty for his assertion: we can fault those who would use Beaty or his sources, Fahey and Webster (both of whom are regularly read and cited by anti-Semites), as *'proof'* of the *'jewish bolshevik'* thesis. Perhaps it is easier to cite such lists than to have to sit down and read around the area and come up with a water-tight case? Whatever the reasons for their use: these lists should not be used in any way, shape or form to make an anti-Semitic argument: the result will only be to discredit anti-Semitism as an intellectually valid position and open yourself up to attack.

The third part of Beaty's thesis that large numbers of jews were involved in working for the Soviet Union against the United States is on far safer ground as we need only recall the espionage trials of the 1940s and 50s to realise that numerous jews did indeed work for the Soviet Union as spies in the United States. Names such as Judith Coplon, Morris and Lona Cohen, David and Ruth Greenglass, Harry Gold, George Koval, Morton and Helen Sobell, Julius and Ethel Rosenberg etc are not uncommon (and all of whom were jewish by-the-way), but we also note that this thesis is slightly overstated by Beaty in so far as yes a significant number of those spying for the Soviet Union in the United States were jews, but there were also numerous spies who were not jewish or had any connection to jews such as Alan Nunn May, Kim Philby, Guy Burgess, Donald McClean etc (all four of whom were British, but served the Soviet Union in part in the United States).

It is also undeniable that many non-jewish spies did have close contact with jews as for example Whittaker Chambers' wife, Esther Shemitz, was jewish and Klaus Fuchs' (who was German not jewish as often alleged) Soviet handler, Ruth Kuczynski, was also jewish. It is also worth noting that Kim Philby's first wife, Alice 'Litzi' Friedman, was jewish (as well as a Soviet agent), but she and Philby split up when Philby buried his past to allow himself to become part of British Intelligence although they didn't officially divorce till 1946 and were friends for years afterwards (hence why I have included Philby as not having any important connection with jews in regards to his espionage activities in the United States). However this does not concur wholly with Beaty's position that jews were necessarily a threat as Soviet spies since there were many prominent anti-Communist jews at this time of which Roy Cohn, the famous associate of Senator Joseph McCarthy and the probable cause of McCarthy's attack on the army and his ultimate downfall, and Isaac Don Levine (the editor of *'Plain Talk'*, which claimed among other dubious things that Karl Marx was an anti-Semite (5)) are perhaps the best known along with former

jewish communists turned strong anti-communists such as the previously mentioned Arthur Koestler.

In essence Beaty's argument is that because many of the communists who came to the United States from the 1880s to the 1940s were jewish: therefore we must see the jewish community as being a threat because it has provided a disproportionate amount of these recruits. This however is not cogent in so far as many of the spies were also of Russian or German origin, if one is determining origin by country of birth, and that therefore Beaty's pro-German hymn, which forms Chapter I of *'The Iron Curtain over America'*, is hypocritical for one could easily label many of Soviet agents as German and/or jewish. So should the United States have taken special action against the German-American or Russian-American community accordingly? The answer is of course no, but what is cogent about Beaty's thesis on this point is that it assumes that jews are biologically different to Europeans and therefore think differently.

Therefore Beaty implies that we cannot consider them to be of the same mental processes as say a German or a Russian (although Beaty believes, for unknown reasons, that the Rus and the Slavs were both Aryan peoples [the Rus are debateable, but the Slavs are agreed not to be by everyone but Slavs]). Beaty never goes into this in detail, but if he had done so then his thesis would have been far more cogent (if perhaps less popular) in so far as it would have offered a rationale as to why the jews should receive special attention from the intelligence and security services and for why the German or Russian communities should not receive the same. That said however one cannot tar the jews with all being communists or all communists being jews (as Nesta Webster herself rightly pointed out), but rather one can notice that a significantly disproportionate amount of Soviet agents were jewish and that communism, or rather marxism in general, was one of the two most important political movements inside the jewish community, along with Zionism and various points in-between, in both the United States and abroad. However Beaty did not argue this in detail so to go into it beyond what has been said would be beyond the scope of this discussion. It should not be said I am not sympathetic to this thesis, because I am, but I find it to be intellectually incorrect, which is why it requires criticism.

So although we can say that jews were significantly and disproportionately involved in sabotage and espionage for the Soviet Union: we cannot hold the equation that Beaty tries to make, i.e. of communism and bolshevism being jewish phenomena, as being valid. That said however we can reasonably argue that jews have historically formed a *'fifth column'* in their host society and that the significant and disproportionate amount of Soviet agents of jewish origin can be held to be an extension of this.

In summary then Beaty's *'The Iron Curtain over America'* is an excellent example of what anti-Semitic literature should be: it is well-researched and well thought out. It is written in a clear and concise style that makes it very readable and it doesn't sacrifice much content to maintain its flow. That is what anti-Semitic literature should be like and I can well imagine that in 1951, when it was first published, *'The Iron Curtain over America'* would have made very convincing reading and that is as it should be (this is indicated by the fact that it went through eleven printings in three years, which is without doubt close to a best seller). However in 2010 we cannot hold Beaty's thesis to be cogent any longer, because much of its facts and arguments have been discredited by scholarly research that Beaty himself could not have possibly predicted and

Beaty thesis itself is rather overstretched in terms of the evidence he presents to support. However when all is said and done: Beaty's *'The Iron Curtain over America'* is truly an admirable bit of work that we cannot help but admire the author, John Beaty, for producing and doing so well out of.

(1) Kevin Alan Brook, 2006, *'The Jews of Khazaria'*, 2nd Edition, Rowman & Littlefield: New York

(2) <http://semiticcontroversies.blogspot.com/2008/10/judeo-bolshevik-debacle.html>

(3) Erich Haberer, 2004, *'Jews and Revolution in Nineteenth Century Russia'*, 1st Edition, Cambridge University Press: New York, p. xi

(4) I have provided numerous quotations to this effect in my ongoing *'Sources on Jews and Communism'* series on Semitic Controversies.

(5) Zygmund Dobbs, 1949, *'Karl Marx: Father of Modern Anti-Semitism'* in Isaac Don Levine (Ed.), 1976, *'Plain Talk: An Anthology from the Leading Anti-Communist Magazine of the 40s'*, 1st Edition, Arlington House: New York, pp. 400-404

Why Say Anything At All?

Tuesday, 4 May 2010

A Few Strokes of the Pen about James von Brunn's 'Kill the Best Gentiles'

I recently wrote a short review of Mark Glenn's *'No Beauty in the Beast'*, which was in the tradition of what we may term the *'paranoid style'*. Another book which carries on in a similar vein, but without Glenn's crypto-Muslim semi-orgasmic love for Islam and a lot less diction is James von Brunn's *'Kill the Best Gentiles'*.

James von Brunn, as you may know, is the veritable moron who decided it would be a good idea to go down to a 'holocaust' museum with a gun and shoot jews (in fact he only ended up wounding a negro security guard and giving a new piece of ammunition to the organisations he professed to be so avidly against such as the Anti-Defamation League). I agree with my wife's remarks that she made to me when she heard of his idiocy at the time: *'That man is an absolute fool. Anybody worth his salt knows that the jews don't visit their own temples.'*

She was as right then as now. You don't go around trying to kill jews if you are a sane anti-Semite. For heaven's sake you live in a society that is largely dominated by jews and their bastard offspring (although it is rather more complicated than that I am simplifying for the sake of space): the last thing any sane anti-Semite is going to do is to walk around giving the jews more ammunition by being so very stupid. However enough said about James von Brunn's general lack of forethought and manifest selfishness (for what else can you call it?).

The 'book', if one can call it that (it is a PDF but it comes across as a seriously disjointed attempt to write a pamphlet [I doubt it was ever published since I can't imagine anybody wanting to seriously read it for anything other than to analyze von Brunn's almost hallucinogenic state of mind]), is surprisingly pretentious and like Glenn cites all kinds of quotations before chapters. A

habit, which although occasionally followed in literary and intellectual circles today, has long since died out as being rather extraneous. I must confess that I have trouble believing that von Brunn has read all the books he professes to have done given that he cites things as diverse as the Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion, Marcus Eli Ravage's dubious two articles in *'Century'* magazine, an unauthenticated but widely reproduced Amschel Rothschild quote, the Talmud (he assumes there is one Talmud when there are in fact two. Despite the fact that he notes the Jerusalem Talmud exists: he doesn't seem to understand its importance in Judaism. He also seems unfamiliar with the Mishnah, which is the senior source of the halakhah to the Babylonian Talmud) [he also doesn't cite the Babylonian Talmud correctly or understand why simple quotation of incriminating passages is rather stupid] and the Bible among many others (often citing any credentials he knows of to lend a fallacy of authority to his quote-mining addiction).

'Kill the Best Gentiles' contains the entire Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion as chapter four for some reason. I don't know why von Brunn felt the itch to reprint the Protocols in his 'book' given that they have been reprinted dozens of times and have only recently been reissued in a new edition in English by the Historical Review Press of England with a new foreword defending them by the 'apostate' jew Israel Shamir. Why reprint something that can be read easily enough elsewhere and there are also numerous second hand editions floating about: so one wonders why bother? Well as filler for von Brunn to write a 'book': they are quite suitable, especially given the fact that von Brunn throughout comes off as about as sane as David Icke when he talks about the shape-shifting blood-drinking lizards that are trying to take over the world and tries to *'prove'* their existence.

In chapter one von Brunn tries to start off by using an intelligent argument, culled without citation from Revilo Oliver's work (which he developed while being prominent in the anti-Communist cause and later used extensively in his work on the Jewish question), that conspiracies have and will always be constant throughout history and therefore will always occur in modernity. This is correct. However what von Brunn does not say, that Oliver did discuss in some detail (for example in his *'Populism' and 'Elitism'* and *'The Enemy of our Enemies'*), is that conspiracies are very hard to prove both historically and currently since they are by nature largely secret. We can only guess at what conspiracies have existed and what conspiracies do exist. In our current time it is just as hard to prove the existence of a conspiracy and as the old saying goes: *'extraordinary claims require extraordinary evidence'*. Von Brunn doesn't trouble himself with such mere technical details as amassing and analyzing detailed evidence and instead rambles happily off into conspiratorial wonderland throughout the first chapter and all latter chapters in particular chapter four, which is titled the *'Illuminati'* (you can guess the rest).

He spends three chapters (eleven, twelve and thirteen) talking with a remarkable lack of research and knowledge on Marxism (as well as Karl Marx), Sigmund Freud (as well as Psycho-Analysis) and Franz Boas (as well as Cultural Anthropology), which ran together as I read them as one long shrill whine a-la Deborah Lipstadt in *'Denying History'* (Lipstadt remarkably managed more research than von Brunn and that is really saying something). Chapter five is a bad schoolboy attempt to prove the Ashkenazim are descended from Khazaria and aren't really Jews at all, which had been called into question and largely discarded as a viable thesis in the years before von Brunn wrote (Oliver wrote several times about the idiocy of the linguistic arguments related to the Old Testament that Khazaria advocates use [for example see Oliver's *'The Uses of*

Religion'], which von Brunn doesn't mention [I wonder why?]). Von Brunn seems to be of the opinion, for what reason I know not why, that the Ashkenazim are the '*bad jews*', while the Sephardim (whom he mentions in passing without noting that they are the other big segment of the Jewish community and are historically extremely important) and the Mizrahim (of whom he seems not to have heard) are simply ignored or are '*good jews*' (by implication).

Perhaps the most annoying thing in the 'book' has to be von Brunn's tiresome habits of capitalising the word: Jew and all other terms he thinks to be of import. This makes his writing, which is poor at best, next to impossible to read as he is forever capitalising things and disrupting the reader's rhythm and thought process.

All in all I can't bear the thought of even reading this 'book' again (I forced myself to do so, because I wanted to see what the proverbial village idiot had to say) and I really do suggest that everyone in the anti-Semitic world simply lets this 'book' and its moronic author die in the complete silence that it so richly deserves.

Sources on Jews and Communism (Part VI)

Wednesday, 12 May 2010

Part VI

'In the vicinity of New York City the Communist camps include a very high percentage of Jewish boys and girls. There is no Federal law prohibiting such camps teaching disloyalty and practically treason to thousands of healthy and bright young future Americans, and they are permitted to exist and continue to warp the minds of immature children whose parents have fled from countries where they were oppressed to a land of freedom and of equal opportunity.' (91)

'Harry Novick

A son of a rabbi and loud in self-defense of repeated accusations made because of his membership in the Communist Party. Harry is one of the most militant fellow-travellers we have. There is no definite tie to link him in actual membership in the party, but no doubt whatsoever as to his beliefs.

If not a member it may be mainly or solely because of the position his father occupies in the Jewish synagogues. Loud and arrogant, completely the tool of the Reds, Harry is both a formidable foe and a pitiful figure.

Harry was an executive board member of our local by virtue of his position as chief shop steward of the radio Bond Street section of the Bridgeport General Electric plant.

Harry has attended Communist meetings and has also invited and taken neighbors of his from Stratford to these meetings.' (92) [#]

'I seldom went to the school library, since my work requires little reference reading. But one day I wandered in and was confronted immediately with Paul Radin's "The Racial Myth." This book is treasonable and anti-Christian. It states in bald terms that there is to be a World Soviet State and that it is to be established by Americans, Jews and Russians.' (93)

'Mr. Scherer. Today the Communist Party is violently anti-Semitic, isn't it?

Dr. Dodd. Let me just put it this way, Congressman Scherer, to be fair, publicly they will say they are against it, but when the question arose, when the 10 or 12 doctors were arrested – what happened in the Daily Workers, the unit which gives the line out to the party people – the Daily Worker began using the same kind of lies which Fascist minded people might be using against the Jewish people. They kept saying, "Of course, there are Jews down in Wall Street, and therefore the doctors in the Soviet Union must be the same type of characters as those people."

In other words, they mouthed the same kind of anti-Semitism which we hear from people who are a real menace.' (94) [#]

'Captain Schneur seemed to have rendered so many services to the Bolsheviki that I could not help asking him how he came to be arrested.

"Jealousy and vengeance of a woman," he answered, and explained to me how the mistress of Comrade Krylenko, a Jewess named Mme. Rasmirovich, asked him for some "help" before he left Petrograd.

It seemed that Mme. Rasmirovich had obtained the right and exclusive privilege from Smolny to print The Soldiers' Pravda (the Bolshevik trench newspaper) and wanted to make her business proposition still more profitable by confiscating large quantities of printing paper in the offices of a big Petrograd newspaper. She wanted Captain Schneur to sign the order of requisition and furnish soldiers to commit the theft. He refused both. In her anger she vowed that he would pay heavily for his offence to her and she began to spread the report that he had been in correspondence with the Secret Police while he lived in Paris, and finally persuaded Comrade Krylenko to have him arrested and sent to the Fortress.' (95) [+]

'The Communist organization of the Soviet Government has proved to be only a dream which cannot be practically realized. Bolshevism in Russia is only a part of the revolutionary anarchy and can be divided into two periods: (a) that of the decay and destruction of the army, which I call the period of the German agents; (b) that of the Red Terror, which I call the period of the historical vengeance of the oppressed in general and of the Jews in particular.' (96) [+]

'Together with other released Party members, Dzerzhinsky arrived at the conference held by the Warsaw committee of the Social-Democratic Party in connection with the revolutionary fervour which continued to mount in view of the October strike which had spread throughout Russia. ("The ovation that greeted them can easily be imagined," wrote A. Krajewski.) Jakub Goldenberg, who was chairing the conference, immediately passed his functions over to Dzerzhinsky.' (97)

'Unfortunately there were still to be undergone the three or four years of civil war and famine, during which, at the hand of the contending armies, the bulk of the Jewish population suffered the worst excesses. All that can be said is that, on the whole, the White Armies were the most brutal, whilst the Red Army did its best to protect these poor victims, notwithstanding the fact that, for one or other reason, the majority of the Jews were, for some time, not sympathetic to the Bolshevik government. Its condemnation of profit-making trading, as of usury, bore harshly on the Jews of White Russia and the Ukraine, whose families had been for centuries excluded alike from agriculture and the professions, and confined to the towns of the Jewish Pale. In 1921 the New Economic Policy temporarily enabled many of them to resume their businesses; but by 1928 the all-pervading collectivist enterprises of the trusts and the cooperative societies, aided by penal taxation and harsh measures of police, had killed practically all the little profit-making ventures to which the Jewish families were specially addicted.' (98)

'For the economic rehabilitation of the Jews – apart from those whose education and ability enabled them to obtain official appointments or entrance to the brain-working professions – the main resource was placed upon the establishment of Jewish agricultural settlements, at first in Southern Ukraine and the Crimea, and latterly in the extensive territory allocated for this purpose at Biro-Bidjan on the Amour River, in Eastern Siberia. Largely by Government help with land and credit, assisted by a whole series of philanthropic associations promoted by Jews of the United States (notably the Jewish Distribution Committee), as well as those of the USSR in the great voluntary Jewish Colonisation Society (OZET), something like forty thousand Jewish families, comprising a hundred and fifty thousand persons, have within the past fifteen years, been added to the agricultural population of the Soviet Union, one fourth in Biro-Bidjan, which has already been made an "autonomous region", ranking as an oblast, and will become a "Jewish autonomous republic" as soon as it obtains sufficient population.

To all the aggregations of Jews, although not recognised as a nation, the Soviet Government concedes the same measure and kind of cultural autonomy as it accords to the national minorities so called.' (99)

'Mr. Tavenner. What kind of a meeting was it?

Mr. Sampler. It was a Communist meeting, but whether it was under a committee or a commission, I don't know.

Mr. Tavenner. Did he hold any position in the Communist Party in the District of Columbia at that time, to your knowledge?

Mr. Sampler. Not that I know of.

Mr. Tavenner. This address, 4402 Georgia Avenue, is it a private home or an apartment building, or what is it?

Mr. Sampler. It is the Jewish Community Center, I believe that is the name.' (100) [#]

'Mr. Moulder. What was Mr. Wahl doing at that time?

Mr. Lowenthal. He was Washington representative or secretary of the American Jewish Conference, which was an amalgamation of a great many Jewish organizations as I understand it.' (101) [#J]

'Mr. Arens. Could you kindly tell us again the circumstances of your joining the Communist Party when you joined?

Mr. Cherlin. The circumstances proceeding my actual joining was that I functioned as a music teacher in a Jewish fraternal organization called the Jewish People's Fraternal Organization [Order].

Mr. Arens. Was that an adjunct of the International Workers Order?

Mr. Cherlin. That is right. We would go from 1 lodge or 1 group to another, a group of 3 or 4 teachers, were we would give lessons. One or two of these people were party people; and, in travelling from one place to another, we would have discussions, political, theoretical, philosophical, and practical; and pressures were put upon me to join the Communist Party.' (102) [#J]

'Mr. Arens. Have you appeared, given concerts, under the auspices of the School of Jewish Studies in the course of the last few years?

Mr. Hollander. I don't recall, sir.

Mr. Arens. We display to you now a thermofax reproduction of an announcement in the Communist Daily Worker (March 30, 1948, p. 5), to the effect that there will be a concert at the School of Jewish Studies in which the artists listed include Max Hollander.

Look at that and see if that refreshes your recollection.

(The document was handed to the witness.)

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. Hollander. It is possible, sir, but I don't remember. Being a violinist of certain stature. I have played concerts a great deal, and I, as a rule, have not asked where the job comes from. May I elaborate, if I may, sir?

Jobs, as a rule, come through the telephone, and have to go through the union somehow. One accepts a job and does not ask who is the employer, but one finds out who has hired him. In effect, that particular person acts as a contractor. I have no recollection of having played a concert for a Jewish school. I may have, sir.

(Document marked "Hollander Exhibit No. 2," and retained in committee files.)

Mr. Arens. You know the School of Jewish Studies has been repeatedly cited as a Communist-controlled outfit: do you not?’ (103) [#]

‘Mr. Arens. What connection, if any, have you had with the School of Jewish Studies?’

Mr. Hellerman. Is that – Excuse me a moment.

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. Hellerman. I am afraid I really don’t understand the question. I don’t know exactly what you mean when you say association.

Mr. Arens. Have you performed at the School of Jewish Studies?’

Mr. Hellerman. I don’t know. I have performed in a great many places.

Mr. Arens. Do you have any recollection of performing there? If you do not, we will pass on to another question.

Mr. Hellerman. I have no recollection of performing there.

Mr. Arens. ‘Are you now, or have you ever been, a member of the Communist Party?’

Mr. Hellerman. I believe that I will decline to answer that question on the basis of the fifth amendment.

Mr. Arens. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?’

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. Hellerman. I decline to answer on the previous grounds.

Mr. Arens. I want to invite your attention, if you please, Mr. Hellerman, to the article appearing in the Daily Worker of 1947 (December 12), which I shall now display to you, in reference to a series of entertainment programs. We have marked here, just for the purpose of directing your attention to it, the name “Fred Hellerman,” of People’s Songs, who is to perform in “Village Varieties, a smash hit, “ and the admission is 75c or a subscription to the Worker. Kindly look at that article, if you please, sir, and tell us if that prompts your recollection of that incident.

Mr. Hellerman. I decline to answer that.’ (104) [#]

‘By a curious – what shall I call it? – coincidence all these men, most of whom were about to play a leading part in the great betrayal of Russia, were Jews.’ (105)

‘What was to all intents and purposes a branch of the Whitfield Street club was established at

49, Tottenham Street, under the title of the Social Democratic Communist Club. In Cable Street, a small thoroughfare turning out of Princes Square, there existed for some time a club known as The Dawn. Greater notoriety has attached to the anarchist club in Berner Street, Commercial Road. It was originally known as the Nihilist Club, and was founded by Russian refugees. The gulf between nihilism and anarchism is not great, the latter, indeed, including the former. The members of the Berner Street club were mainly recruited from the populous colony of foreign Jews that has settled in the East End of London. In April, 1891, the seventh anniversary of the foundation of this club was celebrated, one of the speakers remarking on this occasion that, though “the revolutionary movement among the Hebrews is of comparatively recent origin, at present wherever there are Jews in London, America, Australia, Poland or Russia, among those Jews will be found anarchists.” (106)

‘I had often heard of the honesty of the Jewish smugglers on the frontier; but I had never expected to have such proof of it. Later on, when our circle imported many books from abroad, or still later, when so many revolutionists and refugees crossed the frontier in entering or leaving Russia, there was not a case in which the smugglers betrayed anyone, or took advantage of the circumstances to exact an exorbitant price for their services.’ (107) [#]

‘We must have been there by the time I was six, for I remember the night of the 1935 General Election. It was raining and some people came to the door to take my father to vote for Lewis Cohen, the Labour candidate.’ (108) [#]

‘Because the Communist movement was so heavily infiltrated and influenced by Jewish activists it was natural that the Communist movement should be directed towards passionately attacking the anti-Semitism of National Socialism.’ (109) [#]

‘It was probably during the summer of 1946 that the Fabian Society obtained a very large property in Richmond Terrace, facing St. Peter’s Church. Of course, it was Lewis Cohen, boss of the Brighton-based Alliance Building Society, that provided the wherewithal.’ (110) [#]

References for Part VI

- (91) National Americanism Commission of the American Legion, 1937, *‘Isms: A Review of Alien Isms, Revolutionary Communism and their Active Sympathizers in the United States’*, 2nd Edition, American Legion: Indianapolis, p. 130
- (92) House Committee of Un-American Activities, 1947, *‘Hearings regarding Communism in Labor Unions in the United States’*, 1st Edition, US Government Printing Office: Washington D.C., p. 156
- (93) Bessie Burchett, 1941, *‘Education for Destruction’*, 1st Edition, Self-Published: Philadelphia, p. 160
- (94) House Committee on Un-American Activities, 1953, *‘Investigation of Communist Activities in the Columbus, Ohio, Area’*, 1st Edition, US Government Printing Office: Washington D.C., p. 1756
- (95) Andrew Kalpaschnikoff, 1920, *‘A Prisoner of Trotsky’s’*, 1st Edition, Doubleday, Page & Company: New York, p. 160
- (96) Ibid, p. 285

- (97) Hya Doroshenko, Sofia Dzerzhinskaya, Alexander Katskevich et al, 1988, *'Felix Dzerzhinsky: A Biography'*, 1st Edition, Progress Publishers: Moscow, p. 49. Jakub Goldenberg we may presume to have been jewish as it is a common jewish first and surname in addition to Poland being one of the places where jews were most in evidence in the late 19th and early 20th century.
- (98) Sidney Webb, Beatrice Webb, 1937, *'Soviet Communism: A New Civilisation'*, Vol. I, 2nd Edition, Victor Gollancz: London, pp. 149-150
- (99) Ibid, pp. 150-151
- (100) House Committee on Un-American Activities, 1950, *'Hearings regarding Communism in the District of Columbia'*, Part 2, 1st Edition, US Government Printing Office: Washington D.C., pp. 3252-3253. It should be noted that Sampler here is referring to the building used to house local communist meetings as outlined on p. 3252.
- (101) House Committee on Un-American Activities, 1950, *'Hearings regarding Communism in the United States Government'*, Part 2, 1st Edition, US Government Printing Office: Washington D.C., p. 2964. It should be noted that David Wahl seems to have been an individual of communist leanings and suspected of espionage inside the United States government as well as involvement with the communist infiltration of the United Nations (alongside Alger Hiss). Wahl, according to pp. 2962-2963, was the individual who got Lowenthal, who was also jewish, his job as a senior figure in a department of the Board of Economic Warfare in 1942. Wahl also had a civil service post as well as his lobbying responsibilities. We may assume Wahl was jewish because of his importance in the American Jewish Conference (to my knowledge non-jews are extremely rare in jewish organisations let alone in positions of authority).
- (102) House Committee on Un-American Activities, 1957, *'Investigation of Communism in the Metropolitan Music School, Inc., and Related Fields'*, Part 1, 1st Edition, US Government Printing Office: Washington D.C., p. 629
- (103) Ibid, pp. 754-755
- (104) House Committee on Un-American Activities, 1957, *'Investigation of Communism in the Metropolitan Music School, Inc., and Related Fields'*, Part 2, 1st Edition, US Government Printing Office: Washington D.C., p. 873. It should be noted that *'taking the fifth amendment'* was a common tactic used by communists in legal proceedings against them and/or interrogations of them since they did not wish to answer truthfully as it would *'incriminate them'*, but could not answer negatively without breaking the law.
- (105) Princess Catherine Radziwill, 1919, *'The Firebrand of Bolshevism: The True Story of the Bolsheviks and the Forces that directed them'*, 1st Edition, Small, Maynard & Company: Boston, p. 228
- (106) Felix Dubois, Trans: Ralph Derechef, 1894, *'The Anarchist Peril'*, 1st Edition, T. Fisher Unwin: London, pp. 269-270
- (107) Prince Peter Kropotkin, 1899, *'Memoirs of a Revolutionist'*, Vol. II, 1st Edition, Smith, Elder, & Co.: London, p. 82. It should be noted that Kropotkin was and is one of the most important of all anarchist thinkers and that his experiences, although prior to the Bolshevik revolution, are instructive in informing us of the jewish role in the anarchist and marxist movements in Europe at that time.
- (108) Denis Hill, 1989, *'Seeing Red – Being Green: The Life and Times of a Southern Rebel'*, 1st Edition, Iconoclast Press: Brighton, p. 16. It should be noted that the British Labour party was at this time avowedly socialist and often pro-communist although not affiliated with the Comintern like the Communist party of Great Britain (CPGB).

(109) Ibid., p. 88. It should be noted here that Hill was writing as a life-long marxist and long-time member of the CPGB as well as a senior trade unionist.

(110) Ibid, p. 118. The Fabian Society is a long-standing socialist, still pro-communist at the time referred to by Hill, group that has traditionally formed the intellectual backbone and a lot of funding for the British Labour party. It should also be noted that the Alliance Building Society still exists and has expanded its operations a great deal since Hill wrote.

Sources on Jews and Communism (Part VII)

Saturday, 15 May 2010

Part VII

'I was an 18-year-old law student. I was Jewish. I had been an active, card-carrying member of the Social Democratic party since I was twelve,' (111) [#J]

'A noisy and troublesome and growing minority in the council are called Bolsheviki (big claims), because they demand everything and will not even consider compromise. They want a separate peace, entirely favourable to Germany. I talked to a number of these men, but I could never get one of them to explain the reason of this friendship for Germany. Vaguely they seemed to feel that socialism was a German doctrine and, therefore, as soon as Russia put it into practice, the Germans would follow suit. Not all the council members are working people. Some have never done a hand's turn of manual work in their lives. Many of the soldier members have never seen service and never will. The Jewish membership is very large, and in Russia the Jews have never been allowed any practice of citizenship.' (112) [+]

'Just one more case, because it is typical of many. This man was a real exile, and for eleven years he had lived in Chicago. Born in a small city in Western Russia, he joined, while still a youth, what was known as the Bund, a socialist propaganda circle of Jewish men and women. The youth's parents, quiet, orthodox people, knew nothing of his activities, nor of the revolutionary literature of which he was custodian and which he had concealed in the sand bags piled up around the cottage to keep out the winter cold. On May 31, 1905, the Tavarishi, or comrades, in his town organized a small demonstration against the celebration of the Czar's birthday. The next day the police began searching houses and making arrests among the youth of the town, and they found the books hidden in the sandbags. The boy fled, and found refuge in the next town. Money was raised, a passport forged and the youth finally got to England via Germany. He didn't like England and in 1906 he crossed to the United States, and his whole career in Chicago was a history of agitation and rebellion. He was one of the founders of a socialist Sunday school in Mayor Thompson's town, where children of tender years are given a through education in Bolshevik first principles.' (113) [+]

'A big black-bearded fellow with a hooked Jewish nose mounted the rostrum and attacked the war as a thing of financiers and capitalists.' (114) [+]

'When I arrived in Vilna I had heard quite a good deal about the Jewish speaker, Vladek, who

was called the “young Lassalle.” I went to hear him. It was the first time in my life that I heard a revolutionary speech in Yiddish. Vladék spoke remarkably well. His speech was short and to the point.’ (115) [+]

‘When I came to the United States in 1921, I reminded Vladék of the time I had seen and heard him. He was flattered that I remembered, after not seeing each other for sixteen years. He was now the manager of one of the largest Jewish newspapers in the world, the New York City “Daily Forward,” with a circulation of one million readers. He was the first president of the ORT, and was a councilman in New York, working on plans for slum districts. He was friendly with Prime Minister Leon Blum, Prime Minister Atlee of England, Herbert Morrison, and with all European labor leaders.’ (116) [+]

‘In Petrograd, I also met many of the leaders of the Jewish community, including G. B. Sliosberg the famous lawyer and president of the Jewish Community Council, O. O. Grusenbergh, another prominent lawyer for the Russian Senate, and member of the Board of the Jewish Community Council, Maxim Vinaver, one of the finest organizers and orators in the duma, and a member of the Jewish Community Council board, and Rabbi Eisenstat, a noted scholar and Chief Rabbi in Petrograd, formerly from Rostov. They spoke of the revolution, and asked us to help the Provisional Government under Kerensky.’ (117) [+]

‘In a crowd of typical agitators, men and women, undersized, unwashed and largely Jewish, stood a very tall, well-dressed man with a fresh complexion, clear blue eyes, and an Imperial beard that made him resemble an old-time Frenchman.’ (118) [+]

‘A few Jews changed their place of abode; but the dreaded domination over the less active Christian Russians never materialized, though Jews did play a considerable role in directing the higher affairs of the Revolution, which is natural enough in view of the fact that they had been the pioneers of opposition of the Autocracy.’ (119) [+]

‘On the top floor was the Bolshevik Executive Committee. The chiefs of this Committee claimed to be Americans. One, a young Jew, told me that he had edited a Russo-Jewish newspaper in the East Side of New York; and he affirmed that Bolshevism was practically an American doctrine; and that until lately it had flourished better in New York than anywhere in Russia.’ (120) [+]

‘The vast majority of Jews in Russia are, in fact, to be found in association with the Liberal bourgeoisie and are supporters of the Cadet Party. They loyally supported both the First and Second Provisional Governments like sober and respectable citizens, and they are making the greatest efforts to secure the success of the Liberty Loan. Generally they stand for maintaining the unity of the State and are opposed to centrifugal and separatist ideas. Of the Jews as a body we may expect that they will play a large part in the future reconstruction of Russia, but it cannot be said of them that they played a great and active part in the Revolution. The only Jews that took an active part in the Revolution were the small but energetic Socialist minority of Jewish idealists. If the millions of Jews of Russia have gained their freedom today they owe it to that minority of Jewish idealists.

Yet the very existence of these Jewish idealists is a peculiar demonstration of the force and

reality of Russian idealism. Though members of an oppressed race and with every excuse for racial bitterness, they never faltered in their faith in Russia. In all the Revolutionary parties they played an active part. They went to gaol and Siberia with their Russian fellow-revolutionaries. Yet they knew by experience that every effort of theirs would be, and was, answered by the autocracy in brutal massacre of the Jewish population at large. Had they been swayed even to the slightest degree by racial considerations they would have held their hand if only out of pity for their own race. But to them the ideal was above all, and to-day they may be proud of Russia's freedom, which they helped to achieve in co-operation with the best men and women of all Russia.' (121) [+J]

'The truth of the story is that Mr. Maniuloff secretly took to Rasputin's house two or three police agents, to whom the latter said that God himself had revealed to him that Russia could never be saved from the perils of revolution until the removal of Mr. Stolypine. He even blessed the officers, together with a pistol with which he presented them. It turned out afterwards that this pistol was the very weapon which the Jew Bagroff fired at the Prime Minister in the theatre in Kieff during the gala performance given there in honour of the Emperor's visit to the town.' (122)

'Among the workers the new party gained strength until about 1900. Then all its Jewish members seceded and formed the 'Bund', which favored immediate revolution. Others too seceded.'" (123) [+]

'Perhaps the most startling development of the difficult years – startling to those who knew the anti-Semitic of Tsarist days – is the movement for a Jewish theatre, a movement which has resulted in two solely Jewish stages, both now in their fourth season. On one of them, the Jewish Kamerny Theatre, the plays are given in Yiddish; on the other, the Studio Theatre Gabima, only the purest Hebrew is heard. The former is the more pretentious and has been the busier of the two; the latter has emerged from comparative obscurity at a single stroke by an amazingly perfect and moving production of St. An-sky's folk-tragedy, "The Dibbuk," already introduced to the New York stage by the Yiddish Art Theatre.

The Jewish Kamerny Theatre owes its existence to a group of artists of that race, including Granovsky, Rosovsky, Moosan, Anchron and Altman, who determined in 1919 to found such a stage and six months later opened its doors in Petrograd, thanks to funds provided by the Petrograd Soviet.' (124)

'The Revolutionary emigration has come back to its own. Amongst the members of the Executive Committee, moreover, all are not Russians. Without mentioning the Jews, who are very numerous, Mme. Kolontay, sitting among the Leninists, is Finnish. And there is Rakowski, too, the Socialist leader of Roumania: one never knows exactly whether he is Roumanian or Bulgarian.' (125) [-]

'There are, in this revolutionary commune, many foreigners, Cosmopolitans, Jews especially, hiding under a borrowed name their German origin, but who cannot regard as their fatherland a country where they have scarcely known anything but persecution.' (126)

'Yet another investigating Commission was formed then and there, for Lenin's rehabilitation. I don't know anything about its activities. But I recall that two days later there were discussions of some other elections to this Commission: the 'inconvenience' emerged that its original membership consisted only of Jews, five in all – including Dan, Lieber, and Gots. The rehabilitation of Lenin by a Commission like that could serve only as a source of another Black Hundred campaign – against the whole Soviet for concealing higher treason...' (127)

'We fail to see two stars of the first magnitude amongst the Bolshevik rulers – the 'cronies', Zinoviev and Kamenev. Their absence from the Government might have had a great many valid reasons. First of all, being somewhat in opposition, they might have declined. Secondly, for tactical reasons it was advisable to cut down as much as possible on the number of Ministers of Jewish origin (the sole exception was Trotsky). Thirdly, we must remember that from now on ministerial posts were in fact not the most important in the State: stars of the first magnitude made all high policy in the Party Central Committee. Fourthly, Kamenev was appointed chairman of the Central Ex. Com., which formally was the highest State body, while Zinoviev received a high appointment as editor of the official state newspaper: the Izvestiya of the Central Ex. Com.' (128)

'The Socialist parties of the White Russians, Esthonians, Livonians, Letts, Lithuanians, and Jews were fused for the revolutionary movement. The Jews, in the opinion of Ular, played an important role in the revolution.' (129)

'Among the ethnic groups whose discontent and opposition to Tsardom had necessarily reached vast proportions, and who largely contributed to the downfall of autocracy, is that of the Jews. To a greater degree than the Poles, the Letts or Finns, or, indeed, any other ethnic group in the vast Empire of the Romanovs, they have been the artisans of the Revolution of 1917.' (130) [J]

'It was but natural that the Jews should take a prominent part in the movement of Russian liberation. When Professor Errera wrote that few Jews could be found among the Revolutionaries in Russia, he was absolutely wrong.' (131) [J]

'On the contrary, I maintain that not only have the Jews of Russia good and valid reasons to be on the side of the revolution, but that, in reality, they have contributed individually and collectively, as an ethnic and religious group, to the movement of emancipation in Russia and to the triumph of democracy.' (132) [J]

'My dislike was shared by all Muscovites. Motors were used only by the Jewish rulers, and they sped along regardless of other folk.' (133) [+]

'The autumn of the year 1917 brought great changes. Just as Michael-Petrovitch thought all was well the Bolsheviks took over the government in Petrograd, and the Ukrainians took over Kiev. To Bouromka came, one day soon afterward, a new committee from outside, preaching fiery red doctrines. It was composed of a delegate or two from the factory workmen's Soviet at Poltava, together with student and Jewish propagandists, and they settled down for some time in the village.' (134) [+]

'The University and the superior schools remained closed. The men and women students who were not working here were sent into the provinces by the political committees to carry on propaganda among the peasants in favour of the republic. Eight out of ten were Jews and Revolutionary Socialists.' (135) [+]

'Pivoting on this right foot, he swung round, clicked his heels and executed the fine salute reserved, until lately, for generals.'

Meanwhile, a crowd had gathered round.

"What's the matter?"

"It's an officer bullying a soldier."

A policeman was summoned. He was a little Jew, and wasted no time on laying hands on the general.' (136) [+]

'It is a curious fact that among the leaders of the Labour Party, which at present is the preponderating party in Russia, there are Armenians, Caucasians, Germans and Jews, but not a single real Russian.' (137) [-]

'The Social Revolutionaries prided themselves on being irreligious and very many of them were Jews.' (138) [+]

'All the "counter-Revolutionists" were herded together in one carriage, the one farthest from the engine, and in charge of us was a Jewish official of the Kerensky Government.' (139) [+]

'Here two soldiers waited, and I was taken out between them and marched to the headquarters of the Chekha. In a small, dirty room I underwent an examination by two Jewish Communists, one of whom, Vladimirov – nearly all Jewish Communists assume Russian names – being prominent in the councils of the Communist central committee.' (140) [+]

References

(111) Erich Erdstein, Barbara Bean, 1979, *'Inside the Fourth Reich'*, 1st Edition, Sphere: London, p. 7. The period that Erdstein (*'Inside the Fourth Reich'* is really Erdstein's extremely egoistic autobiography pretending to be a *'nazi hunting'* book) is referring to here is 1938 in Austria. It is worth noting that the Social Democratic party were communists, but communists who believed that communism was inevitable and that revolutionary struggle was largely unnecessary based on the theories of Karl Kautsky.

(112) Rheta Childe Dorr, 1917, *'Inside the Russian Revolution'*, 1st Edition, MacMillan: New York, pp. 13-14. It should be noted that when Dorr speaks of the supposed sympathy of the Bolsheviks with Germany that she means not that the Bolsheviks were German agents/spies, but that they regarded Germany as the most likely place to implement socialism (per marxist doctrine) as indicated by her qualification that the Bolsheviks expected this to happen soon after they seized power in Russia.

(113) Ibid, pp. 94-95

(114) James Houghteling Jr., 1918, *'A Diary of the Russian Revolution'*, 1st Edition, Dodd, Mead and Company: New York, p. 123. I have marked this source as potentially problematic, because it doesn't detail what a 'jewish nose' is and how that indicates that the owner of said nose is in fact a jew.

(115) Mark Carter, 1959, *'The Russian Revolution As I Saw It'*, 1st Edition, Self-Published: Los Angeles, p. 34. Carter is here referring to the revolution of 1905 not 1917, which provides us with valuable additional perspective in regards to the role of jews as revolutionary agitators in radical Russian politics at this time. We should also note that the reference to (Ferdinand) Lassalle refers to the jewish founder of the German Socialist party (SPD).

(116) Ibid. It should be noted that Leon Blum, three times Prime Minister of France, was also a jewish socialist who had communist sympathies (for example see his Leon Blum, Trans: W Pickles, 1946, *'For All Mankind'*, 1st Edition, Gollancz: London).

(117) Carter, Op. Cit., p. 63

(118) Robert Crozier Long, 1919, *'Russian Revolution Aspects'*, 1st Edition, E. P. Dutton: New York, p. 41. It should be noted that Long was the Russian correspondent of the Associated Press in 1917.

(119) Ibid, p. 77. I have marked this quotation as potentially unreliable, because it seems to reference the *'Commissar Lists'*, which were widely believed at the time the work was written and published, but which subsequently have been debunked by scholars as being without value.

(120) Ibid, p. 126

(121) Michael Farbman, 1917, *'The Russian Revolution & the War'*, 1st Edition, The Herald: London, pp. 35-37. It should be noted that Farbman was the Petrograd correspondent of the *'Manchester Guardian'* (a British socialist newspaper) in 1917.

(122) Princess Catherine Radziwill, 1918, *'Rasputin and the Russian Revolution'*, 1st Edition, John Lane: London, p. 72. I am not sure as to how true to life this quote is, as Radziwill was a rather eccentric character, but I have decided to give it the benefit of the doubt.

(123) Alice Stone Blackwell (Ed.), 1918, *'The Little Grandmother of the Russian Revolution: Reminiscences and Letters of Catherine Breshkovsky'*, 1st Edition, Little, Brown, and Company: Boston, p. 107

(124) Oliver Sayler, 1922, *'The Russian Theatre'*, 1st Edition, Brentano's: New York, pp. 282-283

(125) Emile Vandervelde, Trans: Jean Findlay, 1918, *'Three Aspects of the Russian Revolution'*, 1st Edition, George Allen & Unwin: London, p. 21. I have marked this quotation as potentially unreliable, because it seems to reference the *'Commissar Lists'*, which were widely believed at the time the work was written and published, but which subsequently have been debunked by scholars as being without value.

(126) Ibid, p. 201

(127) N. N. Sukanov, Joel Carmichael (Trans. & Ed.), 1962, *'The Russian Revolution 1917 Eyewitness Account'*, Vol. II, 1st Edition, Harper & Brothers: New York, p. 461

(128) Ibid, p. 656

(129) Encarnacion Alzona, 1921, *'Some French Contemporary Opinions of the Russian Revolution of 1905'*, 1st Edition, Columbia University: New York, p. 48

(130) Angelo Rappoport, 1919, *'Pioneers of the Russian Revolution'*, 1st Edition, Brentano's: New York, p. 228

(131) Ibid, pp. 228-229

(132) Ibid, p. 229

(133) Anon., 1921, *'From a Russian Diary 1917-1920'*, 1st Edition, John Murray: London, p. 188. The diary entry is that for January the 8th 1919. I have marked this quotation as potentially unreliable, because, in addition to being anonymous, it seems to reference the '*Commissar Lists*', which were widely believed at the time the work was written and published, but which subsequently have been debunked by scholars as being without value.

(134) Princess Cantacuzene, Countess Speransky, 1920, *'Russian People: Revolutionary Recollections'*, 1st Edition, Charles Scribner's Sons: New York, p. 64

(135) Claude Anet, 1917, *'Through the Russian Revolution: Notes of an Eye-Witness, from 12th March – 30th May'*, 1st Edition, Hutchinson: London, pp. 75-76

(136) Ibid, p. 180. I have marked this quotation as potentially problematic, because Anet doesn't tell us how he knew that this policeman was jewish and hence we do not know whether this was just speculation on Anet's part or not.

(137) Anon., 1918, *'The Fall of the Romanoffs: How the Ex-Empress & Rasputine Caused the Russian Revolution'*, 1st Edition, Herbert Jenkins: London, p. 231. I have marked this quotation as unreliable, because, in addition to being anonymous, it references the '*Commissar Lists*', which were widely believed at the time the work was written and published, but which subsequently have been debunked by scholars as being without value.

(138) Anna Viroubova, 1923, *'Memories of the Russian Court'*, 1st Edition, MacMillan: London, p. 13. It needs to be understood that the Social Revolutionaries, or SRs, were a competing socialist party to the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks and whose powerbase was the Russian peasantry not the urban workers. For more information and a brief overview of the activities and ideas of the Social Revolutionaries see Francis King's (Trans. & Ed.), 2007, *'The Narodniks in the Russian Revolution: Russia's Socialist-Revolutionaries in 1917'*, Socialist History Occasional Papers, No. 25, Socialist History Society: London.

(139) Viroubova, Op. Cit., p. 272

(140) Ibid, p. 358

'Jack the Ripper' and the Jews

Sunday, 16 May 2010

The famous newspaper-created pseudonym for the famous Whitechapel serial killer, 'Jack the Ripper', has long provoked comments from anti-Semitic individuals, authors and scholars. This is not, as some might have it, wholly unjustified in so far as such comments normally include the assertion that 'Jack the Ripper' was probably or in fact a jew. As someone with a long-standing interest in both the anti-Semitic cause and the 'Jack the Ripper' mystery: I thought it would be pertinent to make a short presentation and analysis of what evidence we have to suggest that 'Jack the Ripper' was a jew. I have done so without references in this case as the facts to which I allude can easily be found in any authoritative recent history to the Whitechapel murders such as Paul Begg's work. I will write and publish a more detailed article with full citations laying out the case for a jewish 'Jack the Ripper' at a later date, but I thought to comment on the principle popularly known evidence for this thesis in this article.

The charge that 'Jack the Ripper' was jewish is actually one of the more reasonable suggestions

that we can make about this infamous serial killer. Unfortunately this cannot be proven one way or the other, as with many things to do with the Whitechapel murders, as we do not actually know who 'Jack the Ripper' was, why he or she did what they did, which of the victims (canonical and non-canonical) were theirs and most importantly: why the killings stopped when they did.

However that said there are three important pieces of evidence that have been used in arguing for a jewish 'Jack the Ripper', which we must examine. These are simply: the chief suspect of Melville McNaughton and Donald Swanson; Aaron Kosminski, was jewish, the writing on the wall near the body of the fourth canonical victim; Catherine Eddowes, and the fact that several of the murders occurred very close to jewish social groups. We might further add that another early suspect; John Pizer, was also jewish, but he was suspected more on the basis of gossip rather than anything else and was soon released as he proved to have been elsewhere at the time of the murders. Other jewish suspects that have been presented have been Aaron David Cohen or David Cohen and Nathan Kaminsky, but both of these are conjectures/theories offered by modern authors (hence not directly related to general anti-Semitic discourse). We should also note that several key witnesses regarding possible sightings of 'Jack the Ripper' were jews.

The first piece of evidence is the suspicion of McNaughton and Swanson, who were both senior members of the Metropolitan police force at the time of the Whitechapel murders, of the Polish jew: Aaron Kosminski. We have to give credence to this precisely because McNaughton and Swanson were in a position to have all the facts at their disposal and also to be close enough to the heart of the investigation to form their own reasonable hypothesis as to the identify of the perpetrator. We cannot from the distance of over a hundred years dismiss their '*on-the-ground*' assessment as they had access to knowledge and experience, which has sadly not been passed down to posterity (the Whitechapel murders suffered from a lapse in interest of circa forty years between the last canonical murder and the revival of public interest in the 1930s with the publication of a popular book on the subject of the killings).

We should also note that Kosminski is one of the two suspects, along with the non-jewish Francis Tumblety, in the Whitechapel murders that those who devoted themselves to the study of the Ripper crimes have not been able to satisfactorily dismiss as a suspect and whose timeline and motivation we have suggestive evidence for being in-line with that of 'Jack the Ripper'.

The only problem with Kosminski's timeline is that he was sent to a lunatic asylum in 1891 not in 1888/89 after the murders. This is however easily solved if we point out that the Isaac Kosminski of Goulston Street (where the writing on the wall seemingly accusing the jews of the murders and the fourth victim; Catherine Eddowes, was discovered as well as being in the heart of 'Jack the Ripper's' territory [it also explains how 'Jack the Ripper' disappeared so quickly after the '*double event*' murder]) may well have been Kosminski's brother. This would also explain why Aaron Kosminski came to the attention of the policemen investigating the Whitechapel murders, which has otherwise been left unaddressed. It also gives us our conjectural reason as to the delay between the end of the canonical murders and the committal of Kosminski in so far as his brother had been keeping him in check or locked up (as Kosminski had been severely delusional and mentally ill since at least 1885) until such time as he could be sent to a lunatic asylum. As it happened Kosminski was sent to a workhouse, we may conjecture by his

brother when he became too difficult to handle or he ran out of money, who then sent him to be interned and treated in a lunatic asylum.

We, however, need to note that despite the flurry of activity in the first four murders. 'Jack the Ripper' may well not have committed the fifth and most famous, which has recently been persuasively argued to have been related to Mary Kelly's boyfriend on the basis of a number of discrepancies in the traditional narrative and her boyfriend's testimony. This matters precisely because the frenzied killing of the first four was decidedly different to Mary Kelly (who was, in my opinion, simply butchered as opposed to having a serial killer ritual performed as in the other four cases) and was only lumped in with the Ripper murders, because it occurred at the same time and bore a passing similarity to the other four murders. This 'lumping together' of murders that do not strictly belong together is not uncommon in the many contemporary and modern works on the Whitechapel murders with all sorts of additional victims killed around that time being presented as new ones. This serves to illustrate to the reader that even the most widely believed fact in the Whitechapel murders is not necessarily what it seems: largely due to the hype placed upon the murders by the press at the time, which used them as an excuse to do a bit of moral crusading about the living conditions in east London at the time particularly in relation to the doss houses and rookeries .

We need to point out that the best argument for Kosminski not being 'Jack the Ripper' is that he was later certified as not dangerous by the Colney Hatch asylum although two minor violent episodes did occur during his time in that institution. This argument centres on the assumption that Kosminski had maintained the same basic behaviour patterns, which is obviously problematic given that we have no record of Kosminski's mental state or possible proclivity towards violence in 1888 when the murders occurred. In essence it comes down to whether you prefer the gut instinct of the two senior officers who named Kosminski as their primary suspect or you believe the diagnosis of Kosminski as not dangerous in addition to the belief that said diagnosis was also true several years earlier during the Whitechapel murders. On a personal note: I think it is safe to argue that we must believe the detectives as opposed to the later diagnosis as they were in a position to gauge whether Kosminski could have performed the crime at the time, while the Colney Hatch asylum diagnosis is not (that is not to say that the McNaughton and Swanson's opinion is infallible or correct, but that it is more cogent evidence than the Colney Hatch asylum's later diagnosis).

Before we leave Aaron Kosminski we need to realise that Kosminski was not the only prime suspect as Frederick Abberline, one of the lead detectives on the Whitechapel Murders from Scotland Yard, felt that 'Jack the Ripper' was probably the non-jewish Pole: Seweryn Antonowicz Klosowski (better known to history as the serial killer, with a completely different modus operandi to 'Jack the Ripper', George Chapman). The assertion that Chapman was the murderer has however been long discarded by authors on, and researchers into, the Whitechapel murders. That said we must remind ourselves once again that Kosminski is one of the two most likely candidates, along with Francis Tumblety, that have been presented as 'Jack the Ripper'. If 'Jack the Ripper' was Jewish: it was more than likely Aaron Kosminski.

The second piece of evidence that is used to argue for a Jewish 'Jack the Ripper' is the writing on the wall in Goulston Street, where Isaac (and probably Aaron) Kosminski lived, which is better

known as the 'Goulston Street Graffito'. This piece of graffiti was and is held to be importance by some in the case because a bloody piece of Catherine Eddowes' apron was found underneath it (which also happens to point to Kosminski being 'Jack the Ripper' if Isaac Kosminski was indeed his brother). The writing has been recorded as saying slightly different things by different sources, but the official police version of the writing, as reported by constable Alfred Long and accepted by Sir Charles Warren (the then Metropolitan Police Commissioner), stated as follows:

'The Juwes are the men that will not be blamed for nothing.'

The second version, recorded by the detective Daniel Halse, stated:

'The Juwes are not the men who will be blamed for nothing.'

The third version, recorded by the surveyor Frederick William Foster, stated:

'The Juwes are not the men To be blamed for nothing.'

'Juwes', of course, is simply a vernacular spelling of jews in English and all three versions the meaning has stayed the same with only superficial differences in expression of that meaning. The meaning should be simply understood as a two-fold message: *'the jews are never blamed for things that they do'* and/or *'the jews have really done what they are blamed for'*. Both meanings are fundamentally the same message (i.e. the jews should be blamed for what they have done but they aren't always blamed for what they have done) and therefore we cannot quibble over meaning or the message, but to say that it is simply a standard anti-Semitic argument, then as now, regarding the jews.

As to the graffiti's relevance: it would be best to take a sceptical angle here by pointing out that the East End of London, particularly Whitechapel, at this time was home to a very large community of émigré jews from Eastern Europe and anti-Semitic feelings were, understandably, running high. This would make the existence of anti-Semitic graffiti on a street, where we already know that at least one jew lived, nothing unusual. After all there has never been any proof for the assertion, which is occasionally made, that 'Jack the Ripper' wrote those words and it seems rather unlikely that the Ripper stopped and decided to write a bit of anti-Semitic graffiti implicating jews indirectly. After all if the Ripper was jewish, as some have argued using the Goulston Street graffiti, then why on earth would he or she implicate themselves by pointing directly to it as there were many non-jews as well as jews living in the East End of London, particularly Whitechapel, at this time.

The far more likely explanation of this graffiti, as attested to by the fact that it has not been argued to be of any significance [but rather is merely incidental] among authors on and researchers into the Whitechapel murders for quite some time, is that it was simply there when 'Jack the Ripper' passed by and dropped the piece of apron. As stated anti-Semitic graffiti would have not been unusual and it is unlikely there is any reason that a bloodied part of Eddowes' apron was dropped under that graffiti intentionally. In fact what is far more likely, if we look at Kosminski as a prime suspect once again, is that he took the part of the bloodied apron as a souvenir, but found upon returning to his brother's house in Goulston street that he could not

hide it (as it is doubtful his brother Isaac would have been involved in the murders), in addition to the removed organs and entrails [which if you believe the '*From Hell*' letter (which I personally don't) the Ripper fried and ate], so it was quickly discarded in favour of the far more valuable souvenirs.

In essence this second piece of evidence is a red herring in the argument for a jewish 'Jack the Ripper' in so far as it seems to proffer a useful piece of evidence for that thesis, but it actually forces the person using that evidence for said thesis to journey into the realms of wild conjecture as to why on earth 'Jack the Ripper' would do something as silly as tell the world that he or she was, in fact, a jew. This more often than not simply renders their argument nonsense by virtue of their point being made on unreasonable conjectures not to mention absurd filler of stories of jewish ritual murder (the Whitechapel murders bear no relation to the phenomenon of jewish ritual murder as they didn't involve exsanguination or any reports of highly religious/travelling jews being involved) and out-of-context quotations from the Babylonian Talmud.

The third piece of evidence, which is not normally used [as it has not been remarked on much even inside the considerable amount of literature on the Whitechapel murders], that can be used to argue for a jewish 'Jack the Ripper' is the fact that several of the murders took place next, or very close, to jewish social clubs. This piece of evidence is interesting in that it offers us a potential source for the killer (killing the first prostitute after an evening at the social club) and also a reason why the killings occurred as late as they did (club meetings [which often dragged on till late at night] etc). However that said the fact that several of the murders were next, or very close, to jewish social clubs cannot be used unless we can demonstrate that 'Jack the Ripper' was either a member of these clubs (which is quite possible) or that these locations were deliberately chosen by him or her for the murders.

These two conditions however are as nothing compared to the reasonable counterargument that it was standard practice among prostitutes (or '*shilling whores*' as they were contemporarily known) to take their clients to a quiet place where they were not likely to be disturbed to perform the desired coital services. This argument simply dismisses the presence of these jewish social clubs near several of the murders as being coincidental, which is reasonable if we assume that the prostitute was the one suggesting which quiet spot would be best. It is however quite possible that 'Jack the Ripper' suggested the appropriate quiet place and not the prostitute given that the one thing we know almost as a certainty is that 'Jack the Ripper' was a local and did not look out of place (otherwise he would have attracted unnecessary attention, been easily recognised and described and promptly identified and caught). Hence 'Jack the Ripper' would more than likely have known of good local quiet spots that he could have simply suggested to the prostitute before hand.

This counters the reasonable assertion that it was the prostitutes dictating where the Whitechapel murders happened and raises the possibility that 'Jack the Ripper' picked at least some of the spots. If 'Jack the Ripper' was a member of these clubs then he or she would have known that these clubs would have concluded their business or should be doing so soon: hence offering him or her a quiet place to take the prostitute in question and commit his or her next murder.

That said the argument on both sides is quite plausible and which side you take depends on

which event you deem more likely: the Ripper dictated the quiet spot or the prostitute dictated it. There is little to choose between them (even Occam's razor cannot help you as both are equally simple solutions), but if you deem the former more likely than the possibility that the Jewish social clubs were involved as a 'known quantity' to the Ripper raises its head.

In essence then the fact that there several of the murders were next, or very close, to Jewish social clubs could be of importance, but only in a conjectural sense until more information relating to this becomes available through new research or finds.

So to summarise: we have examined the three central pieces of evidence for the Jewish 'Jack the Ripper' thesis. We have discussed the strong possibility that the mentally-ill Jew Aaron Kosminski was the murderer but also noted that he is only one of two extremely probable suspects. However we have also pointed out that if 'Jack the Ripper' was Jewish then it is very likely to have been Aaron Kosminski as he best fits the facts that we know about the Ripper.

We have discarded the 'Goulston Street Graffito' as being without importance to the Jewish 'Jack the Ripper' theory, because despite appearances it doesn't offer any evidence for said thesis. Finally we have discussed the possibility that the Jewish social clubs next, or very close, to several of the murders played a role in 'Jack the Ripper's' actions and we have pointed out that this may well be true, but that it is a conjectural argument that requires further evidence to qualify, modify or discard.

Therefore we must conclude that a Jewish 'Jack the Ripper' is a likely and significant possibility, but that if 'Jack the Ripper' was a Jew then it was more as a mundane serial killer rather than anything more exotic such as a Jewish ritual murderer as some anti-Semites have suggested down the years.

Sources on Jews and Communism (Part VIII)

Thursday, 20 May 2010

Part VIII

'A by-product of these general migration schemes was a project for the settlement of Jews on the land. A committee for this purpose was set up in 1923, but apparently achieved no results till, in the following year, an American Jewish organization established an American Jewish Joint Agricultural Corporation ("Agro-Joint") to promote "the mass transfer to productive occupations" of as many as possible of the 2,700,000 Jews living in the Soviet Union. An agreement was reached by which funds for this enterprise would be provided in equal proportions by Agro-Joint and by the Soviet authorities. In the autumn of 1924 a "committee for the settlement on the land of Jewish toilers" (Komzet) was established by the presidium of the Soviet of Nationalities, and drew up a programme for the settlement of 100,000 Jewish families. Land was put at the disposal of the committee in the southern Ukraine and in the Crimea, with the promise of further allocations in the Volga region and in the North Caucasus. In 1925, in spite of some local resistance, 100,000 Jews were in fact settled, and the number had risen to

250,000 by 1928, mainly in the Ukraine and in the Crimea. Settlement was almost exclusively in the form of kolkhozy; individual Jewish settlers were rare. The scheme had no political implications, though Petrovsky, the president of the Ukrainian Sovnarkom, went so far as to suggest to the ninth Congress of Soviets in May 1925 the creation of "separate Jewish districts or even a Jewish region", and hopes were expressed elsewhere that the project might one day lead to the foundation of a Jewish Soviet republic.' (141)

'According to Gleb Struve (Soviet Russian Literature), who considers Bagritsky 'one of the most talented and original of the young Soviet poets', the Lay is 'the story of a Ukrainian peasant who flies from the Communist food-detachment commanded by the Jew Kogan, encounters on his way the "Green" anarchist bands of Makhno and is forced to joined them. Then Kogan is taken prisoner by the Makhno bands and Opanas is despatched to shoot him. On the way to the execution he changes his mind and proposes to Kogan to let him escape, but Kogan chooses death. Later on the Makhno bands are defeated by the Reds and Opanas in his turn taken prisoner. Questioned by the Red commanded Kotovsky he confesses to having killed Kogan and submits docilely to the execution. It is a typical revolutionary heroic poem.' (142) [J]

'Now I again knew somebody who was in possession of stolen wealth, and felt no scruples about taking it from him. He was a Polish Jew who had been a lieutenant in the International Brigades in Spain. When I left Moscow in 1941 I let him have the use of my room. After my return I had been there several times. I had seen that he had plenty of blankets, suits, and shoes, all rarities in Russia, and that he also had a great deal of cash. The origin of his wealth was no secret to me; he had held an important job at the International Red Aid for three years.' (143) [*]

'Politically, the Social-Revolutionaries always advocated a federative Russian republic. The composition of the party was extremely varied. School teachers and small intelligentsia became affiliated with it. The more prominent leaders numbered several important Moscow Jewish merchants.' (144)

'Besides obvious foreigners, Bolshevism recruited many adherents from among émigrés, who had spent many years abroad. Some of them had never been to Russia before. They especially numbered a great many Jews. They spoke Russian badly. The nation over which they had seized power was a stranger to them, and besides, they behaved as invaders in a conquered country. Throughout the Revolution generally and Bolshevism in particular the Jews occupied a very influential position. This phenomenon is both curious and complex. But the fact remains that such was the case in the primarily elected Soviet (the famous trio – Lieber, Dahn, Gotz), and all the more so in the second one.

In the Tsarist Government the Jews were excluded from all posts. Schools or Government service were closed to them. In the Soviet Republic all the committees and commissaries were filled with Jews. They often changed their Jewish name for a Russian one – Trotsky-Bronstein, Kameneff-Rozenfeld, Zinovieff-Apfelbaum, Stekloff-Nakhmakes, and so on.' (145) [-]

'There was a head (president) of the soldiers and officers deputies association of the Twelfth Army who was a Jew from Riga, an attorney. He came to see me, and when I showed him this document he said, "The document that these soldiers gave you would entitle you to become

almost a commander-in-chief, but these people write to you and say that you can't be even a company commander because you don't fit the Revolution.''' (146) [+]

'At this point I would like to call to your attention a comment of Lenin's. He was not Jewish. Lenin once said, "If it had not been for the enthusiastic support of Jews and their genius for organization, I would never have been able to make a revolution and make it triumph."

During the period of civil war most leaders on the Red side, the most important leaders as well as the lesser ones, were Jewish. They were called "political commissars." The top man was Leon Trotsky Bronstein.' (147) [+]

'Shortly after I left my mother, a Revolutionary Committee arrived. Three men, a Jew, a sailor with a rifle, and a soldier comprised the committee. They demanded that all wages paid to the workers on the estate be raised one hundred percent.' (148) [+]

'At that time, most of the Jewish population was very much pro-Bolshevik and pro-Communist for a reason I will speak about in much detail later; by no means all of them (I do not want to make any kind of generalization), but very many of them were, especially the younger ones propagandized the German occupation troops little by little.' (149) [+]

'Obviously you want to unburden something that weighs heavily on your mind." Rudin said, "Yes, it does, Sir. As a young artillery officer, back in 1917, I came home on leave. My father had a modest estate in the vicinity of St. Petersburg. We belonged to the Russian nobility but not to the very wealthy top-notch aristocracy of Russia. We are of an impoverished but very ancient and noble family. My father served all his life in the army and was a retired general, too old to participate in the war of 1914. He lived in that home of ours with my mother, my sister, and my fiancée, who was visiting them when I came on leave. And then, out of the blue, came the Revolution. I know that you were somewhere out in the provinces with the regiment. You were not in Petersburg and the horrors of the Revolution reached you gradually. But to us who were there it came as a big blow out of nowhere. A few trucks full of drunk sailors, led by several Jewish youths of St. Petersburg, seized my father and shot him outright. They tied me to a tree with ropes so that I could not move at all. They put a gag in my mouth and then in front of me that gang raped my sister and fiancée and then they shot them both, as well as my mother. They looted and smashed everything in the house but for some reason that I do not understand, they forgot all about me. Finally that gang drove off, probably to do the same thing to our neighbors.' (150) [+]

'Arcadi Berdichevsky, who became my husband in 1928, had worked from 1920 until 1927 at Arcos or at the Soviet Trade Representation in London. He was a Russian Jew, who had studied at Zurich University and emigrated to the United States in 1914. In 1920 he had thrown up a very good job in New York to work for the Soviet government in London. He was not a Bolshevik, but had been a member of the Jewish Social Democratic party in Poland (the Bund), where he had lived until he went to study in Switzerland about 1910. He knew less about Soviet Russia than I did, since he spent his whole time in England since 1920. He was a sincere Socialist, and although he was too much of a Jew and knew the old Russia too well not to perceive the naivete of the picture I painted of the U.S.S.R., he believed as I did that a new and

better world was being created in Russia. He, like me, wanted to take part in the building of that new socialist world.' (151) [#]

'While awaiting Arcadi's arrival from the Far East I lived with his sister and her two sons in their tiny two-roomed apartment in the Dom Politkatajan on Pokrovka. This was the House of the "Political Hard-Labor Prisoners" – i.e., of those who had done hard labor in Siberia under the Tsar. Vera, my sister-in-law, had been sent to a Siberian prison from Lodz in Poland while still in her teens. First, like Arcadi, a member of the Bund (Jewish Social Democrats) she had become a Social Revolutionary in Siberia but had joined the Bolsheviks in 1917, and had herself fought against the Japanese in the Intervention. She had been imprisoned by them but had escaped. Her whole life had been one of adventure, hardship, and sacrifice; but now she had a good job and was full of confidence in the future. She radiated happiness. Her first child had died as a baby on the long trek in the snow across Siberia to the prison camp. Trying to shield it from the cold, she had suffocated it in her arms. Her second son, Shura, had somehow survived the rigors of prison and exile, and was now a youth of eighteen studying engineering at the Moscow University.' (152) []*

'The greatest source of revenue of the Torgsin shops was remittances from abroad. Jews, in particular, often had relatives abroad – in Poland, in Germany, and above all in the United States – who would send them a few dollars a month to save them from starvation. The percentage of Jewish people standing in Torgsin queues – there were queues even at these shops since there were never enough shop assistants – was very high. Anti-Semitism, although officially condemned, took a new lease on life when the Russians saw their Jewish neighbors in the apartment kitchens cooking good food which they never had a chance to buy.' (153) []*

'A far more unpleasant type of blatmeister was a certain V, the titular head of one department at Promexport, who acted as general factotum and toady to Kalmanofsky, the chairman. He attended to the letting of the chairman's datcha ("country house") and other personal affairs, and was always at this side, fetched and carried for him, flattered him, and made himself useful in innumerable ways. Quite useless at his office, he was invaluable to the chairman for securing whatever he personally required and in general in attending to his private affairs. V had no dignity at all. The chairman often treated him like a dog, stormed at him and vented his temper on him. This chairman was not stupid; he was in fact an able and intelligent man, an educated Jew who could appreciate merit and liked me like my husband who stood their ground and were never subservient.' (154) []*

'The straight Russian part of the party is in complete command of the situation, since over 71 per cent are straight Russian. Of the rest, 6.3 per cent are Ukrainian, 5.3 per cent Caucasian, while the Jews, who in many parts of Europe are considered to have commanding influence, only number 4.9 per cent.' (155)

'As the Germans advanced deeper into Russia, theatre companies in provincial cities folded up and hurried eastward. This was not organized evacuation but the movement of small individual groups. A large percentage of actors stayed to wait for the Germans. Only a few theatres in the larger provincial cities were evacuated completely and in an organized fashion, but the local Soviet authorities could claim no credit for these successes. They were due to the personal

enterprise of individual theatre directors who public-spirited enough to think about saving their theatres as well as themselves. In the majority of cases, the leading Soviet administration personnel, including heads of Party committees, executives of state enterprises and officials of the NKVD, loaded their belongings onto government trucks and fled to safety at the first opportunity. Needless to say, they washed their hands of responsibility for what would happen to the population they left behind – a population which included artists and large groups of Jews.’ (156)

‘Our party attended a meeting at Novo-Nikolaievsk of the Siberian Revolutionary Committee, the highest governing body in Siberia at the present time, which had been called to discuss a scheme for development of an important mining region with the help of foreign immigrant workmen. We watched the proceedings with keen interest, for we felt that we were witnessing a part of the Soviet apparatus at work. There were about thirty-five men and women in the room, mostly workers and peasants, with a sprinkling of intellectuals and professional men. A number of old Siberian revolutionary exiles now sat as rulers of the country where they had once been confined as prisoners. The average age of the gathering I should estimate at about forty. The Committee included few university graduates, perhaps a dozen, certainly no more; there were eight or ten Jews among them.’ (157) [+]

*‘As in Russian literature, the two chief themes in the Ukraine are also the new order in agriculture and industry. Successful authors are I. Kirilenko and V. Kuzmich, Ivan Le and G. Kozyuba. Nathan Lurye, a young Jewish writer, wrote one of the most noteworthy works on the Socialist organization of village life in his novel *The Call of the Steppe*. But all these are names which mean little to us. Not one of them, with the exception perhaps of Mikitenko, has hitherto attained the importance of a Sholokhov or Gladkov.’ (158)*

‘What happens to the other faiths? We were several times surprised to discover that Jews in the U.S.S.R. are considered not as members of a religious persuasion, but as a “national minority”, in the same was Armenians, Georgians, Tartars, etc.... (An official, telling us about national minorities represented in the government, said, “Kaganovitch is a Jew, Mikoyan is an Armenian”) and when they introduced themselves to us, several Soviets specifically announced that they were Jews.’ (159) []*

‘We met several Russian Jews who occupied responsible positions, the director, for instance, of Pravda’s printing works, the most important Soviet newspaper press.’ (160) []*

‘The Jewish theatre, which even under the former regime and at the beginning of the revolutionary period played an important part in Russian life, has completely disappeared.’ (161) []*

‘M. J. Olgin, member of the central committee of the Communist Party, and editor of the Jewish Communist organ, “Freiheit,” has written a pamphlet since recognition of Russia by the United States, entitled “Why Communism,” which is even clearer in its open advocacy of violent destruction of the United States government.’ (162)

‘The problem of the large number of revolutionary Russian Jews in Germany doubtless

contributed toward making Fascist Germany anti-Semitic. ' (163)

'Camps Nitgedaiget

Communist camps near N.Y., Chicago, Lumberville, Pa., Wash., D.C., Detroit, Birmingham, etc. ' run by the communist Jewish "United Workers Cooperative Assn." The camp near Chicago for example is located on Paddock Lake 14 miles west of Kenosha, Wis. And occupies about 205 acres; accommodates 500 to 600 people from July 4, to Nov. 1; a Young Pioneer Camp has been held here for the past two years (under direction, 1933, of Comrade Levine of the Young Communist League); ' (164)

'Communist League of America

American adherents of the expelled Trotsky faction in the Communist International; organized 1928; while not affiliated with the Communist Part of the U.S.A. it supports the Communist T.U.U.L. strikes and participates in other "united front" activities; is more violently revolutionary in theory than even the parent Communist Party. In 1930 the national committee included Martin Abern, James P. Cannon, Vincent Dunne, Hugo Oehler, Max Schactman, Carl Skoglund, Maurice Spector, Arne Swabeck, issues Youth and Jewish papers besides the English weekly "Militant"; ' (165)

'Debs Memorial Radio Station

Radio station WEVD named after Eugene V. Debs, "started and continued by Socialists and radicals," was according to 1932 Am. Labor Year Book, "finally allowed to keep its license after a hard fight, and was heavily endowed by the Jewish Daily Forward" (Socialist newspaper). ' (166)

"Potted Biographies" says: "In June 1917, MacDonald, assisted by Snowden, Smillie, Ammon, Anderson, Roden Buxton, Mrs. Despard, Mrs. Snowden, and many East End Jews, held a conference at Leeds and agreed to the formation of Workmen's and Soldiers' Councils, on Russian lines, to end the war by outbreak of a revolution which would paralyse our military operations. ' (167)

'Freiheits

Communist Jewish "Foreign Language Groups" (see) conducting Freiheit Singing Societies, Freiheit Workers Clubs, etc., etc., in N.Y., Chicago and other cities. The official Jewish Communist newspaper (published in Yiddish) is the Jewish Daily Freiheit; Moissaye J. Olgin is editor. The building of this newspaper, which in 1930 had a daily N.Y. sworn circulation of 64,067 copies, adjoins the building of the official communist Daily Worker (published in English). They use the same presses. Communist banners, recently decorated the front of both buildings, ' (168)

'International Workers Order

I.W.O.

Communist fraternal and agitational insurance society formed in 1930 by 7,000, mainly Jewish members of the left of the Workmen's Circle. Now, after three years, it claims 34,000 members including branches of Hungarians, Slovaks, Ukrainians, Italians, Polish, Russians, Armenians, Spanish, Bulgarians, Greeks, Negroes and Americas; conducts Russian, Slovak, Ukrainian and Jewish Communist language schools and about 130 elementary and higher schools for children in order to counteract "capitalistic" and "nationalistic" public school tendencies.' (169)

'After another offering of a shilling, I queried the Demuth woman regarding Marx's religious inclinations. She said "'e was a God-fearing man.'"

I gathered that Marx had often gone on Saturdays to a Jewish temple in the Maidenhead section of London. Sometimes, when his ailment had bothered him too severely (using the exact words of the Demuth woman), "he prayed alone in his room, before a row of lit candles, tying sort of a tape measure around his forehead.'" (170) [-]

References

(141) Edward Hallett Carr, 1958, *'A History of Soviet Russia: Socialism in One Country 1924-1926'*, Vol. I, 1st Edition, MacMillan: New York, pp. 528-529

(142) Gerald Abraham, 1943, *'Eight Soviet Composers'*, 1st Edition, Oxford University Press: New York, p. 61, n. 1

(143) Valentin Gonzalez, Julian Gorkin, Trans: Ilsa Barea, 1952, *'El Campesino: Life and Death in Soviet Russia'*, 1st Edition, G. P. Putnam's Sons: New York, pp. 111-112

(144) Ariadna Tyrkova-Williams, 1919, *'From Liberty to Brest-Litovsk: The First Year of the Russian Revolution'*, 1st Edition, MacMillan: London, p. 43. It should be once again noted that the Social-Revolutionaries, or SRs, were a different and competing socialist party to the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks.

(145) Ibid, pp. 298-299. I have marked this quotation as unreliable, because it seems to reference the *'Commissar Lists'*, which were widely believed at the time the work was written and published, but which subsequently have been debunked by scholars as being without value.

(146) Victorin Moltchanoff, 1972, *'The Last White General'*, Regional Oral History Office: The University of California at Berkeley, p. 37

(147) Ivan Stenbock-Fermor, 1986, *'Memoirs of Life in Old Russia, World War I, Revolution, and in Emigration'*, Regional Oral History Office: The University of California at Berkeley, p. 97. I have not been able to find this comment of Lenin's in a brief review of Lenin's published work, but I have decided to let it stand on the grounds that it doesn't sound uncharacteristic of Lenin's writings but we should remember that it is not an authenticated quote and could very well be something attributed to Lenin that he did not say or write. On p. 182 we also read Stenbock-Fermor recalling something similar, but this time suggesting that Trotsky is the one who had a genius for organization: hence it may just be that Stenbock-Fermor is transliterating the meaning of Lenin's comment regard Trotsky to Jewish Bolsheviks in general. We should also note that Stenbock-Fermor is generally pro-Jewish in the transcript of his oral memoirs and even suggests at one point that the Virgin Mary was a *'Jew girl'* (and hence Jews should be accepted).

(148) Ibid, p. 192

(149) Ibid, pp. 256-257

- (150) Ibid, pp. 381-282
- (151) Freda Utey, 1940, *'The Dream We Lost: Soviet Russia Then and Now'*, 1st Edition, John Day: New York, p. 16
- (152) Ibid, p. 62
- (153) Ibid, p. 102
- (154) Ibid, p. 229
- (155) Stuart Chase, Robert Dunn, Rexford Guy Tugwell (Eds.), 1928, *'Soviet Russia in the Second Decade: A Joint Survey by the Technical Staff of the First American Trade Union Delegation'*, 1st Edition, John Day: New York, p. 151
- (156) Martha Bradshaw (Ed.), 1954, *'Soviet Theaters 1917 – 1941'*, 1st Edition, Research Program on the U.S.S.R.: New York, p. 174
- (157) Abraham Heller, 1922, *'The Industrial Revival in Soviet Russia'*, 1st Edition, Thomas Seltzer: New York, p. 41
- (158) Kurt London, Eric Bensinger (Trans.), 1938, *'The Seven Soviet Arts'*, 1st Edition, Yale University Press: New Haven, p. 149
- (159) Helen Lazareff, Pierre Lazareff, 1956, *'The Soviet Union after Stalin'*, 1st Edition, Philosophical Library: New York, pp. 209-210
- (160) Ibid, p. 210
- (161) Ibid, p. 211
- (162) Elizabeth Dilling, 1934, *'The Red Network: A "Who's Who" and Handbook of Radicalism for Patriots'*, 1st Edition, Self-Published: Chicago, p. 16
- (163) Ibid, p. 99
- (164) Ibid, p. 130
- (165) Ibid, p. 140. Out of those Dilling mentions as being members of the national committee two are certainly jewish: Martin Abern (formerly Martin Abramowitz) and Max Schachtman. While one, Maurice Spector, was probably jewish given that he later worked for the Labour Zionist movement. So three out of eight members (or 37.5%) of the national committee as outlined by Dilling were/was jewish at the time she wrote.
- (166) Ibid, p. 145
- (167) Ibid, p. 148
- (168) Ibid, p. 161
- (169) Ibid, p. 178
- (170) S. M. Riis, 1962, *'Karl Marx: Master of Fraud'*, 1st Edition, Robert Speller & Sons: New York, p. 11. When Riis speaks of the *'Demuth woman'* he is speaking of Helene Demuth: Karl Marx's long time maid and mistress who was gifted to Marx's wife, Jenny von Westphalen, by her mother. I have marked this quote as potentially unreliable as Riis' testimony, although rather obscure, has not been used or credited by any biographer of Marx of whom I am aware. Also Riis doesn't provide any evidence that the woman he talked to was really Helene Demuth (who had died in 1890 although Riis originally published *'Karl Marx'* in the 1920s, which still stretches the timeline quite a bit).

Sources on Jews and Communism (Appendix II)

Friday, 21 May 2010

Appendix II

Jews in the Comintern 1919-1943

The below tables have been taken from Peter Huber, 1998, '*Structure of the Moscow apparatus of the Comintern and decision-making*' in Tim Rees, Andrew Thorpe (Eds.), 1998, '*International Communism and the Communist International 1919-1943*', 1st Edition, Manchester University Press: Manchester, pp. 41-64. Since it would be impossible to reproduce the tables as they are presented by Huber: I have changed their format slightly as to show the same information but in a manner more suited to being published on a forum or a blog.

We should additionally note that these tables are limited in what they tell us in so far as some of the surveys conducted by the Comintern on their staff had separate categories for jews and others did not. These surveys also relied on the self-identification of a jew as being jewish rather than say being Russian or Estonian (i.e. if a jew identified themselves as a Russian then they were held to be Russian by the Comintern survey): hence making the lists the bare minimum number of jews, by which we mean in this instance an individual who has at least one jewish grandparent, who were involved with the surveying Comintern departments.

Of the tables that Huber produces only two include '*jewish*' as a nationality, this is unfortunate as it leaves many interesting questions unanswered as Huber himself points out on p. 44, these are tables 3.2 (*Apparatus staff according to nationality, 1933*) and 3.7 (*Members of the restructured Liaison service (S.S) in 1940*). (1) Despite these limitations however these tables allow us to gain some insight into what occurred to jews working in the Comintern between 1933 and 1940: it also allows us to reasonably suggest that if the Comintern conforms to the general pattern, regarding the amount of jews in the higher and responsible echelons of the Soviet state and the Bolshevik party in 1917, the amount of jews in the Comintern in 1919 would have been either higher or roughly equal to the number of jews in the Comintern in 1933. (2)

The reason for this decline in the number of jews can be reasonably ascribed to two causes: the need to have less jewish personnel in the Comintern to counter the '*counter-revolutionary*'/'*reactionary*' argument that Bolshevism was a jewish conspiracy (which was by 1933 a major impediment to the spread of communism among the '*working class*') and racial conflict/competition between the different racial and sub-racial groups within the Comintern (best exemplified perhaps in Stalin's use of the NKVD to '*purge*' the Comintern, and old radicals in general, of those he perceived to be politically or ideologically dangerous of whom a significant proportion were jews [although one of the heads of the NKVD at this time, Yagoda, was a jew]). (3)

Table 3.2 (*Apparatus staff according to nationality, 1933*)

Nationality %

Russian 47.3
Jewish 13.4

German 9.1
 Latvian 5.7
 French 3.6
 English 3.2
 Hungarian 2.7
 Polish 2.7
 Other 12.3

This table is self-explanatory and very suggestive in that a significant 13.4% of Comintern staff self-identified as jewish and there were doubtless many other jews within the Comintern staff who did not identify as jews and hence ascribed their nationality as something other than jewish. It clearly indicates the overrepresentation of the jews in the Comintern apparatus in 1933 before the 'purge' of the Comintern began.

Table 3.7 (*Members of the restructured Liaison service (S.S) in 1940*)

Name D.O.B Nationality Joined CPSU Joined SS Comments

K I Blinov 1901 Russian 1932 1938 Instructor
 A E Voroncov 1914 Russian Non-party 1940
 A I Kogan 1908 Jewish 1930 1939

Sector I

Z G Kac 1913 Jewish 1932 1938 Instructor
 I M Korsun 1912 Russian 1939 1938 Instructor
 A S Blinov 1906 Russian 1932 1937 Instructor
 I I Bojkov 1910 Russian 1931 1937 Instructor
 S E El'bert 1908 Ukrainian 1939 1937 Secretary

Sector 2

M A Gel'fand 1909 1939 1940 Head of Sector 2

Sector 3

Ya M Zysman 1886 1917 1936 Head of Sector 3
 G M Kazakov 1904 Russian 1924 1937 Instructor

Book-keeping

M Z Basmakov 1892 Russian 1917 1938
 P Ch Mezis 1887 Latvian 1920
 A N Nikonenko 1895 Russian 1924 1930
 G P Meskov 1898 Russian 1939 1939

Sector 'S'

A K Nikolaev 1900 Russian 1920 1938 Head of Sector
E M Dimitrova 1902 Bulgarian 1926 1938
V I Sazonov 1911 Russian 1931 1938
M A Aronova 1911 Ukrainian 1926 1940

Sector 4

I A Baranov 1912 Russian 1939 1940 Head of Sector
I V Potemkin 1900 1938 1938
I P Vugrecov 1899 Russian Non-party 1938
T M Medvedev 1892 Russian 1918 1936
I I Kazinik 1909 Belorussian 1925 1939
N I Krjuk 1915 Ukrainian 1930 1938

Sector 5

D K Pavlov 1895 Russian 1919 1937 Head of Sector
I N Voroncov 1908 Russian 1932 1938
A A Maslov 1911 Russian 1933 1937

Sector 6

A A Samoilov 1889 Russian 1920 1927 Head of Sector
A E Guseva 1899 Russian 1920 1938
E D Muraveva 1910 Russian 1940 1938

Sector 7

M A Orlov 1910 Russian 1932 1938 Head of Sector
V A Egorov 1910 Russian 1932 1938
M M Sysoev 1909 Russian 1931 1938
A V Vorobev 1910 Russian 1938 1940
G D Petrov 1910 Russian Non-party 1940
I P Peicev 1901 Bulgarian 1920 (CPBU) 1930
V F Masanov 1898 Russian Non-party 1932
M G Kostin 1906 Russian 1931 1940
I A Rudiaga 1912 Ukrainian 1931 1936

Sector 8

K V Cechlov 1911 Russian 1939 1938 Head of Sector
F M Elizarov 1907 Russian 1931 1938
E P Nedosivina 1905 Russian 1927 1938

Sector 9

E A Bukatin 1907 Russian 1925 1932 Head of Sector
A V Zimin 1907 Russian 1937 1939 Engineer
V M Savickaia 1909 Russian 1940 1934 Engineer
E K Majorova 1906 Russian 1928 1938 Engineer

Sector 10

P K Capurin 1909 Russian 1932 1940 Head of Sector
I St Sustrow 1904 Russian 1926 1940
V S Dubinin 1915 Russian 1936 1939

Out of Moscow

Ja Podchaliusin 1913 Russian 1938 1938
L V Masukov 1910 Russian 1932 1938
K I Cirkov 1904 Russian 1925 1940
G A Frumnin 1904 Russian 1925 1940
S Choznev 1913 Kazakh 1934 1937
V V Slynev 1907 Russian 1930 1939
S A Georgiev 1902 Bulgarian 1925 1930

Table 3.7 indicates to us that after the 'purge' of 1934-1939 the Comintern had a lot less jews in it than in 1933. Although Tables 3.3 and 3.7 aren't directly comparable: they do however give us an idea of how much the percentage of jews was decreased in the Comintern by the 'purge'. (4) While, of course, there maybe unrecognised jews in table 3.7: it still remains that a clear majority of those involved in this arm of the Comintern were likely Russians and not jews. In essence we have to recognise that the connection between jews and bolshevism is not as clear as it might at first seem.

References

- (1) Huber points out on p. 64 n. 41 that this list excludes 8 administrative personnel.
- (2) To see this pattern in action then one needs only note the steady decrease in the numbers of jews in the Politburo i.e. 1917: 5 out of 7 (Kamenev, Lenin, Sokolnikov, Trotsky and Zionviev); 1921: 4 out of 8 (Kamenev, Lenin, Trotsky and Zionviev); (start of) 1926: 3 out of 14 (Kamenev, Trotsky and Zionviev); (end of) 1926: 1 out of 14 (Zionviev); 1927: 1 out of 17 (Kaganovich); 1930: 1 out of 15 (Kaganovich); 1934: 1 out of 15 (Kaganovich).
- (3) For a detailed account of the NKVD's 'purge' of the Comintern please see William Chase, 2001, *'Enemies within the Gates? The Comintern and the Stalinist Repression, 1934-1939'*, 1st Edition, Yale University Press: New Haven.
- (4) We should also note that in anti-Semitic literature on the bolshevik revolution: you often find much material being purported regarding its early years as there is much information, although a significant part of it is not correct, about the role of jews in Bolshevism at that time, but the longer we travel into the history of the USSR the less we find that anti-Semitic authors are able

to say about the role of jews in bolshevism. Anti-Semitic authors, such as Frank Britton, are usually forced to scrounge for tit-bits, using the (heavily jewish) spy rings for the USSR of the 1950s, to continue the jews and bolshevism thesis into, and beyond, the 1940s. Anti-Semites in general need to purport a more realistic view of the Soviet Union in acknowledging that while it was significantly jewish during its early period: that influence waned drastically as time went on due in the main to racial conflict/competition between jews and Slavs, which the latter seems to have won.

Sources on Jews and Communism (Part IX)

Monday, 24 May 2010

Part IX

'The greater part of the guard was dispatched to the Front: only two shifts remained. One was almost entirely composed of Jews. It was even called "the Jewish Guard." The majority of these Jews treated us very well, and individual Red Guards showed a great understanding, and openly condemned the executions.' (171) [+]

'Our courier, or interpreter, or whatever he was, kept his eye on us sharply for the rest of the journey. He was a young Jew, typical of a multitude of others who were thriving under the service of the Soviet Government, for they seem to have a peculiar facility for adapting themselves to conditions under which the ordinary man sinks. I was old enough to have been his father, and found his rudeness almost unbearable. He was constantly breaking into conversation with my wife, and he was amazingly lacking in common sense. His chief aim seemed to be to pump absurd propaganda into the ears of strangers.' (172) [+]

'As we were leaving the hotel for a walk through the city, a young Jew by the name of Feinberg stopped us at the door. There seemed to be no way of dodging these interpreters.' (173) [+]

'There entered an American Jew with a red badge in his buttonhole which showed him to be a member of the Communist party. I went over to him and found that he was holding forth to two of the Americans about the blessings of Soviet rule.' (174) [+]

'I gather from what I have heard in the famine districts. The speculators, often Jewish, in the provinces have fought shy of administrative positions, and have preferred instead to capture the less arduous and more profitable jobs in charge of Soviet warehouses and stores. The notorious "Soviet mice" who eat the corn in the Government stores, not to speak of other food-stuffs, wares, and goods, still flourish in these provincial places.' (175) [+]

'The number of Jews in the Foreign Office and the Soviet institutions I called at, is extraordinary. It is exceptional in Moscow to find anybody there in an at all responsible post who is not of that race.' (176) [+]

'Few people ventured to be so outspoken as this, for everybody feared the four or five

Communists who were attached to the regiment to eavesdrop and report any remarks detrimental to the Bolsheviks. One of these Communists was a Jew, a rare occurrence in the rank and file of the army. He disappeared when the regiment was moved to the front, doubtless having received another job of a similar nature in a safe spot in the rear. The only posts in the Red army held in any number by Jews are the political posts of commissars. One reason why there appear to be so many Jews in the Bolshevik administration is that they are nearly all employed in the rear, particularly those departments (such as of food, propaganda and public economy) which are not concerned with fighting. It is largely to the ease with which Jewish Bolsheviks evade military service, and the arrogance some of them show toward the Russians whom they openly despise, that the intense hatred of the Jew and the popular belief in Russia that Bolshevism is a Jewish "put-up" are due. There are, of course, just as many Jews who oppose the Bolsheviks, and many of those are lying in prison. ' (177) [+]

'The singers had studiously rehearsed, the execution was excellent, the enthusiasm they aroused was unbounded, and they were recalled again and again. They would probably have gone on endlessly had not the Jewish agitator, who was acting as master of ceremonies and who had to make a speech later, announced that they must get along with the programme. ' (178) [+]

'Intellectuality in the party has always been represented largely, though by no means exclusively, by Jews, who dominate the Third International, edit the Soviet journals, and direct propaganda. It must never be forgotten, however, that there are just as many Jews who are opposed to Bolshevism, only they cannot make their voice heard. ' (179) [+]

'In discussing with the Bolsheviks, out of official hours, the internal Russian situation, the Lithuanians asked how, in the view of the universal misery and lack of liberty, the Communists continued to maintain their dominance. To which a prominent Bolshevik leader laconically replied: "Our power is based on three things: first, on Jewish brains; secondly, on Lettish and Chinese bayonets; and thirdly, on the crass stupidity of the Russian people." ' (180) [+]

'The Social-Democratic members were, however, mostly Jews or Georgians; and this predominance of the foreign element was greatly strengthened when the Bolshevik leaders returned to Russia. ' (181)

'The next day I made the acquaintance of my fellow travellers, an elderly Russian from Dvinsk, a Pole and a barely twenty-year-old Jew just home from exile in a threadbare suit of blue cheviot and broken boots, but with eyes that were fire. He was an Under-Commissar in the food distribution bureau at Petrograd, he said. ' (182) [+]

'The first room I came into harboured "The Third Internationale Executive and Agitation Committee of Bjelof for the Propagation of Bolshevistic Ideas among the Prisoners of War in Russia." Here sat a Hungarian, and a Viennese Jew, but evidently they were not the ones I was to see. The corridor on the first floor was full of people. They were petitioners and persons waiting to see the head commissar of Bjelof, sent out by the Soviets' central committee in Moscow – Mr. Rosenfeld, the very man I wished to get in touch with. As it was still in those when a foreigner in Russia commanded just so much respect as he demanded, I went past the whole mob right into the audience room.

There were six or seven persons in the place, and it was a little while before I got my bearings. Two soldiers sat on a bed, with their rifles between their boots, and smoked cigarettes, and another man in a soldier's cape lay in a corner and slept loudly on a pile of cartridge belts. A pale man, with a face like yellow peas, sat at a small table on which there was a typewriter, and ate soup. In the middle of the room a man, whom I supposed to be Rosenfeld, without a collar and wearing long boots, was conferring with two tousled youths in the black blouses of the Russian Intelligentsia. Rosenfeld was a fattish Jew of about 35-40 years. I drew his attention to me by handing him a glazed card with all the titles which a foreigner travelling in Russia does not disdain to claim. Rosenfeld willingly let himself be impressed, he overwhelmed me with politeness and excuses for the untidiness of the place, with bows and noble gestures. He personally took a machine gun off an armchair that I might sit down. He was apparently figuring out something else while he studied me and my errand. The man with the soup was set to click off a flattering letter of introduction for me and Rosenfeld gave all my papers his personal vise. ' (183) [+]

'It was already growing light when I was wakened and presented for the commissar, a young Jew with a highly sympathetic personality, and for his adjutant who quite the opposite was a highly sinister person, no doubt a Pole, who looked as if he might very well be his own executioner also. ' (184) [+]

'The President of the soviet and the Commandant of the two – he combined the two offices – was a Red Jew who had some manufactured name which I have forgotten. His age was uncertain. ' (185) [+]

'One surprise of this Revolution of surprises was the extraordinary influx of Jews into Petrograd and the prohibited towns and districts when the victory of the people was assured. ' (186) [+]

'If Witte had made his proposal sooner – it might have met with a different reception. But now – now the Jewish cause is indissolubly bound up with the revolutionary Bund. The Jews will owe their emancipation to force, and they will see to it that the fore is sufficient to burst their bonds and give them all their rights. ' (187) [+]

'You see, we were in the Russian Social Democratic Labor Party, but there were various organizations of the Jews. The Marxist non-Zionist organization of Jews was the Bund. Abramovich was a leading man with the Mensheviks, but was also a leader of the Bund. But then there were two Zionist socialist parties, one called the Socialist Zionists (Sotsialist sionisty), ideologically like the SR's, and then there were the Poaleitsion, which means in Hebrew "the workers of Zion." I think they had a Marxist orientation, but the difference between them and the Bund was that the Bund did not believe in Zionism. ' (188) [+J]

'After the talk there was a discussion in which I participated. My main opponent was Iurii Petrovich Figatner, quite a remarkable man, a Bolshevik, an old revolutionary, Jewish, about then years older than I. He had something to do with the Kislovodosk Soviet. ' (189) [+J]

'In the summer of 1900, Mendel Rosenbaum, a Russian of Jewish extraction, who had been

captured at the frontier in October, 1898, attempting to import prohibited literature, thrown into prison, and removed to the provinces as a preliminary to Siberian exile, managed to escape to Switzerland with the aid of a small sum granted from a special fund raised by the Society of Friends of Russian Freedom.' (190)

References

- (171) K. Alinin, 1920, *'Tche-ka: The Story of the Bolshevik Extraordinary Commission'*, 1st Edition, Russian Liberation Committee: London, p. 52
- (172) Alexander Schwartz, 1921, *'The Voice of Russia'*, 1st Edition, E. P. Dutton: New York, p. 22
- (173) Ibid, p. 39
- (174) Carl Bechhofer, 1921, *'Through Starving Russia: Being the Record of a Journey to Moscow and the Volga Provinces in August and September 1921'*, 1st Edition, Methuen: London, p. 24
- (175) Ibid, pp. 107-108. I have marked this quote as potentially problematic, because Bechhofer seems to be repeating hearsay as opposed to what he had himself observed or knew to be true.
- (176) Ibid, p. 139
- (177) Paul Dukes, 1922, *'Red Dusk and the Morrow: Adventures and Investigations in Red Russia'*, 1st Edition, Self-Published: New York, pp. 228-229. It should be noted that Sir Paul Dukes was the former Chief of the British Secret Intelligence Service in Soviet Russia when he wrote this book.
- (178) Ibid, p. 256
- (179) Ibid, p. 283
- (180) Ibid, p. 316
- (181) E. H. Wilcox, 1919, *'Russia's Ruin'*, 1st Edition, Chapman & Hall: London, pp. 159-160. It should be noted that Wilcox had been the Petrograd correspondent of *'The Daily Telegraph'* in 1917.
- (182) Henning Kehler, Frithjof Toksvig (Trans.), 1922, *'The Red Garden'*, 1st Edition, Alfred A. Knopf: New York, p. 16
- (183) Ibid, pp. 37-38
- (184) Ibid, p. 90
- (185) Ibid, p. 148
- (186) Stinton Jones, 1917, *'Russia in Revolution: Being the Experiences of an Englishman in Petrograd during the Upheaval'*, 1st Edition, McBride, Nast & Company, p. 274
- (187) Emile Joseph Dillon, 1918, *'The Eclipse of Russia'*, 1st Edition, J. M. Dent: Paris, pp. 6-7
- (188) Jacob Marschak, 1971, *'Recollections of Kiev and the Northern Caucasus, 1917-1918'*, Regional Oral History Office: The University of California at Berkeley, p. 19
- (189) Ibid, p. 35
- (190) George Perris, 1905, *'Russia in Revolution'*, 1st Edition, Chapman & Hall: London, p. 65

The Rabbinical Roundup: This Week among the Jews (W/C: 24/05/2010)

Sunday, 30 May 2010

Week Commencing: 24/05/2010

This week Yahweh's little darlings have certainly been making their big shyster in the sky proud. We have had an abundance of events within the jewish community worldwide that deserve comment, but, of course, we can unfortunately only pick a few of the juiciest and most revealing of these howls of protest or sweaty hands being rubbed in expectation of a large payout of the latest jewish scam to talk about.

First this week we come to a classic theme among the jews: 'holocaust' reparations. (1) Now you and I wouldn't think to claim back all the valuables that were stolen by someone else's ancestors from ours on the grounds that it has been too long for justice to be served. This, of course, simply doesn't apply to the jews, or so they seem to think, as we have situation where the jews; not content with getting billions of dollars for reparations both to 'holocaust survivor' organisations, who then proceed to steal the money from their fellow jews being the jews that they are [promptly claiming that they need that extra townhouse in New York City for their romps with prostitutes], and to Israel are claiming just this: that they want all their old possessions back (with interest). This we should note is both in the form of direct payment and payment in kind. Now as if the jews haven't been given enough money for alleged atrocities that supposedly killed uncle Moshe who suddenly turned up after the war and wrote a best-selling biography of his 'experiences' in a camp he never visited. (2) They have decided that their next victim for 'holocaust' reparations should be Eastern Europe as after all they've drained the rest of Europe dry and are still trying to get even more money out of Germany despite having asserted, like any good blackmailer or con-artist that last time was truly the last [and I am sure this time will also be *'the last'* as well].

This has taken the shape of various '*U.S. lawmakers*'; read jewish stool-pigeons hoping for the highly organised jewish lobby to give them some gravy off of the train come their re-election races (3), demanding that Eastern Europeans give the jews anything they want and if necessary change their domestic laws to appease the devil's children. This indicated by the fact that a jew, one Stuart Eizenstat, is the handler (well sorry his fancy job title is; '*Special Advisor on Holocaust Issues*') for the U.S. Secretary of State. The World Jewish Congress reported that some Eastern European countries had been so ungrateful as to not just fork over whatever the jews wanted and were actually demanding some kind of proof (oy vey!) or were asserting, rightly I think we can reasonably add, that the present owners of the property have the actual right to and over it. After all if this was not the case then I dare say the jews could lay the claim to any building in the old jewish quarter of any city where there was an anti-jewish rising or the jews were kicked out by an ungrateful population for doing such lovely things as charging extortionate interest, shady business dealings, ritually-murdering children, attacking Christian churches, committing fraud, embezzling local dignitaries' funds etc ad infinitum. (4) Can you imagine that ambulance-chaser industry? If you think the jews have a gravy train going with the '*holocaust industry*', so aptly termed by the jew Norman Finkelstein (5), then try imagine the potential gravy trail they could have with a more general '*anti-Semitism industry*'. It would be Exodus all over again.

We even have Eizenstat singling out Poland, Romania and Lithuania as being tardy on sending their annual tribute to the jews and it is evident that the jews are enforcing their demands for

tribute by forcing submission and support from all Polish political parties on this issue. One wonders what the jews have on them to force that kind of obedience, but we will probably never know. Whatever it is it is probably quite shocking otherwise the jew wouldn't be able to drag all the Poles around by their proverbial nose rings as they have been doing.

In related a related news story of about a year ago the jews decided that Lithuania had not been sufficiently subservient to the self-appointed rulers of the universe and commenced an operation to '*persuade*' Lithuania to give up their annual tribute to their masters. (6) What was Lithuania's crime you might ask? Well it was offering to pay the jews fifty-two million dollars in reparations for '*lost property*' etc. Now you might further ask: why is the jew quibbling over that? The answer; I am afraid, is rather predictable: the jew wants more money. The World Jewish Congress after bemoaning the alleged loss of 150,000 and 200,000 jews to the 'holocaust' (not defined of course) makes its real reasons for howling to the world and brandishing their late grandfather's funny bone to the world abundantly clear. I quote:

'Alperovitch and Lauder said that "a better plan was negotiated between the former Government and the Jewish Community. It would have led to the return of previously Jewish communal properties."'

So all they are after is more money. It isn't because they actually care if 150,000 to 200,000 Lithuanian jews died, for if they simply cared they would seek closure not act like the jewish mafia extorting governments apparently at will, but because they have bills to pay, mistresses to please, egos to sooth and you can't forget that a jew must have that ever so expensive kosher food. After all its better for you according to jewish nutritionists: right?

Before we leave the jews to waddle into the night it is important to note that the President of the World Jewish Congress, from whose website we graciously take our sourcing for this section, Ronald S. Lauder also happens to be the President of World Jewish Restitution Organization (WRJO) who are the enterprising jews who demand to be paid more than fifty-two million dollars in hush money. For the sake of completeness we should note that Simon Alperovitch is the President of the Jewish Community in Lithuania and has no doubt been offered his '*cut*' by Lauder. After all what would the jewish world be without corruption and kick-backs: right?

Next we had the Obama administration, that is riddled with jews largely of the socialist and/or communist persuasion rather than the hard-line Zionists found in the former administration of George W. Bush, holding its first ever '*Jewish America Heritage Month*'. (7) You guessed it folks: the glitzy glamour of the chimp in the Whitehouse attracted more than its fair share of prominent hook-nosed rotund waddling members of the tribe. The news, as reported by the Jewish Telegraphic Agency, tells us inadvertently how much the jews in power love Obama, while the jews who aren't in power hate his guts because they want their goy-puppet to win next time. Attending our monkey-pretending-to-be-a-President were two jews of particular note: Lee Rosenberg; Head of the (extremely powerful) American Israel Public Affairs Committee (better known by its acronym: AIPAC) and Alan Solow; Chair of the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations. To be honest: I rather think that the chimp was flattered to be attended by two of the most powerful jews in America at the present time.

Rosenberg and Solow's relationship to the monkey in the Whitehouse was also outlined further in the article when it stated as almost as an incidental that: *'both also happen to have been major fund-raisers for Obama's campaign, as were several others among the 250 or so in attendance.'* Did somebody just let the cat out of the bag on who not only allowed but actively supported Obama's rise to become the Chosen's favourite marionette? I think they just did. Whoops-a-daisy: eh JTA?

Not only does the article by the JTA let the cat out of the bag regarding Obama's backers, but it also directly implies the extent of jewish power when it states: *'Obama presented an array of Jewish heroes and celebrities who pronouncedly defied Jewish stereotypes. In addition to the major givers, the entrepreneurs and the communal leaders, there were also sports heroes - - including Sandy Koufax - veterans, non-profit innovators, journalists, actors and organizers.'*

This statement all but trumpets the fact that firstly jews obey certain stereotypes; perhaps Ron Kampeas would agree that this implies that jews are indeed self-centred little beings, inclined to usury and view themselves as superior to just about everything else in the world including each other most of the time, and that it is a relative rarity for jews to not be within these given stereotypes (hence *'pronouncedly defying jewish stereotypes'*). It also implies that there stereotypes are negative and that therefore jews need to break with them.

In this vein the article also later suggests that the particular stereotype to be targeted was jews in the United States military. This might be slightly puzzling to some readers, but military circles have long been adverse to jews and have long held to the, correct, belief that jews are by nature cowardly and prefer to skulk behind the lines than actually go into battle. (8) This may be challenged in the modern era by the IDF (it should however be noted that the IDF is largely a paper tiger), but it is also indisputably true that jews have historically avoid physical conflict as much as possible and have been disproportionally found, when found in the military at all, in behind the lines units unless forced to fight at the front by for example the Russian Tsars.

Are the jews cowardly? Well you need only to read your Old Testament to find out that they are indeed so. They will happily massacre just about anyone, but as long as they don't suffer themselves and predictably being the Semites they are: they never ever *'fight fair'*. So why should we?

Anyway back, from our slight diversion, to Ron Kampeas' statement and its implications: he indirectly tells us that those jews who gathered to smirk as their pet monkey did handstands for their amusement were an elite group from all the different parts of the American establishment and are able to mould opinion in that they are so important as to be invited to have a photo opportunity with 'our' President. Does this not directly imply that jews are at least substantial force inside what we may term the *'elite of America'*? (9)

Of course it does, but of course Kampeas would never actually say that being the good observant jew that he is, but he can certainly imply it so all his jewish readers can snicker and smirk behind their salesmen smiles and all the gullible goyim can say *'Oh isn't that nice: I am pleased for you Mr. Goldberg'*.

In other news, this time from the world's first postage stamp-sized terrorist state, the Israeli government has '*rejected*' even taking part in a conference designed to de-escalate the situation in the Middle East by mutually agreeing to dispose of nuclear weapons. (10) The Israelis, of course, claimed that the talks were '*deeply flawed*', '*hypocritical*' and '*ignored the realities of the Middle East and the real threats facing the region*'. This is obviously rather absurd as Israel is the only country in the Middle East to actually have nuclear weapons capacity and has acted unilaterally to stop its rivals gaining nuclear capability to defend themselves via a Mutually Assured Destruction (or M.A.D.) scenario. It can only be likened to the jews refusing to play with the same toys as everyone else and demanding that the jews, as Yahweh's little darlings, be given all the best toys while everyone else gets old toys and when somebody tries to get a new toy: the jew steals it from them and jumps up and down on it. We note in passing that other '*rogue states*', such as Iran (public enemy number one if you believe Israeli propaganda), have signed this accord to try to achieve a de-escalation of the arms-race in the Middle East, but yet the jews refuse to play fair. So I repeat once again: why should we '*play fair*' with the jews?

In related news the Simon Wiesenthal Center in a press release detailed its annual '*National Tribute Dinner*' to which it coaxed most of the leading financiers, owners and CEOs in the media industry to attend. Among those in attendance without hook-noses were Russell Crowe and Mary Hart (who is only a convert to Judaism). (11) Ron Howard, Brian Glazer and Hans Zimmer: I have not been able to confirm the biological origin of aside from rumours that they may be jewish. One notes that all those present from the media industry were either jews or those who have worked so closely with jews, such as Brad Grey, that they may as well be.

The SWC, in its infinite wisdom, as the new Temple of Solomon in New York City, was holding a bit of a celebrity bash to replenish its rather depleted funding after the antics of fellow members of the tribe at the stock exchange and the commercial banks, whose depleted status perhaps risks uncovering all the corruption and rather odd '*expense*' claims. So predictably the SWC's '*higher management*' wants to conceal this fact from its Israelite financial backers, Burt Sugarman, Brett Ratner and Michael Milkin, who it is trying to dupe into giving it even more money to spend. This is revealed in the presentation of a '*Medal of Valor*' to one Monsieur Le Maire Aristide Pelissier who, as mayor of the French town of Les Brunels, hide one of the SWC's Israelite backers, one Esther Lieberman, from the horrid Germans who wanted to do something so horrible as to call her account for crimes against humanity. We can't have jews being held to account now can we? What would the world be coming to if we did? Sanity: perhaps? It is clear from this award is being give as a fop to Lieberman in order to encourage here to part with even more of her ill-gotten gains which the SWC can spend on '*management conferences*', '*training*' and the odd '*extra service*' at a hotel.

In addition to providing a front to con their fellow members of the tribe out of yet more of their ill-gotten gains: the SWC recognised its fundamental role in promoting destructive racial mixing and unfounded, not to mention illogical, egalitarian dogma in doing honour to Brian Grazer and Ron Howard for producing communist-inspired films promoting '*diversity*' among everyone but the jews. The SWC's sleazy jews sat there with satanic smiles on their faces watching the gullible goyim tell all the jews how honoured they were to be given such recognition by the self-proclaimed masters of the universe. In addition the SWC honoured one Dr. Ofer Merin; an Israeli who was part of the Haiti earthquake rescue operation (why an Israeli you might ask: well

the SWC are trying to prove to the world that the Israelis aren't baby-bayoneting monsters and this is their, and in fact a common Israeli, method to try and do so) and Sir Winston Churchill, a corpulent drunk who when he wasn't living inside a bottle of the best whisky was screaming his frothing hatred of Germans at anyone who would care to listen, in gratitude for the latter's breaking the Geneva convention and deliberately killing as many German civilians as possible by bombing their houses forcing the beastly Germans to retaliate to whip up some little enthusiasm against *'the Hun'* in Britain.

I think the SWC's *'choices'* on which they have lavished their shallow praises and hollow promises on speaks volumes about them. Don't you?

Well that's enough jews in the news for this week.

Shalom!

References

(1) All details mentioned are taken from the news story; *'US lawmakers press Eastern European countries over Holocaust restitution'*, published by the World Jewish Congress on the 27th May 2010. This is available at the following address:

<http://www.worldjewishcongress.org/en/main/showNews/id/9349> [Last accessed: 30/05/2010]

(2) If you are yourself not convinced of the speciousness and lack of evidence for the conspiracy theory that is better known as the 'holocaust' then please see the excellent introductory material available at the Vrij Historisch Onderzoek website at the following address: <http://vho.org/> [Last accessed: 30/05/2010]

(3) This is implied in the fact that both the chairmen were Democrats (Senator Ben Cardin and Representative Alcee Hastings) as the Democrats are currently being expunged all over the board in their re-election races. So what better thing to do than to do something that Yahweh's little darling's hold close to their heart and give them the opportunity to con even more money out of gullible governments.

(4) Details of all the 'torments' suffered by the jews particularly in relation to their frequent expulsion can be found in any good history of the jews or of anti-Semitism. For a decent one volume summary I recommend Haim Hillel Ben-Sasson (Ed.), 1976, *'A History of the Jewish People'*, 1st Edition, Weidenfeld and Nicholson: London. However as a word of warning the book I have recommended is a substantial bit of work totalling 1170 pages, but it is shorter than any of the other major histories of the subject and represents the work of several jewish historians on the subject of jewish history and hasn't dated as badly as have many others like Simon Dubnow's two major multi-volume histories of the jews from the early twentieth century. The more technically inclined may wish to read the masterly work of Guido Kisch, 1949, *'The Jews in Medieval Germany: A Study of their Legal and Social Status'*, 1st Edition, University of Chicago Press: Chicago, which although written by a jew is actually a largely sound piece of scholarly work.

(5) Norman Finkelstein, 2001, *'The Holocaust Industry: Reflections of the Exploitation of Jewish Suffering'*, 2nd Edition, Verso: London

(6) All details mentioned are taken from the news story; *'Lithuanian restitution plan unacceptable, say Jewish leaders'*, published by the World Jewish Congress on the 16th July

2009. This is available at the following address:

<http://www.worldjewishcongress.org/en/main/showNews/id/8461> [Last accessed: 30/05/2010]

(7) All details mentioned are taken from the news story; *'Welcome to Obama's Jewish America'*, written by Ron Kampeas and published by the Jewish Telegraphic Agency on the 28th May

2010. This is available at the following address:

<http://www.jta.org/news/article/2010/05/28/2739354/israel-but-not-just-israel-welcome-to-obamas-jewish-america> [Last accessed: 30/05/2010]

(8) On this point see the extensive, although obviously pro-jewish (it was written by a jew), work: Joseph Bendersky, 2000, *'The "Jewish Threat": Anti-Semitic Politics of the U.S. Army'*, 1st Edition, Basic Books: New York. A less well known book, also written predictably by a jew, seeking to 'refute' this argument, which it predictably does not, is E. Rubin, 1952, *'140 Jewish Marshalls, Generals & Admirals'*, 1st Edition, De Vero Books: London.

(9) Although this should not be confused to mean *'high society'* as there is a distinct conflict between American *'high society'* and jews who are permanently trying to gain entrance to it via bribes and offers of marriage (but this has largely failed).

(10) All details mentioned are taken from the news story; *'Israel rejects Middle East nuclear talks plan'*, published by the BBC on the 29th May 2010. This is available at the following address: http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/middle_east/10191339.stm [Last accessed: 30/05/2010]

(11) I refer here to its press release of the 27th May 2010 entitled *'SWC 2010 National Tribute Dinner Honoring Ron Howard & Brian Grazer'*.

A Martyr to the Anti-Semitic Cause: Captain Archibald Ramsay M.P. and his 'The Nameless War'

Friday, 4 June 2010

Captain Archibald Ramsay is a figure who in many ways deserves to be far better known than he is in British political history. He can perhaps be referred to as a true idealist and a man who sacrificed greatly for what he believed in. Fortunately a decent quasi-biography of Ramsay has been written and his importance recognised by those scholars concerned with the so-called *'Nazi fifth column'* (that never actually existed) and early-mid twentieth century anti-Semitism in Britain. (1) Ramsay was even the indirect subject of a recent documentary, which unfortunately simply pilloried him without trying to explain his views. Ramsay was also the probable source of inspiration for the *'Friday Club'* and its leader; Guy Spencer, portrayed as an active National Socialist and a supporter of the British Union of Fascists, in the first series of the popular British period murder mystery drama: *'Foyle's War'*. (2)

After Ramsay's internment; due to the, shall we say, unconstitutional regulation 18b (despite being a sitting member of parliament at the time), which was aimed at the non-existent *'fifth column'*, was finished towards the end of the war. Ramsay began writing a small book cataloguing his experiences and putting forward his ideas. This project in time became the quite well-known, in anti-Semitic circles, book called *'The Nameless War'*. (3) The book itself is not very innovative as it is largely confined to a combination of putting forth Ramsay's comments on the origins of the Second World War and commenting on his internment under regulation 18b.

However Ramsay does spend quite a bit of time in the work restating his beliefs in a simple and matter of fact way, which both indicate that the author is well-read and educated as well as quite an able writer of propaganda. The fact that *'The Nameless War'* went through four editions; that I know of, in ten years from its first publication in 1952 to the fourth edition (1962); that I acquired with many other interesting volumes from Professor Revilo Oliver's estate, speaks for itself. The book itself has; to my knowledge, retained its popularity in anti-Semitic circles and is still read by British nationalists today even if Ramsay is not popular among philo-Semitic groups like the British National Party.

According to Griffiths, and to which surmise I agree on the basis of my own research, Ramsay was really a Christian anti-communist who came to anti-Semitism rather late in life as the result of his research into the origins, causes and consequences of the Bolshevik revolution. Ramsay was lead to anti-Semitism by reading such authors as the learned Denis Fahey who, also arguing from a Christian anti-communist point of view, pointed out the evidence which was then widely circulating that the origins of the Bolshevik revolution lay among the jews. We cannot reasonably or rationally condemn Ramsay for believing and arguing this to be true as it was credible information from numerous eye-witnesses that confirmed the '*jewish Bolshevik*' thesis. (4) In essence Ramsay concluded that because the Bolshevik revolution, the Comintern and the individual Bolshevik parties outside the Soviet Union were heavily influenced, or even largely controlled, by jews that therefore the problem went beyond Marx and Lenin et al, but rather to the jewish people as a whole.

While it is true that Ramsay's conclusion was largely correct: his logic does leave something to be desired in so far as Ramsay does not seem to have taken into account in his writings (or elsewhere) that there were numerous jews who were strong anti-Communists as well as those jews who were strong Communists. In essence Ramsay needed a theme to unify this disparate reality (which although he doesn't consider it he does seemed to have realised was to some degree the case) which he found; perhaps predictably at this time in history, in the Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion, which, of course, purport to be a jewish revolutionary document of grand strategy, which allowed Ramsay to argue that this dual aspect of the jews (i.e. strong anti-Communism or strong Communism) was part of the plot in the same way it had been during the French revolution with the Illuminati (per Nesta Webster's theory concerning the French Revolution, which was then very popular).

This unifying theme that Ramsay found in the Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion was something that would stay with Ramsay's writing from the Spanish Civil War; when he first read the Protocols, and his death some years after the Second World War. It tends to permeate his writing and that is true of his last book: *'The Nameless War'*. While we can criticise Ramsay's approach and use of facts what we cannot do is deny that at the time when he wrote *'The Nameless War'*: it was a cogent work based on decent references and information. It has not aged well, but then not many anti-Semitic works have because the information that they provide is representative only of what was then current academic and intellectual opinion as opposed to the information that has since become available, which unfortunately does discredit much of what Ramsay has to say in *'The Nameless War'* as well as many other anti-Semitic works. However what Ramsay does give us in *'The Nameless War'* is a poignant account of and his experiences during his imprisonment under Regulation 18b similar to those given by two other prominent

Regulation 18b detainees; Arnold Leese, in his autobiography; *'Out of Step'* (5), and Admiral Sir Barry Domville in his autobiography of his experiences after the first World War, in the inter-war period and during the Second World War; *'From Admiral to Cabin Boy'*. (6) For similar reminiscences about the disgusting conduct of other Allied governments during and after the war towards their own citizens who were so vile as to want to halt the spread of Communist barbarism, Masonic influence and/or jewish power, then please see for example Franklin Knudsen's *'I was Quisling's Secretary'*. (7)

I do not feel it would be of value to go through Ramsay's *'The Nameless War'* in any detail as it is, as I have said, largely a rehash of common pro-German, anti-Communist and anti-Semitic ideas at the period that Ramsay wrote that can be read about in more detail than Ramsay gives in numerous anti-Semitic, anti-Communist or revisionist standard works regarding the Bolshevik revolution and the lead up to and Allied/Soviet conduct of the Second World War. However whatever we may think of Ramsay's ideas with the benefit of hindsight: we cannot but admire the bravery and fortitude of a man who stood up for what he believed in and kept his priorities straight even when faced with a completely hostile situation as he found in Britain after the Second World War when it would have far easier to simply lay low and pretend to have been *'reformed'*.

So thus while we must accord Ramsay much respect: we must not let our respect for his person colour our critical judgement of *'The Nameless War'*, which while a pleasant read for any convinced anti-Semite; such as myself, is unfortunately not a cogent work of anti-Semitism, but rather its only real present value lies in the account Ramsay gives in its pages of his illegal detention under Regulation 18b.

References

- (1) Richard Griffiths, 1998, *'Patriotism Perverted: Captain Ramsay, the Right Club and British anti-Semitism 1939-1940'*, 1st Edition, Constable: London
- (2) *'Foyle's War: The White Feather'*, Season 1, Episode 2. Wikipedia claims that the inspiration was British Union of Fascists leader Sir Oswald Mosley, but I rather doubt this precisely because Ramsay was the founder of the *'Right Club'* and was thought of as an excellent speaker (like Mosley), while Mosley didn't maintain clubs in London and nor did he work with the largely aristocratic milieu that the *'Friday Club'* is portrayed as having, which the *'Right Club'* of Ramsay had.
- (3) Archibald Ramsay, 1962, *'The Nameless War'*, 4th Edition, Britons: London
- (4) I have been reproducing these numerous eye-witness testimonies and other contemporary/modern accounts of the relationship between jews and communism in my *'Sources on Jews and Communism'* series on this blog.
- (5) Arnold Leese, n.d. (probably 1951-1952), *'Out of Step: Events in the Two Lives of an Anti-Jewish Camel-Doctor'*, 1st Edition, Self-Published: Guildford
- (6) Barry Domville, 2008, [1948], *'From Admiral to Cabin Boy'*, 1st Edition, Historical Review Press: Uckfield
- (7) Franklin Knudsen, 1967, *'I was Quisling's Secretary'*, 1st Edition, Britons: London

Sources on Jews and Communism (Part X)

Friday, 4 June 2010

Part X

'Communist front will hold huge meeting at "Polo Grounds." On May 15 a meeting and demonstration, called "Salute to the Jewish State in Palestine," will be held at Polo Grounds, home of NY Giant baseball team. This meeting is another example of Communist efforts to horn in on Palestine question and exploit it for Stalin's purpose.

The front that's planning this Polo Grounds meeting is American Committee of Jewish Writers, Artists and Scientists. Among its leader are such men as Albert E Kahn, a Communist Party member who's a high officer of International Workers Order, Communist fraternal insurance society.

With Gromyko as a speaker, the American Comm of Jewish Writers, Artists and Scientists held a big "USA, USSR, Palestine friendship dinner" last Dec 30. On Nov 12 the same front held a meeting to celebrate 30th anniversary of Bolshevik Revolution in Russia.

Dr Albert Einstein has let himself be roped in as an honorary president of this front. Most of the great scientists of the world Einstein the greatest of them all. It's a pity that he doesn't recognize his lack of expertness in political questions. He isn't a Communist and in fact has expressly opposed Moscow on several matters... and yet he has been sucked into a number of Communist fronts.' (191)

'Shipler quickly picked the state of Israel as new recipient of his "award," and induced Maj Aubrey S Eban, representative of Israel and of the Jewish Agency at United Nations, to agree to come to the dinner and accept the "award" in Israel's behalf. But after learning that Marshall had rejected it, Eban did the same. He explained that he had "accepted in good faith," not knowing that his doing so might arose controversy.

Meanwhile Shipler tried to raise money on the basis of Eban's acceptance. He telegrapher some supporters of Zionism, telling them of the "award" to Israel, and asking each to contribute \$500 as cost of two tables, at \$25 per plate.' (192)

'After Marshall rejected the "award," Shipler hastily picked a substitute guest of honor. This was Maj Aubrey S Eban, representative of Israel and of the Jewish Agency at the United Nations. He was to accept a special citation to Israel. But after Eban learned of Marshall's cancellation, he cancelled, too. So Shipler got Dr Israel Goldstein, former president of Zionist Organization of America, to substitute for Eban and accept the citation. Bishop Oxnam made the presentation.' (193)

'A considerable number, though by no means a majority, of the Russian Liberals are Jews, and Russian Liberals do not at all endeavour to hide this fact. The consequence is that the union of the Russian Liberals with all the persecuted races has been all the more firmly cemented.' (194)

'It was a rude shock to be brought back to an appreciation of the fact that in the events of the day and in the new power which was ruling Russia, there was feverishly and aggressively at work an influence bitterly antagonistic to the tradition and spirit that these wonderful old buildings represented, - the influence of men who hated, despised and scorned them, - the influence of the Russian Jew.' (195) [+]

'Kerenski's famous and fatal order No. I had reached the front. My friend kept his temper and asked what authority there was, then, if the officers were deposed. "Oh, a committee runs things now." "And whom have you chose as head of your committee?" my friend asked. He was astonished to hear that the only Jew of the company had been elected chairman. "But," he expostulated in wonder, "I thought you hated this man, despised and distrusted him." "Yes," said the soldier, "we do hate him and we don't trust him at all, but you see he can talk and we can't. He understands the new order and we don't. We need a man who can talk, so we elected him."' (196) [+]

'I had been surprised at the sweeping way in which Russians had accused the Jews of being responsible for the terrors of the October revolution. I had discounted most of it as race prejudice. But what I had seen of the peasant character, which made possible such as incidents as those described in the story of the Russian officer, and the prominence of the Jews in the local Soviets in the towns I had visited, made it seem reasonable to suppose that the Jews were to play a part in the Bolshevik movement out of all proportion to their numbers. The dominance of the Jew in the affairs of Russia where he had so long been an outcast, which a year ago would have seemed a fantastic dream, now bade fair to become an accomplished fact.' (197) [+]

'The wholesale confiscation of the goods of the Burjui having provided insufficient to finance the needs of the Akmolinsk Provincial Soviet, he, along with a dozen Russians, had been arrested on the charge of having more than ten thousand rubbles in the bank. They were hauled before the governor of the province, an energetic Jew who, in spite of an exaggeratedly curt and businesslike manner, had left a favorable impression on me when I called on him. They had been suddenly offered the alternative of paying over a certain sum in cash or going to jail.' (198) [+]

'A look of steady malignity not easily forgotten flashed from under the bushy eyebrows of Geitzman, a New York Jew, whom some trick of fortune had thrown into a position of power here in the middle of Siberia, as we sat opposite him in his bare little office discussing ostensibly a question of passports, but really wondering how long the game he was playing would last, and what would be the outcome.' (199) [+]

'For nearly a month, on the other hand, on the Pacific, in Japan, and in Vladivostok I was associated with a group of twenty-two political refugees of a high type, and from them I formed some estimate of the effect the leadership of the returning revolutionists would have upon the course of the social movement in Russia. Fifteen of these persons had been arrested forty times in all, and they had served in prison an aggregate of twenty-two years. Five of them had been exiled to Siberia and had spent there altogether five years. None of them had committed any deed contrary to American law. They were persecuted for engaging in socialist propaganda and for organizing workingmen. But for two Letts, all the party were Jews. None of them was over

thirty-five years of age, and most of them, after several years' residence in the United States, had not passed the late twenties.' (200) [+]

'An acquaintance of mine, who took particular interest in these returning delegations, told me that there seemed to be a preponderance of Jews among these immigrants, but that they included exponents of every conceivable theory of government, misgovernment and anarchy.' (201) [+]

'Hundreds of young people flock to the university towns who have only so far enjoyed a very superficial education in the schools and colleges and clerical seminaries of provincial towns. In the country they go to the high schools, science and technical institutes, with the intention of gaining further development to fit themselves for the learned and practical professions. To these are joined the Jews and the foreign nations in the south of the empire, and particularly countless Jewesses from Poland and South Russia, who throng to the courses given in the girls' high schools. These form the Radical element.' (202) [J]

'That resolution was sent to Trotzky, the Peoples' Commissaire for Foreign Affairs; Trotzky was at Brest-Litovsk negotiating a separate peace, and his assistant, a Russian Jew named Zalkend, forwarded the resolution to me saying he felt it his duty to do so.' (203) [+]

"I have just been called to the phone and heard that Smolny Institute, Bolshevik Headquarters, has formally announced that a revolution similar to that in Russia has begun in Germany. The Bolshevik leaders here, most of whom are Jews and 90 per cent of whom are returned exiles, care little for Russia or any other country but are internationalists and they are trying to start a worldwide social revolution.' (204) [+]

'At this time the Bolshevik Government at Moscow had a representative at Vologda in the person of Vosnesenski, who occupied the position of Chief of the Far Eastern Division in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Vosnesenski was a shrewd Jew.' (205) [+]

*'Among the prominent Stakhanovite workers we find many Jews like Blidman, Khenkin, Yussim and others, whose names are known all over the country. Jewish Red Army men who took part in the battles at Lake Hassan were among those decorated by the Soviet Government for their heroism and devotion. Jewish names are among those of the Heroes of the Soviet Union, as well as among those of the Deputies to the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. and the Supreme Soviets of the Union Republics.' (206) [*J]*

*'Among the builders of Birobidjan is the Lishnyansky family. The wife – Leah Lishnyansky – the best milkmaid on the collective farm – is now a member of the Soviet Parliament, a Member of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. She was one of the first settlers and has set many examples of great devotion to the cause of building up the Jewish Autonomous Region.' (207) [*J]*

*'In view of its considerable progress and achievements the Soviet Government, on May 7, 1934, proclaimed the Birobidjan district the Jewish Autonomous Region. A Jewish state unit has been created in the Soviet Union.' (208) [*J]*

'The Russian or Ukrainian who lives in the region takes an active part in building up the Jewish

Soviet state, and is just as enthusiastic about it as the Jewish worker or peasant. Many Russians in the Jewish Autonomous Region are learning to speak Yiddish. Russian children sing Jewish songs and speak the Jewish language. Russian workers attended performances at the Jewish theatre and applaud the Jewish actors.’ (209) [*J]

‘The Soviet Jew feels fully at home in the country; he lives the great life of the country, is not afraid of difficulties and faces the world and nature as an equal, as a builder of Socialism, as a worthy son of his Soviet homeland.

Like the members of all the other nations of the Soviet Union, the Soviet Jew is alive to all the beauty of the world. Enjoying the full assistance of the Soviet state, which helps him in his labours and struggle, bound with fraternal ties to all the nations of the Soviet Union, and having his Jewish national Soviet state unit, the Soviet Jew is indeed an equal among equals.’ (210) [*J]

References

- (191) Anon., ‘Counterattack’, May 7th, 1948, pp. 3-4
- (192) Anon., ‘Counterattack’, May 28th, 1948, p. 1. The Shipler referred to is the Reverend Guy Emery Shipler and his ‘The Churchman’ magazine, which ‘Counterattack’ lists as a communist or pro-communist front organisation. This quotation is suggestive of the readiness of communists and Zionist jews to work together as long as it wasn’t contrary to the interests of either party and the only reason, in this stated case, that there was a refusal was because it would be ‘controversial’ (i.e. detrimental to their propaganda image) for Israel and Zionists to do so. This is further confirmed by the quotation from n. 193 below.
- (193) Anon., ‘Counterattack’, June 11th, 1948, p. 2
- (194) Leonid Andreyev, Maxim Gorky, Fyodor Sologub (Eds.), A. Yarmolinsky (Trans.), 1917, ‘The Shield’, 1st Edition, Alfred A. Knopf: New York, p. ix
- (195) William Adams Brown Jr., 1920, ‘The Groping Giant: Revolutionary Russia as seen by an American Democrat’, 1st Edition, Yale University Press: New Haven, p. 85
- (196) Ibid, p. 86
- (197) Ibid, pp. 86-87
- (198) Ibid, pp. 121-122
- (199) Ibid, p. 128
- (200) Edward Ross, 1918, ‘Russia in Upheaval’, 1st Edition, The Century Co.: New York, p. 176
- (201) Frederic Coleman, 1918, ‘Japan or Germany: The Inside Story of the Struggle in Siberia’, 1st Edition, George H. Doran: New York, pp. 135-136. I have marked this quote as potentially unreliable because Coleman seems to be repeating what he had heard not what he had seen himself.
- (202) Angelo Rappoport, 1913, ‘Home Life in Russia’, 1st Edition, Methuen: London, p. 204
- (203) David Francis, 1921, ‘Russia from the American Embassy: April, 1916 – November, 1918’, 1st Edition, Charles Scribner’s Sons: New York, pp. 210-211. It should be noted that David Francis was the United States ambassador to Russia between 1916 and 1918.
- (204) Ibid, p. 214
- (205) Ibid, p. 239
- (206) D. Bergelson, 1939, ‘The Jewish Autonomous Region’, 1st Edition, Foreign Languages Publishing House: Moscow, p. 10

- (207) Ibid, p. 33. The Leah Lishnyansky mentioned by Bergelson is, of course, jewish.
(208) Ibid, p. 42
(209) Ibid, pp. 46-47
(210) Ibid, p. 48

In Brief: A Few Words Say a Thousand

Saturday, 5 June 2010

As many of my regular readers know I am a long-time member of many jewish forums, news groups and mailing lists. Every so often you read the kind of response at these places of jewish electronic communal life that makes you break out into a wolfish grin. When I was reading my 'topic digests' this morning from a Revisionist Zionist group (largely populated by American not Israeli jews I might add); which I should note has a history of posting not very nice things about us goyim, I read the following response to a particularly rabid (and rather corpulent) Israeli jew called Professor Paul Eidelberg: who likes to call non-jews vermin by implication and believes that the Israeli government is 'anti-Semitic'. Oh and don't forget he; as well as any other follower of Judaism, believes; although unlike most he says so explicitly on occasion, that jews are destined to rule the world and that all of us non-jews should be subjugated and governed by the whims of jews (probably in his case to fill his enormous belly with all the matzo he can stuff into his mouth with his greasy paws). (1)

The response is ostensibly from a rather misinformed American Christian lady who some enterprising jew has obviously been exploiting and mentally raping for quite some time; possibly since childhood, in order to elicit the kind of unfortunate statements that she makes. I will now let the letter speak for itself:

'Dear Professor Eidelberg,

Appreciate your logic about all the names of Islam's god not coming near any identity like being a father. Certainly also the "Freedom Flotilla" is a farcical disconnect from anything "humanitarian" since according to the Koran, man was not created "in the image of God."?

But I take comfort in knowing the time will come when Israel's enemies will come bending to Jews:

*"The sons also of them that afflicted thee shall come bending unto thee;
and all they that despised thee shall bow themselves down at the soles of thy feet;
and they shall call thee, The city of the LORD, The Zion of the Holy One of Israel."*

Isaiah 60:14

My hope lies in the flora of prophecies, such as in Isaiah 41:8-11:

"But thou, Israel, art my servant, Jacob whom I have chosen, the seed of Abraham my friend."

*9 Thou whom I have taken from the ends of the earth,
and called thee from the chief men thereof, and said unto thee,
Thou art my servant; I have chosen thee, and not cast thee away.
10 Fear thou not; for I am with thee: be not dismayed; for I am thy God:
I will strengthen thee; yea, I will help thee; yea,
I will uphold thee with the right hand of my righteousness.
11 Behold, all they that were incensed against thee shall be ashamed and confounded:
they shall be as nothing; and they that strive with thee shall perish."*

*So I am not giving up praying for the time soon when Jerusalem shall be the "throne of the
LORD" and a praise in the earth*

Isaiah 62:6-7

*"I have set watchmen upon thy walls, O Jerusalem,
which shall never hold their peace day nor night:
ye that make mention of the LORD, keep not silence,
7 And give him no rest, till he establish,
and till he make Jerusalem a praise in the earth."*

*Sunday my husband, who is a pastor in our congregation in NJ, will be giving a sermon/
PowerPoint in Connecticut to our Christian friends, "If I Forget Thee, O Jerusalem," He is
hoping to lay everything out to help anyone who has been injured in the media distortion war
and confirm our faith in the destiny of Israel.*

Shalom,

Rebecca Gray'

Mrs Grey's letter would be uninteresting, but for two very specific points of its content. Firstly we note that Mrs Grey explicitly tells us that according to her faith: the whole world must bow down to and serve Israel (and note not Jesus Christ). Mrs Grey is obviously a devout Zionist Christian. I think we could also reasonably refer to her as a crypto jew as she seems to believe by implication of her argument that God can be controlled by a single (or a group of) human will(s) and that the New Testament is simply irrelevant in a scriptural argument as both are characteristic implicit positions in Conservative, Orthodox and Ultra-Orthodox Judaic thought.

Mrs Grey assures Professor Eidelberg that God will come to the aid of the jews, but what Mrs Grey seems to conveniently forget is that Professor Eidelberg believes; as is common among many practicing jews today although this is a fairly recent evolution, that *'Hashem helps those who help themselves'* (2) or rather said jews don't actually believe Hashem exists, but rather are happy to be enterprising businessmen in his name and are quite happy to attend shul just in case Hashem actually exists (and are sure that Hashem would forgive such perfect beings as themselves anyway). I am sure the enterprising Professor Eidelberg is already preparing a special scam for Mrs Grey to invest in: perhaps in Israeli oil, which; according to some, will be found en masse in Israel, because the Bible is suggested to say so.

Secondly Mrs Grey and her husband; a pastor no less, are engaged in the promotion of another government's agenda in the United States in the same way as *'The Friends of the Soviet Union'* were involved in promoting the Soviet Union's agenda as an article of religious faith.

It is noteworthy that in short order Mrs Grey and her husband have begun to organise a pro-Israel *'educational'* meeting to propagandise anyone and everyone who will listen with Israel's version of events regarding the Gaza flotilla. Since if you believe Mrs Grey's implied version of events; of course, then the media is anti-Semitic and there is a whole anti-Semitic conspiracy against Israel, which has been alluded to in relation to the Gaza flotilla incident by just about every pro-Israeli organisation on the planet taking their cue from the statements made by the Israeli Prime Minister; Benjamin Netanyahu, and the Deputy Foreign Minister of Israel: Daniel Ayalon. These two proverbial jokers have been officially claiming since May the 31st that said incident is really an Islamic conspiracy against Israel masterminded by Al Qaeda. We could afford to sit back and laugh at the idiocy of these two bawling Israelites if the *'Israel Lobby'* (so-called) wasn't quite so quick off the mark and has begun the process of trying to cover up Israeli piracy and unwarranted aggression by yelling about Islamists and a conspiracy against the jews.

Mrs Grey and her husband; whom we must presume to be biologically Aryan, are representative of the underestimated part of the *'Israel Lobby'* in so far as the *'Israel Lobby'* could not function well without having a large amount of unpaid activists on the ground who look to various different organisations; often with disparate objectives but whom are united on the subject of Israel, to guide their activities, while these organisations take their cue from the Israeli government: much like how the old Muenzenberg fronts always took their cue from the various Soviet organisations who they really took orders from. (3)

Anti-Semites often talk about the *'Israel Lobby'* and the power of the jew, but the lesson of Mrs Grey's letter in this regard is that the source of jewish power is really; in whole or in part, down to the our actions or rather lack of them. If anti-Semites cannot successfully reach out to the American people and prefer to simply isolate them by condemning them from the safety of their own homes, while wondering why the jew is so powerful, then what future is there for anti-Semitism? The jew gets out there among the folk and warbles his Pied Piper tune while leading the folk to the edge of a cliff, but the general anti-Semite sits around complaining about the jews doing X, Y and Z implicitly acknowledging that the jewish self-image of themselves as mortal gods and generally superior beings I generally true, because they will do the things that the anti-Semites don't want to do and win the folk over to the jewish swansong isolating anti-Semites and preventing the *'anti-Semitic movement from above and below'* that has historically been so destructive for jews. (4)

This raises a question that every anti-Semite must answer: do you want to just roll over and die or do you want to fight the jew for every inch of every battlefield? The former is easy while the latter is hard: are you a man or are you a mouse?

References

(1) If the reader doubts my words about the noxious jew called Eidelberg then I quote two

specimens from his (lengthy) signature on one of the jewish mailing lists I belong to:

*'ISRAELIS MUST BE PREPARED FOR A CONTINUOUS BATTLE FOR SURVIVAL
WE CAN NOT RESIGN FROM THIS STRUGGLE
WE CAN NOT DEPEND ON ANY OTHER NATION
THIS IS OUR BATTLE - AND WE MUST FIGHT IT ALONE
WE WILL WIN BECAUSE OF OUR MIGHT AND RIGHTEOUSNESS
AND THE ALMIGHTY WILL BE BY OUR SIDE'*

And:

*'Peace Process = Piece of Israel For Piece of Paper
Zionist Left (Labor, Kadima & Meretz) = Arab Nationalism Not Zionism
Self-Defense = Restraint = Israeli Deaths to Save Arab Lives
Transfer = Transfer Jews Not Arabs
American Aid = Does Not Aid Israel = American Control of Israel
Jewish Power NOT Jewish Weakness
Israeli Leadership = Chelmitic Leadership = No Leadership
ISLAM IS NOT A RELIGION OF PEACE AND LOVE'*

Can there be any further doubt as to Professor Eidelberg's strident anti-gentile opinions? I don't think so.

(2) I quote once again from Eidelberg's signature:

*'HASHEM HELPS THOSE WHO HELP THEMSELVES.
PLEASE DON'T WAIT FOR A MIRACLE - BE THE MIRACLE!!'*

(3) For more information about this please see Sean McMeekin, 2003, *'The Red Millionaire: A Political Biography of Willi Muezenberg, Moscow's Secret Propaganda Tsar in the West'*, 1st Edition, Yale University Press: New Haven

(4) For an interesting exposition of this thesis see Benjamin Ginsberg, 1993, *'The Fatal Embrace: Jews and the State'*, 1st Edition, University of Chicago Press: Chicago

In Brief: Jews and American Communism

Saturday, 5 June 2010

Of the thirty-four autobiographical manuscripts owned by New York University's Tamiment Library and Robert F. Wagner Labor Archives; the fact that thirteen are written by jews about themselves is truly remarkable. This means that a whopping thirty-eight percent of these important manuscripts regarding American communism and the far left are jewish in origin, which is well above the proportion of jews in the American population and of note as many of these individuals were leaders or important figures inside the American far left during the early to mid twentieth century. For the sake of completeness we list the names and quote part of the biographical added by New York University's archivists: (1)

Israel Amter (1881-1954), was a founding member of the Communist Party, USA and served as

its representative to the Comintern, and as head of the New York State Communist Party.

Alexander Bittelman (1890-1982), was a Communist activist and theoretician. His typescript *"Things I Have Learned,"* describes his childhood and radical activities in Russia, arrival in the United States in 1912, early Socialist connections, formation of the American Communist Party, factional feuds within the Communist movement, comments on its important personalities such as Earl Browder, William Z. Foster, Jay Lovestone, Charles E. Ruthenberg; contains reflections on the New Deal and Cold War; thoughts on Bittelman's imprisonment for Communist activities; concern for Jewish survival; and reflections on the world ca. 1963.

Harry Fleischman (1914-2004), was a labor and socialist activist who, as a teenager joined the Young People's Socialist League. His activities in the Socialist Party included serving as National Chairman of the Red Falcons, the Party's organization for children (1936), regional director of the Indiana-Illinois Socialist Party (1942-50), and campaign manager for Norman Thomas's presidential campaigns in 1944 and 1948. These experiences informed his book, *Norman Thomas: A Biography* (1964). Fleischman also worked as labor and political editor of the *Voice of America* (1951-53), as director of labor and race relations at the American Jewish Committee, and was a board member, and later chair of the Workers Defense League, a nonprofit worker advocacy organization.

David Greenberg. This collection includes contains the manuscript of the unpublished anthology, *"Behind Bars: The Prison Experiences of War Resisters,"* edited by **David F. Greenberg** and Beverly D. Houghton. The anthology contains essays by resisters to the Vietnam War regarding their experiences in various prisons and jails.

J. B. S. (Jacob Benjamin Salutsky) Hardman (1882-1968) was a Russian-born author, social philosopher, labor editor and leader. His incomplete autobiographical manuscript titled *Odyssey*, along with research files for projected chapter titles, covers his work for the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America as director of education and cultural activities and as editor of its organ, *The Advance* (1920-44), Brookwood Labor College, the Jewish Socialist Federation, his editorship of the *American Labor Monthly*, his service on the C.I.O.-New York State Radio, Press, and Education Committee, family matters, writing projects, and other political activities.

Israel Kugler (1917-2007) was a graduate of City College, earned a Ph.D. from New York University in sociology and taught for many years at New York Community College. He was a member of the Young People's Socialist League and later of the Socialist Party. He was a founding member and president of the United Federation of College Teachers (UFCT) and a founding member and officer of the Professional Staff Congress (PSC), the faculty/staff union at the City University of New York (CUNY). He led the historic 1966-1967 faculty strike at St. John's University. Raised in the traditions of immigrant Jewish socialism, he was a life-long devotee of Yiddish culture and served as national president of the Workmen's Circle, board member of the Jewish Labor Committee and president of the Three Arrows Cooperative Society.

Miriam Moskowitz. The collection contains an autobiographical typescript *"Phantoms of Spies Run Amok and An Odyssey of Surviving McCarthyism,"* describing her 1950 arrest, conviction and prison sentence for conspiracy to obstruct justice for impeding a grand jury investigation of

atomic espionage - she was charged with the knowledge that **Harry Gold** had intended to lie to the grand jury. The typescript also includes her memories of her time, along with **Ethel Rosenberg**, in the Women's House of Detention in New York City, her life after release from prison, and the continuing debates about the guilt or innocence of those accused of espionage.

Charles C. Recht (1887-1965) was born in Bohemia to Jewish parents, emigrated to the United States, graduated from New York University Law School, and served as general counsel for the New York Bureau of Legal Advice, which provided free legal service to men who resisted the new draft laws related to the entry of the United States into World War I. Recht also represented many radicals who faced deportation at that time, and later served as an officer of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born. From 1921 until 1933, when diplomatic relations were established, Recht officially represented Soviet interests in the U.S., and thereafter he continued to represent many Soviet citizens and organizations.

Morris Rosen was a carpenter, and a communist trade unionist.

This collection contains a 56 pp. manuscript by **Jack Schmulewitz**, about his parents **Julius Schmulewitz** (1895-1966) and **Lilly Jacobowitz Schmulewitz** (1902-1968). Julius was a member of the Bakery and Confectionary Workers International Union, Local 3.

Helen Sobell was the wife of **Morton Sobell**, who was convicted, in 1951, along with **Julius and Ethel Rosenberg**, of espionage, for transmitting information about the construction of the atomic bomb to the Soviet Union.

Baruch Vladeck (1886-1938), a socialist and Jewish leader, was born near Minsk, Russia in 1886. He was involved in radical activities in Russia until in 1908, fearful of arrest and exile, he fled to the United States. Vladeck was subsequently a leader in the American Socialist Party and editor of the Jewish Daily Forward and served on the New York City Board of Aldermen (1916), City Housing Authority (1934) and City Council (1937). He was one of the founders of the American Labor Party. He headed a number of organizations, including the Jewish Labor Committee, which organized rescue work in Europe, and the Joint Distribution Committee, the coordinating agency of Jewish philanthropic disbursements abroad. He was active in his efforts to aid the daring underground operations of a group of dissident socialists known as the "*New Beginning*" in Germany during the early days of Hitler's rule.

Isidor Wisotsky (1895-1970). The collection contains a typescript of Isidor Wisotsky's unpublished autobiography, "*Such a Life*," in which he recounts his experiences as a Russian Jewish immigrant working in New York City's Lower East Side in the early twentieth century, his anarchist and Industrial Workers of the World activities, and his personal recollections of radical leaders.

References

(1) It should be noted that I am not exerting copyright over this material (as it is not my own), but rather reproducing it for educative purposes per fair use as it is simpler to use what has already been written than to re-write it in my own words for such a short article. Further I have

bolded the names of those of jewish origin who are mentioned in the biographical text provided by New York University.

The Rabbinical Roundup: This Week among the Jews (WC: 31/05/2010)

Sunday, 6 June 2010

Week Commencing: 31/05/2010

We've had quite a week with the rulers of the universe haven't we? We have had the Gaza flotilla incident on the high seas, which has basically eclipsed all jewish news to such an extent that you wouldn't think anything else had happened in the world relating to the jews; but that one act of unwarranted piracy and aggression against a peaceful aid convoy. While we will devote some space to this and the fallout from it: it would be absurd to cover it to the exclusion of other interesting events. (1)

As I am sure you know Israel decided it would be a wonderful idea to send its naval commandos to 'seize' a convoy carrying humanitarian aid to Gaza. The unmitigated disaster that it turned out to be has been rightly recognised to be a national humiliation for Israel: not so much because Israel decided once again to do something utterly illegal, but because the Israeli naval commandos managed to be get all but beaten by a bunch of balding hippies and whooping Muslims with no military background or weapons to defend themselves. One Israeli author even went so far as to claim that this all but ended the myth of Israeli military power. I think we would have to agree with that as it doesn't lend itself to the self-proclaimed jewish status of being the pinnacle of creation, but we would further add that the jews have never been particularly good soldiers (2) and that their victories in the Middle East have largely been because they were outfitted by the American taxpayer, leeched equipment as 'holocaust' reparations and were given intelligence by the CIA. However let us be fair to the jews: they are good at intelligence gathering and have an advantage in that the jews worldwide act as a convenient hideout for and recruiting area of Israeli agents. It is just rather obvious that the jews of Israel don't actually have the foggiest what to do with that intelligence as far as their military and political strategy goes. (3) We won't go into the details of this event as we will cover that in later articles on Semitic Controversies, but we will summarise and comment on it.

The result of this typical exercise of jewish barbarity was that nine people were killed and that many others, including some Israeli commandos, were left injured: some seriously. It has most recently been revealed that some of those thought to have been killed in the 'combat' that raged on the ship and which forms the basis for the defence of the supposedly omnipotent and omnipresent masters of the universe; well in their own minds anyway, were in fact killed by multiple execution style shots to the back of the head, while kneeling. (4) You can well imagine the howls of hatred for the goyim that arose from the miasma surrounding Tel Aviv when this little detail was leaked to the Israeli press (and then from there to the international press) and the balding vultures that double as Israeli journalists had the egoistic impertinence to tell their readers; and the world in general, that their fellow jews were; predictably, lying through their slimy lips while doubtless cursing those goyim who were so ill-mannered as to believe that facts

are more akin to the truth than what one of Yahweh's little darlings claims to be the truth.

The howls are; predictably, still continuing as we hear a profusion of buzz words and phrases such as; '*terrorism*', '*Al Qaeda*', '*Hamas*', '*attacked Israel*', '*arms smuggling*', '*Nazis*', '*holocaust*', '*special relationship*', '*Iran*', '*nuclear weapons*', '*anti-Semitism*', '*international conspiracy*' etc ad infinitum (until the sun grows cold and the earth grows old), being almost sweated out of every Jew's gaping pores as they mop their chubby brow at the strenuous exercise they get from their constant jibber-jabbering at anyone who will listen (and if nobody wants to listen then the Jew likes to talk to himself to make himself feel all important [after all we've got to feel sorry for poor little Shlomo]).

So if we are to believe the wailing that is emanating from here in New York city as well (and if you sit quietly with the lights out you can hear the constant high-pitched '*Oy vey!*' droning on and over the sounds of everyday life) as from the world's localised plague house; otherwise known by the epithet of Israel, then the entire event was stage-managed by a totally evil Machiavellian super-intelligent Islamic conspiracy; to provoke the Jews into bordering the ships and forcing the Jews to kill people making them martyrs, run by Al Qaeda to smuggle arms to Hamas in Gaza and the whole thing is being funded by Iran. Not exactly very plausible now is it? That is; however, the story that is getting peddled with an increasing shrill voice by the '*Israel lobby*' (so-called) and Israel's leadership itself.

Are the Jews desperate to cover up the fact that their soldiers boarded a peaceful ship and started killing people execution style when they wouldn't lie down and be beaten to a pulp for sport by Jews? Of course; the Israelis, the '*Israel Lobby*' and the '*Jihad Watch*' junkies (5) want us to believe it was an Islamic conspiracy, but aren't they forgetting something? That there were was an awful lot of other observers; credible ones too, on that ship who weren't Islamic or even from the Middle East, but rather a bunch of balding left-wing hippies in the main. Are they being directed by Al Qaeda to ship weapons to Hamas and being paid by Iran too? Oh of course: the left and liberal crowds are part of the conspiracy too. It's all a conspiracy against Israel and the Jews!

Oy vey! What is a Jew to do?

Only of slightly less magnitude this week is the confirmation of a distinct Jewish biological identity that geneticists have long been arguing for, but philo-Semites who claim to be rational; such as Jared Taylor, as well as academics of a left-wing persuasion; such as Ashley Montagu [nee Israel Ehrenberg], have long been either deliberately ignoring [sans logic] or claiming doesn't exist contrary to the genetic, anthropological, sociological and historical evidence. (6) This study published in the prestigious '*American Journal of Human Genetics*' has been something of a vindication of what anti-Semites have been saying for well over a century: Jews are a (largely) distinct genetic group who are not closely related to Europeans and are, in essence, alien to the European continent. (7) No doubt some philo-Semites might yowl that the Jews have lived in Europe for thousands of years, which is true: they have, but so have the Sami who are a Mongoloid people who live in Scandinavia; principally Sweden, but yet we cannot assert the Sami; who have been in Europe longer than the Jews and have been far more sedentary are European precisely because they are not of the same biological group as Europeans, but are

rather of another, which originated outside of Europe in spite of the later migration to Europe.

Just you wait for the jewish yelling to start that they are not a biological group, that they are just like everyone else (but are, of course, selected by Hashem to be his 'chosen people' so they aren't really) and that anyone who anyone who says otherwise is a '*goddamn-nazi-who-wants-to-kill-six-million-jews.*'

In news coming out of Britain: the leadership contest for the top job in the British Labour party is turning out to be a kosher affair with only three candidates having successfully gained the minimum number of required Member of Parliament votes to be in the running to be the head of the parliamentary opposition in Britain and even worse: potentially the next Prime Minister of the United Kingdom. Two of these three candidates; who are David Miliband, Edward Miliband and Edward Balls, are jewish (the first two: who also happen to be brothers and both members of the current Labour shadow cabinet by-the-way) (8).

This is potentially disastrous as if one of Miliband brothers (9) comes to power then Britain will have a similar situation that of France currently with a Israeli-cum-jewish spy at the head of its government acting as a surrogate for the '*Israel lobby*' (i.e. Nicolas Sarkozy). What future for Britain is there with a potential jewish fifth column in government with the power to do as it pleases? One thing you can guarantee is that a Miliband government will make as much criticism of jews and Israel illegal as it possibly thinks it can get away with. After all the Miliband's wouldn't wish to let down their kinsmen now would they?

I am sure the Community Security Trust; the British version of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai Brith and part of the '*Israel Lobby*' (so-called) in Britain, is salivating at the possibility of the first jewish prime minister of Britain since Benjamin Disraeli and the power that it will bring them. (10) The CST had a bitter disappointment a few years ago when Michael Howard [nee Michael Hecht], the jewish leader of the kosher British Conservative party, failed to hustle enough votes to get to dance the hora on top of Buckingham Palace and Big Ben.

In other; perhaps rather alarming, news it has been reported by Arutz Sheva that Israel is looking to become an '*international gas power*' in the near future. (11) No doubt the rationale behind this is to copy Russia's habit of using its gas supplies to enforce acceptance of Russia's policies, influence and demands worldwide, which would create a whole new powder keg in the Middle East by allowing Israel to begin to try and control the West not only by having the massive '*Israel lobby*' (so-called) worldwide, but also economically, which creates a potential second tier to Israel's power over the West by using its surrogate jewish communities to enforce gas contracts and then taking away (or threatening to take away) gas supplies.

Another point of interest for us is the deep-seated and inherent corruption that our jewish masters would get involved in; in a scenario where Israel becomes an internationally powerful gas exporter. You can just imagine the cat-fights, the high-pitched screeching, snarling quibbling and quick-fire gesticulation that would occur in jewish boardrooms between rabid jewish lawyers frothing at the mouth, rotund jewish executives and cigar chomping jewish financiers fighting each other tooth and nail for the right to extract a little more blood from the goyim. (12) Of course Israel doesn't really care about providing a service or good to others and nor do the jews

as a people: all they care about is what they; Yahweh's little darlings, can get out of it.

After all according to jewish 'culture' and Judaism: the jew owns everything and everyone one on this planet... so why bother with the formalities?

Taking a lighter tone to finish out this week's edition of *'The Rabbinical Roundup'*: the students of La Quinta High School in California innovated an entirely new version of 'whack-a-mole' this week, but rather than squishing moles and causing PETA activists to have simultaneous heart attacks: these enterprising youths decided to hold a *'Beat the Jew'* game. (13) Of course; it should be understood that we are not advocating violence here and nor were the students, but rather they were trying to be politically correct and demonstrate the supposed eternal 'suffering' of the jews, but instead ended up getting attacked by them. After all only the jews; our eternal masters, are allowed to suffer and anyone who does anything they don't like; as the poor persecuted people that they are, are to be expelled by their suddenly exposed tribal superpower credentials.

Seven students may not be allowed be allowed to graduate after all jews the world over now suspect these seven young people of being as bad as a German soldier in an einsatzgruppe from the Second World War. Nobody is allowed to act out jewish suffering other than jews: right? Why: you ask? For the simple reason that if we goyim start acting out jewish suffering then it would start to lead to awkward questions being asked about events that are borderline impossible or absurd and the possibility of a program like *'Mythbusters'* trying them out and finding them to not only be impossible but blatant lies.

Oh well a goy can dream can't he?

Well that's enough of jews in the news for this week.

Shalom!

References

(1) Two articles regarding this event are currently in gestation: one on the events themselves which is weighing up the facts as they have been presented and the other focuses on the actions of the *'Israel Lobby'* and how quickly it began to push out the Israeli version of events and to attack any dissenting opinion. For this story I haven't cited a particular story that I have taken my facts from (aside from the execution-style killings), because of the mass of the media coverage and any one story containing slightly different facts etc.

(2) The only modern non-jewish state to use large amounts of jewish soldiers was the Russian Empire: where the state took children from jewish families by lot (and the corruption that surrounded this among the jewish community is another matter entirely), forced them to become Christian converts and educated them to be soldiers. Please see Nicolas Riasanovsky, 1993, *'A History of Russia'*, 5th Edition, Oxford University Press: New York, pp. 323-340

(3) Israel debatably has the best military, economic and political intelligence network in the world not so much because of the ability of the jews as they like to claim, but because of the unique situation of and the long-standing tradition of inter-community cooperation of the jews

around the world.

(4) All details mentioned are taken from the news story; '*Gaza flotilla attack: Autopsies reveal intensity of Israeli military force*', publishing by The Guardian on the 4th June 2010. This is available at the following address: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2010/jun/04/gaza-flotilla-attack-autopsy-results> [Last accessed: 06/06/2010]

(5) It should be understood that I am as thoroughly opposed to Arabs and Islam as I am to jews, but I do not agree with the pro-Israel philo-Semitic idiocy of Robert Spencer and his '*Jihad Watch*' Diaspora. I also note with something of a smirk that Spencer and his ilk purport arguments against Islam very similar to those that anti-Semitism does in regard to Judaism: yet they would scream the other as the lord's honest truth and the other they would impugn as lies made up Muslims and supposed '*Nazi allies*'.

(6) On this point please see Roger Pearson, 1997, '*Race, Intelligence and Bias in Academe*', 2nd Edition, Scott-Townsend: Washington D.C.

(7) Two excellent summaries of the research and implications of this newly published paper have been written firstly by our fellow critic of jews; Kevin MacDonald (this is available at the following address: <http://theoccidentalobserver.net/tooblog/?p=2133> [Last accessed: 06/06/2010]), and a neutral party: Razib Khan (this is available at the following address: http://blogs.discovermagazine.com/gnxp/2010/06/genetics-the-jewish-question/?utm_source=feedburner&utm_medium=feed&utm_campaign=Feed%3A+DiscoverBlogs+%28Discover+Blogs%29 [Last accessed: 06/06/2010]).

(8) All details mentioned are taken from the news story; '*Andy Burnham 'confident' of Labour leadership support*', published by the BBC on the 6th June 2010. This is available at the following address: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/politics/10247644.stm> [Last accessed: 06/06/2010]

(9) It should be noted that both the Milibands' parents; Ralph [nee Adolphe] Miliband and Marion Kozak, were jewish marxists [his father was a leading marxist political theorist in Britain] and the Milibands' paternal grandfather fought for the Red Army as a jewish volunteer against Poland before immigrating to Belgium to spread marxist poison there.

(10) The Community Security Trust's website can be found at the following address: <http://www.thecst.org.uk/> [Last accessed: 06/06/2010]

(11) All details mentioned are taken from the news story; '*Israel Headed for Gas-Exporter Status*', written by Hillel Fendel and published by Arutz Sheva on the 6th June 2010. This is available at the following address: <http://www.israelnationalnews.com/News/News.aspx/137886> [Last accessed: 06/06/2010]

(12) It should be noted that '*blood*' and '*gold*' have historically been used interchangeably by jews as pointed out by Ronnie Po-chia Hsia, 1988, '*The Myth of Ritual Murder: Jews and Magic in Reformation Germany*', 1st Edition, Yale University Press: New Haven, pp. 6-10

(13) All details mentioned are taken from the news story; '*Calif. High school ends 'Beat the Jew' game*', published by the Associated Press on the 5th June 2010. This is available at the following address:

<http://www.google.com/hostednews/ap/article/ALeqM5iwCfz63usQBbz2TcOekMu4jEDluwD9G4LV9G5> [Last accessed: 06/06/2010]

Notice: '*The Rabbinical Roundup*' is hyperbole, informed comment and political satire not defamation or incitement to hatred and comes under the requirements for 'free speech' per United States law. Semitic Controversies also condemns and rejects violence, and seeks a peaceful solution to the Jewish Question.

Why I am an anti-Semite

Tuesday, 8 June 2010

I often get asked the question by people who are starting to get to know me as a person: '*why are you an anti-Semite?*' Of course: the sub-text to this question is simple. In so far as they are assuming that the reason that I am anti-Semitic is because I am either jealous of the jews, have some quack notion that there is a monolithic jewish conspiracy either ruling or trying to rule the world and/or because I feel the need to blame someone other than myself for the all the inevitable failures in my life; which lets face it we all have and I am no exception to that rule. This sub-text essentially derives from the myths that are propounded about anti-Semitism by jewish authors and 'intellectuals' who have been trying for years to assert that anti-Semitism is not caused by the behaviour of jews and even more radically; has nothing to do with jews at all.

If we look at this assertion; so frequently made by jews and those who apologise for them, we can see its frightening illogicality. Let us take a similar example so dear to the minds of a dominant clique of jewry; the Zionists, and apply the same logic that Zionists themselves so often borrow from authors on anti-Semitism. This would be that being anti-Islam (or simply opposed to Islam) is an ideological/intellectual position that is not caused by the actions and behaviour of Muslims and that we can suggest even more radically that this opposition to Islam has nothing to do with Muslims at all.

Does that sound like a cogent position in regards to Muslims and the Islamic religion in general? No: of course it doesn't, but then why does that sound absurd to so many people today, but yet when the same logic is applied to the jews and Judaism: it suddenly becomes cogent and set in stone.

A thinking opponent might counter that '*anti-Semitism*' is different to '*anti-Islamism*', but then I'd have to ask how so? If you compare the arguments used by say Robert Spencer, Christopher Hitchins, Pamela Geller etc ad infinitum, against those used by say Theodor Fritsch, Adolf Hitler, Revilo Oliver etc ad infinitum, you will notice a distinct similarity that we may say borders on the uncanny. They use the same basic charges against Muslims that anti-Semites use against the jews, but while many anti-Semites recognise; quite logically I might add, that anti-Semitic arguments against the jews can be reasonably transliterated to apply to Muslims and Islam in a modified form: anti-Islamists will; as a rule of thumb, shrink back in horror at the very thought of condemning the jews. After all anti-Islamists have been trying to claim; inspired by jewish 'intellectuals' and Israeli government propagandists, that the jihadis are the '*new nazis*' and have even invented their own little absurd term to try to link the two: '*Islamofascism*'. Cute: isn't it?

In essence then we can say that out of the two ideologies; which aren't mutually exclusive by-the-way, anti-Semitism tends to be the more rational, because it implicitly recognises that while jews are a major part of the problem that faces Western civilization; nay the world, today; they are not the only problem unlike anti-Islamists who tend to explain events they perceive

negatively as having a single cause in Islam and its adherents; sometimes conceptualized as an international Islamic conspiracy.

This then brings us onto a slightly more distasteful subject, which is why anti-Islamists tend to be rather one dimensional and unable to recognise the fact that jews are also a problem in addition to Muslims. The answer is; unfortunately, obvious. Anti-Islamism; as a movement, has for a long time been dominated by Israelis and jews who support Israel unconditionally; i.e. hard-line Zionists, because Israel's conflict with the Arab states has had to find legitimizing language that is not '*racist*' in order to frame its propaganda correctly in polite and intellectual society as well as the mass media. So rather than suggesting; as some Israelis explicitly do, that the Arabs are Amalekites and thus Israel is divinely-commanded to exterminate them. The Israelis sought; and still seek, to define their conflict with the Arab world in terms of religion, which although controversial would not be and is not so controversial as to define the conflict as that of one of race. Defining the Arab-Israeli conflict in terms of religion had and has another benefit; which may or may not have been in the minds of those who originated the argument, in so far as it allows and has allowed its Israeli and jewish Diaspora advocates to play on the crusader mythos which dominates Western civilisation and particularly Christian groups who look back to the days of yore when Christian knights carried all before them on the battlefields of Europe in order to gather support among devout Christians and those yearning for a more conservative and traditional society.

This also played into a trend in Christian theological and historical writing; which had begun in the early twentieth century and included the noted British Anglican theologian James Parkes as a key advocate, to identify Judaism as being '*the big brother*' of Christianity. Some went even further: they argued that Christianity was a '*perfected*' or an '*evolved*' form of Judaism, which in spite of its obvious absurdity as a claim, has gained sway particularly in Protestant Christian circles of the Dispensationalist variety, which has been further aided by a renewed attempt to '*convert the jews*'. This has; of course, lead some jews to become nominal or real Christians and has lead to their rising steadily through the ranks of many Christian groups to preach how wonderful jews are to Christians. We can reasonably assert that many American and European Christians listening to jewish Christian leaders and 'intellectuals' do not pick up the attempts; conscious or unconscious, to replace the traditional doctrines of Christianity that have stood for over a thousand years with doctrines imported directly from Rabbinic Judaism.

This isn't their fault; of course, because they do not know very much; if anything, about Judaism and they also trust those who they look to for leadership to lead them to the right path and to not deceive them. To blame American and European Christians for trusting the wrong people is rather absurd as we all have trusted the wrong people in our lives and sometimes we go on trusting them; against all the evidence to the contrary, because we want to believe the best of them as opposed to accepting the more uncomfortable reality. Our folk are like that; they are a lovely, kind and compassionate people, but they are easily abused and it is up to those made of sterner stuff; like you and I dear reader, to help them come to terms with the abuse they are suffering and to lead them to the proverbial promised land.

You are probably thinking this sounds a little absurd aren't you? Well lets work through a common example of this together and then switch it around so that the shoe is on the other foot

to explain the point even more aptly.

The obvious example from the literature; as it is the most frequent of the attempted importations from Rabbinic Judaism, is the idea that the jews are a unique people, with a special; or '*chosen*', status and as such are God's favoured children even when they convert to Christianity (and in a paraphrase from George Orwell's '*Animal Farm*': '*all Christians are equal, but jewish Christians are more equal than others*'). You might tell me this is absurd, but think about it a moment. Do not Christians generally lionise jews as being the wonderful people of Israel of the Bible and do not many; although certainly not all, see it as their special mission to help the jews by converting them to Christianity in order to hasten the advent of the Second Coming of Christ?

Of course they do, but look at the emphasis that this places on the jews. In so much as it gives them a special status in that you can convert all the Africans and Asians you like to Christianity, but the Second Coming of Christ won't happen till you convert all the jews to Christianity. Does it not now become obvious why this doctrine is so alien to Christianity, which; whether you agree or disagree with it, is a religion based on the notion of universal equality in the sight of God, as it introduces a tier system with the jewish Christians placed on the first; superior, tier, while all other Christians are on the second; inferior, tier. What makes the idea even more inimical to Christianity's egalitarian basis is that the assignment of jewish Christian first tier status is based on racial biology rather than having originally been a follower of Judaism, which implies that Christians are not equal in the sight of God and as we said before: '*jewish Christians are more equal than non-jewish Christians*'.

Thus we cannot help but see that what these jewish Christians; especially those of 'intellectual' and/or in leadership position(s), are doing is changing and subverting the very fabric of what Christianity stands for as an egalitarian ideology. As when they enter into communion with the Christian church they bring with them their innate ideas and perceptions; which have been drilled into them and selected for, by centuries of rabbinical and communal education and rule, which they attempt to; often successfully, force into their newly professed creed.

This might all seem somewhat mystical or obscure to you at the moment, but if we invert and personalise our example the mist will clear. Suppose; for example, that you were a devout Christian of a completely non-jewish background, but lately you have come to doubt and reject Jesus' being the son of God and the New Testament's status as a divine work, but that you still accept the Old Testament as being of God. This new intellectual position has placed you in a situation where you have become a follower of Judaism; let us say Orthodox Judaism for now, and you have satisfied the local panel of rabbis that you are indeed a jewish soul born into a gentile body.

So now you have become a jew: you start working your way up the local ladder of authority among the jews to become say an exponent of Judaism and of taking Judaism '*unto the nations*'. Now your background has been as a gentile Christian raised in a pro-egalitarian environment. So you would begin to argue; because it is to your potential benefit to do so, that Orthodox Judaism should look to convert Christians from their errors into become professing Orthodox jews.

However you have hit on a rather large snag: your local jewish community does not agree,

because Judaism specifically tells them; and you, that a jew is born not made. But yet to you this seems like an alien concept, because you were not raised with it. So you go back and forth with your local rabbis and jewish community about it; as you think that your proposed course is the best for them and the community, because it is what you understand as being a jew; as an outside convert looking in, while the rabbis and jewish community are looking at it as those who were born and raised as both followers of Judaism and jews. So your received norms and forms are not only different, because of culture, but because you were born into different groups who understand things differently. Since jews understand a jew to be a religious and cultural phenomenon underpinned by its biological base, while you understand a jew to be merely a religious and cultural phenomenon based on God's love for all his creations.

Finally you get your way and you begin to introduce significant numbers of other converts to your local synagogue. This then begins to further your position as it presents the local jewish community with a fait accompli, which either forces them to accept these new followers of Judaism on your terms or to move to another synagogue which does not and retains its traditional ways. If we multiply this effect up through Orthodox Judaism itself: it would result; in a few decades, in a new form of Orthodox Judaism being born almost completely unrelated to that same Orthodox Judaism that was in place before the changes you introduced began, but is instead closely related to gentile Christian belief.

It is thus obvious that the process that is occurring here is simply the subversion and takeover of one group by another; which may well be doing so unconsciously, and is simply caused by the admittance of those with a very different understanding of what something is compared to the original group. Once inside the group; if the individual or individuals with the differing views are not controlled via group sanctions (such as being offered incentives to conform, being punished and/or kicked out the group for example), they will inevitably try to spread their ideas and get into a position to change the group's ideology to fit their own perceptions of what it should be. In essence: the poison is the presence of the uncontrolled dissenting opinion within the group that allows the dissenter the opportunity to potentially gain enough power; or convene enough of their own friends or converts into a faction, to either takeover the group entirely or split the group via schism.

Now imagine if we were to apply the presence of different biological groups into the equation and that if say a socialist or conservative group is composed of Irish people and that its consensus was opposed to the understanding of an individual of superficially similar opinions of another biological group; say this person is jewish, who has just joined the group. The original Irish members will; of course, be kind to the new member, but will go through the process of testing the new member by fire to see where in the '*pecking order*'; if you will, they will sit. If; upon discovering the jewish member's radically divergent views from their own, they do not remove the jewish member from their group and the jewish member is allowed to go unchecked and to gain some little or even substantial power within the group. Then the jewish member, because they are working from completely different assumptions, will eventually try to takeover or split the group with their opinions in order to make that group fit their vision of what it should be.

In essence when you add in the angle of biological group competition then the conflict within the

group and need for vigilance inside the group against potential threats increases as does the need for drastic group sanction to deal with them when they manifest themselves.

We may briefly note that in both conservative and socialist politics: a considerable sea change occurred when these groups were either split or taken over from the inside by those of superficially similar; but actually very different, ideological positions.

For example: when the French worker and socialist theorist Pierre Proudhon allowed a young jew named Karl Marx to work with him; that young jew learned all he could from Proudhon, built up his own small faction and then formally split with Proudhon with the publication of his criticism of Proudhon's '*The Philosophy of Poverty*': '*The Poverty of Philosophy*'. Marx's faction continued to go at a disparate course to Proudhon's and eventually Marx's faction became the dominant one within socialist theory, which then solidified into the truism of the day with its own attempts to defend its group orthodoxy; from the same kind of subversion perpetrated by Marx on Proudhon, with the long-running ideological battle between Stalin and Trotsky's factions inside the socialist world.

We can summarise what happened with Proudhon and Marx in so far as that the socialists of Proudhon's day invited their own destruction by not recognising the biological threat to their hegemony represented in the person of Karl Marx who had superficially very similar opinions, but with those opinions being backed up by entirely different assumptions and an alien mentality being used as a prism through which to reach his conclusions, which were so at odds with Proudhon's own.

If we think that this only applies to socialism; or those groups with a '*far left*' political orientation, then we should observe that this also holds true for conservative groups as well. For example the British Tory (i.e. Conservative) Member of Parliament for Maidstone; one Colonel Wyndham Lewis, had invited a young jew called Benjamin Disraeli into his social and political circle sometime in the years before 1838. This young jew then proceeded to use Wyndham Lewis' political connections to form a clique of close friends and associates; including Wyndham Lewis' wife Mary Anne, around him.

Before Disraeli had the opportunity to mount a formal coup d'état against Wyndham Lewis: the latter unexpectedly died in March 1838. Disraeli promptly married (and abused) Mary Anne, took Wyndham Lewis' money to pay of his extravagant debts and stepped on Wyndham Lewis' still fresh corpse to take over; as an acknowledged social radical of almost diametrically opposed views to his predecessor and his party, Wyndham Lewis' Tory constituency. Disraeli then proceeded to subvert and sabotage his way into political power, eventually rising to become the first jewish Prime Minister of Britain. This helped paved the way for social radicals and those formerly held to be beyond the pale of Tory social and religious politics; such as jews, to become accepted within the Tory party and eventually to become an integral part of it.

We can summarise what happened between Wyndham Lewis and Disraeli in so far as Wyndham Lewis invited his own political destruction, the frittering away of his personal fortune and the destruction of all the values he held dear as a prominent member of the British Tory party, by not recognising the threat that Disraeli posed to him both politically and personally. Nor did

Wyndham Lewis recognise that he was dealing with an individual who although he may have seemed to have superficially similar opinions to Wyndham Lewis': those opinions were arrived at on the basis of very different logic and assumptions, which eventually grew to subvert the whole British Tory party with Disraeli's rapid political ascent to the highest political office in the land making them the new norms of British conservatism.

We can see then that the concepts that we have outlined and discussed in some detail necessarily cross political lines, but what we also need to understand is that they transcend mere politics and flow into every aspect of the world in which we live. If we merely apply the logic that we have worked through together to the country or the nation then we come to what may still be a startling conclusion. In that if what we have said holds true for smaller groups; such as socialists or the British Tory party, then it will also apply at the national level. So that if we acknowledge that we have a problem with those of different and opposing interests being within our country or nation; then we must also concern ourselves with the question of what subversive forces could be involved with this.

If we take into consideration the established fact that most of the; for example, American media is largely owned and/or run by jews or that United States Middle Eastern foreign policy is being consciously subverted to an unequivocally and unconditionally pro-Israeli position by what has been loosely-termed '*The Israel Lobby*'. Then we realise that we have a subversive element in a position of power trying enforce its opinions on those of a very different biological group who suppose that the media is there to tell them the truth, but that same media is in reality subtly distorting what they hold to be true and using it to the benefit of the jews both individually and collectively. Then we know we have a problem as a group.

If we acknowledge that in; for example, European and American universities we have a disproportionate proliferation of jewish academics and students who influence other groups using their own group sanctions: in essence distorting scholarship to fit with their individual and collective agenda. Then we know we have a problem as a group.

If we further acknowledge that we cannot; for fear of sanction from our country or nation, criticise this subversive group or point to what they are doing publicly. Then we know that our group, our country and our nation have been all but seized by another biological group which has; unconsciously or consciously, subverted us due to their need to impose their interpretation of what is good, bad and neutral onto us in accordance with their individual and/or collective interests as jews.

This then leaves us with two simple choices. Either we can oppose this new power structure within our group, country and nation or we can collaborate with this new order.

I have chosen to oppose this new power structure and its intentions for my people: that is why I am an anti-Semite.

Correction: 'Judeo-Bolshevik Debacle' Article

Monday, 14 June 2010

I have to say that everyone loves to be right about things, but at the same time everyone is human and we do make mistakes from time-to-time; especially when the person one is addressing isn't specific enough or makes a mistake, which can sometimes lead you up blind alleys.

On the 5th of October 2008 we published an article entitled '*A Judeo-Bolshevik Debacle*' written by a contributor. (1) Within that article we addressed Michael Hoffman's '*Judaic Communists*' list and one particular name (among many) we simply couldn't find in the various lists of senior Soviet officials was the '*Judaic Communist*' that Hoffman labels as '*Dragonsky*' and asserts was a '*Hero of the Soviet Union*' and a General in the Red Army.

As we could not find anyone of that name on the lists of '*Heroes of the Soviet Union*' we naturally assumed that there must be another origin for the claim and we discovered that there was as '*Dragonsky*' listed as a '*Hero of the Soviet Union*' in the G.I. Joe fictional universe. We believed that this; in the absence of any other evidence, could only be the origin of this claim from Hoffman.

As it turns out there is an individual who Hoffman probably meant who was Jewish and was a '*Hero of the Soviet Union*' as well as being a General in the Soviet Armed Forces. However Hoffman; typically as regular readers will know, didn't give enough detail to track this individual down and nor did he spell the individual's surname correctly (which you would have thought would be kind of important with a list of '*Judaic Communists*'). In a book I have been reading I came across a mention of this character in a footnote and immediately recognised that he could well be the individual Hoffman meant. So for the sake of the factual record, intellectual honesty and being complete I reproduce the relevant footnote:

'David Dragunsky (1910-1992) commanded tank units during World War II and participated in the capture of Berlin; he twice received the Hero of the Soviet Union award. After the war, when he reached the rank of major general, he participated in a number of events to honor the memory of Holocaust victims and advocated the construction of memorials; see Redlich, War, Holocaust and Stalinism, p. 231, for his letter to Mikhoels asking the committee to set up "monuments for the executed children, old people and women..... We must erect fences, monuments and inscriptions everywhere and show dates." By the late 1960s Dragunsky was notorious for his activity in Soviet anti-Zionist propaganda and became chairman of the Soviet anti-Zionist Committee of 1983.' (2)

References

(1) The article in question maybe found at the following address:

<http://semiticcontroversies.blogspot.com/2008/10/judeo-bolshevik-debacle.html>

(2) Vladimir Naumov, Joshua Rubenstein (Eds.), Laura Wolfson (Trans.), 2005, '*Stalin's Secret Pogrom: The Postwar Inquisition of the Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee*', 2nd Edition, Yale University Press: New Haven, p. 21

Useful Quotations and Summaries for anti-Semites: Moses Hess (Part I)

Wednesday, 16 June 2010

Moses Hess is a jewish figure who is not exactly well known, but he was the father of modern Zionist ideology and in particular Labor Zionist ideology. He anticipated Theodore Herzl; the better known founder of modern Zionist ideology, by several decades and was also a close associate of another famous jew; Karl Marx, during his youth. He is the earliest voice of modern Zionism and jewish nationalism that can be explicitly recognised beyond the confines of jewish religious and messianic movements in the historical literature.

He is important to the modern anti-Semite, because; despite being largely unknown inside the non-jewish world, he is very well-known; and still widely read along with Herzl, inside the jewish world particularly the part of that world that is called Israel today. Hess also forms a useful link between the two; historically and currently, most influential political ideologies inside the jewish community: Zionism and Marxism. Hess in essence forms a bridge through which we may point out that jewish nationalism is quite able to cohabit and even work with Marxism despite the ostensible conflict between the two. The utility of Hess for an anti-Semite is thus rather obvious in that he provides a solid connection between the two and forces ones philo-Semitic onto the back foot and into the intellectually hollow quagmire of claiming that Hess was either unimportant or a lone quack (both of which may be easily demonstrated to be false positions).

Hess is also notable for the modern anti-Semite for the reason that he is; unusually for a jew, very explicit in his opinions and spends a great deal of time attacking and doing down gentiles, while praising the jews to the skies. Hence Hess is eminently quotable for those seeking short, instructive and mainstream references from jewish political and intellectual culture and literature to backup their arguments or reinforce their theses on the jewish question.

Part I of this article will simply be a selection of fifty-five quotations from Hess' principle; and most read, work on Zionism: *'Rome and Jerusalem'*. This research has been undertaken and written up because of the considerable need for anti-Semitic intellectual cribs and this; I hope, will be the function that other anti-Semites put this first part to use as. What is perhaps problematic for the average anti-Semite is the lack of explanations of key terms that Hess uses; particularly those derived from jewish history or Judaism, but this will be corrected with the addition of an appendix containing these necessary explanations in the next two weeks.

Part II of this article will be a personal interpretation of what I have quoted in Part I in addition to reviewing the conclusions of part of the literature on Moses Hess and will be geared towards forming the basis of an anti-Semitic understanding of Hess and his intellectual position as well as that position's relation to jews both historically and currently.

If you wish to reproduce either or both parts of this article then you may do so, but please give credit and provide a link back to the blog; *'Semitic Controversies'*, that it was first published at, because as much as I wish my research to be used: I do not wish for people to simply steal it and

claim it as their own either explicitly or by implication as has been the case in the past.

Part I (Quotations from ‘Rome and Jerusalem’)

‘Every Jew has within him the potentiality of a Messiah and every Jewess of a Mater dolorosa.’
(1)

‘Already eighteen hundred years ago, a Jew, who has since become a redeemer among the gentiles, found an extra-mundane point of support, from which he wished to lift the world from its poles.’ (2)

‘Even in later Rabbinic Judaism, the Rabbis never separated the idea of a future world from the conception of the Messianic reign. Nachmanides insists, in contradiction to Maimonides, upon the identity of Olom Habbo, “the world to come,” with the Messianic reign.’ (3)

‘With the Jews, solidarity and social responsibility were always the fundamental principles of life and conduct.’ (4)

‘The solidarity of the Jews covers also the Shem, i.e., the name of God. The Jewish law of solidarity: “All Israelites are responsible for one another,” is expressed also in the form of Kiddush Hashem, the Sanctification of God’s name; i.e. the Jew is urged to act in a more unselfish spirit than the law requires, and even to sacrifice his own interests and person, that he may thereby reflect glory upon the name of Judaism and all other Jews.’ (5)

‘True it is, that the “end of days,” when the knowledge of God will fill the earth, is still far off; yet we firmly believe that the time will come when the holy spirit of our nation will become the property of humanity and the earth will become a grand temple wherein the spirit of God will dwell.’ (6)

‘The “pure human nature” of the Germans is, in reality, the character of the pure German race, which rises to the conception of humanity in theory only, but in practice it has not succeeded in overcoming the natural sympathies and antipathies of the race. German antagonism to Jewish national aspiration has a double origin, though the motives are really contrary to each other. The duplicity and contrariety of the human personality, such as we can see in the union of the spiritual and the natural, the theoretical and practical sides, are in no other nation so sharply marked in their points of opposition as in the German. Jewish national aspirations are antagonistic to the theoretical cosmopolitan tendencies of the German. But in addition to this the German opposes Jewish national aspirations because of his racial antipathy, from which even the noblest Germans have not yet emancipated themselves/ The publisher, whose “pure human” conscience revolted against publishing a book advocating the revival of Jewish nationality, published books preaching hatred to Jews and Judaism without the slightest remorse, in spite of the fact that the motive of such works is essentially opposed to the “pure human conscience.” This contradictory action was due to inborn racial antagonism to the Jews. But the German, it seems, has no clear conception of his racial prejudices; he sees in his egoistic as well as in his spiritual endeavours, not German or Teutonic, but “humanitarian tendencies”; and he does not know that he follows the latter only in theory, while in practice he clings to his egoistic ideas.

*Progressive German Jews, also, seem to think that they have sufficient reason for turning away from the Jewish national movement. My dear old friend, Berthold Auerbach, is disappointed with me, just as much as my former publisher, though not on the ground of "pure human conscience." He complains bitterly about my attitude and finally exclaims: "Who appointed you as a prince and judge over us?" It seems that on account of the hatred that surrounds him on all sides, the German Jew is determined to estrange himself from Judaism as far as possible and endeavours even to deny his race. No reform of the Jewish religion, however extreme, is radical enough for the educated German Jew. But the endeavours are vain. Even conversion itself does not relieve the Jew from the enormous pressure of German Anti-Semitism. The German hates the Jewish religion less than the race; he objects less to the Jews' peculiar beliefs than to their peculiar noses. Neither reform, nor conversion, nor emancipation throw open to the Jew the gates of social life, hence their anxiety of deny their racial descent. Molleshot, in his *Physiological Sketches* (p. 251), tells how the son of a converted Jew used to spend hours every morning at the looking-glass, comb in hand, endeavouring to straighten his curly hair, so as to give it a more Teutonic appearance. But as little as the "radical" Reform movement – an appellation which characterizes it so well, inasmuch as it lays the axe at the root of Judaism and its national historical cult- accomplished its aim, so little will the tendency of some Jews to deny their racial descent fulfil their purpose. Jewish noses cannot be reformed, and the black, wavy hair of the Jews will not change through conversion into blond, nor can its curves be straightened out by constant combing. The Jewish race is one of the primary races of mankind that has retained its integrity, in spite of the continual change of its climatic environment, and the Jewish type has conserved its purity through the centuries.' (7)*

'If Judaism owes its immortality to the remarkable religious productivity of the Jewish genius, this genius itself owes its existence to the fertility of the Jewish race.' (8)

'And just as it is impossible for me to entertain any prejudice against my own race, which has played such an important role in universal history and which is destined for a still greater one in the future, [...]' (9)

'[...], it is a fact which may even come to the attention of our German Jewish reformers, that the Jewish religion is, above all, Jewish patriotism.' (10)

'No more did I seek to suppress the voice of my Jewish consciousness, but on the contrary, I carefully followed up its traces and was pleasantly surprised when I found, in my old manuscripts, a passage anticipating my present day Jewish aspirations.' (11)

'The way and manner in which the persecution of the Jews in Europe, and even in enlightened Germany, is looked upon, must necessarily cause a new point of departure in Jewish life. This tendency demonstrates quite clearly that in spite of the degree of education to which Occidental Jews have attained, there still exists a barrier between them and the surrounding nations, almost as formidable as in the days of religious fanaticism. Those of our brethren who, for the purposes of obtaining emancipation, endeavour to persuade themselves, as well as others, that modern Jews possess no trace of a national feeling have really lost their heads. These men do not understand how it is possible that such a stupid medieval legend, which was only too well known

to our forefathers under the name of Mamserbilbul, should be given credence, even for a moment, in Nineteenth Century Europe. To our educated German Jews, the feeling of hatred towards the Jews displayed by the Germans has always remained an unsolved puzzle. Was not the entire of the German Jews, since the days of Mendelssohn, directed toward becoming wholly Germanized, to thinking and feeling as Germans?’ (12)

‘In vain does the enlightened Jew hide behind his geographical and philosophical alibi. It is of no avail. Mask yourself a thousand times over, change your name, religion and character, travel throughout the world incognito, so that people may not recognise the Jew in you; yet every insult to the Jewish name will strike you, even more than the pious man who is permeated with the spirit of Jewish solidarity and who fights for the honor of the Jewish name.’ (13)

‘Judaism is not threatened, like Christianity, with danger from the nationalistic and humanistic aspirations of our time, for in reality, these sentiments belong to the very essence of Judaism.’ (14)

‘Development of the knowledge of God, through study and conscientious investigation, is not only not forbidden in Judaism, but is even considered a religious duty.’ (15)

‘Differences of opinion in regard to metaphysical conceptions have always obtained among the Jews, but Judaism never excluded anyone. The apostates sever themselves from the bond of Jewry. “And not even them has Judaism forsaken,” added a learned rabbi, in whose presence I expressed the above-quoted opinion.’ (16)

‘A Jew belongs to his race and consequently also to Judaism, in spite of the fact that he or his ancestors have become apostates.’ (17)

‘The converted Jew remains a Jew no matter how much he objects to it.’ (18)

‘After the dispersion, study became, as you can find again in Sachs, an essential and inseparable part of the national cult.’ (19)

‘More reasonable are the attempts of those fusionists who, like my friend Hirsch, of Luxemburg, are utilizing freemasonry as a means to amalgamate all the historical cults into one. The Luxemburg Rabbi, the antipode of his namesake, the Frankfurt Rabbi Hirsch, developed the idea of fusion so thoroughly in his excellent lectures which he delivered at the Luxemburg Lodge, and later published under the title Humanity as a Religion, that, according to him, the matter may be considered closed. All that remains for the rabbis to do is to close up their reform temples and send the school children to the Masonic temples. In truth, the logical consequences of the forms have long since led those who took the sermons of the reform rabbis seriously, toward making such a step; as you, being a resident of Frankfurt, well know. In vain did they afterward ornament their fusionist sermons with Talmudic quotations. It was too late and they had to be satisfied to preach to empty pews.’ (20)

‘This people was hardly noticeable in the ancient world, where it was greatly oppressed by its powerful, conquering neighbours. Twice it came near to being destroyed; namely, in the

Egyptian and Babylonian captivities; and twice it rose to new spiritual life and fought long and successfully against the mightiest as well as the most civilized peoples of antiquity – the Greeks and the Romans. Finally, in the last struggle of the ancient world, it was this people which fertilized the genius of humanity with its own spirit, so as to rejuvenate itself, along with the regeneration of humanity. To-day, when the process of rejuvenation of the historical peoples is ended and each nation has its special function in the organism of humanity, we are for the first time beginning to conceive the special significant of the various organs of humanity.’ (21)

‘When we observe that every modern people, every part of modern society, displays in its activity as an organ of humanity a special calling, then we must also determine the importance and function of the only ancient people which still exists to-day, as strong and vigorous as it was in the days of old, namely, the people of Israel.’ (22)

‘In the organ of humanity there are no two peoples which attract and repel each other more than the Germans and the Jews; as there are no two mental attitudes which are simultaneously akin to each other and still diametrically opposed, as the scientific-philosophical and the religious-moral.’ (23)

‘The greatest and most dangerous enemy of the Jewish religion in antiquity was the religion of gross sensualism, the material love of the Semites, namely, Baal worship. In medieval ages, the enemy was represented by the embodiment of spiritualistic love – Christianity.’ (24)

‘I agree with you in your view of human love and believe, also, that moral freedom is the destiny of man as well as of humanity. But to me this goal of humanity is identical with the recognition of God, which Judaism proclaimed at the very beginning of history, and to the spread and development of which it has always contributed, and which, since Spinoza, it has made accessible to all historical nations.’ (25)

‘We Jews have always, from the beginning of our history, cherished the faith in a future Messianic epoch.’ (26)

‘In other words, that History, like Nature, will finally have her epoch of harmonious perfection.’ (27)

‘Then, also, began the history of creation of the social world, which will celebrate its Sabbath after the completion of its world-historical labor, by introducing the Messianic epoch. Here, in this conception, you can see the high moral value of the Mosaic genesis history, in which supernaturalists have discovered a system of science. As you see, my esteemed friend, the very biblical Sabbath-law in itself inspires us with a feeling of certainty that the uniform, eternal, divine law governs alike both the world of Nature and the world of History. It is only to those people who cannot conceive the manifestation of the religious genius of the Jews, that the historical development of humanity appears as lawless, indeterminate, infinite “Progress” when contrasted with the life of Nature which, though it has not reached the end of its development, is yet governed by strict laws which are calculable.’ (28)

‘But, thanks to the religious genius of the Jews and its divine Revelation, which continually

manifested itself in various forms: first in prophetic utterances, then in mysticism, and finally in philosophic speculation – the human spirit was constantly brought nearer to the recognition of the law.’ (29)

‘The revelations of the holy spirit point to no other future but to the mature age of the spirit of the social world. This age will begin, according to our historical religion, with the Messianic era. This is the era in which the Jewish nation and all the other historical nations will arise again to a new life, the time of the “resurrection of the dead,” of “the coming of the Lord,” of the “New Jerusalem,” and of all the other symbolic expressions, the meaning of which is no longer misunderstood.

The Messianic era is the present age, which began to germinate with the teachings of Spinoza, and finally came into historical existence with the great French Revolution. With the French Revolution, there began the regeneration of those nations which had acquired their national historical religion only through the influence of Judaism.’ (30)

‘In the social sphere, it is not yet completed; it is at present developing its last race and class struggle, in order to bring about a reconciliation of all opposites and to establish an equilibrium between production and consumption, and finally to reach that perfected and harmonious course of life which characterises every age of maturity.’ (31)

‘As an offset to the noble and exalted historical religion of my regenerated Judaism, you oppose the “bloody sacrificial cult” of the ancient Israelites, and claim that orthodox Jews will never agree to a rebuilding of the Temple without, at the same time, reinstituting this ancient cult. You assume, therefore, that my love for my people will not go so far as to consent to the introduction of the sacrificial cult.

I cannot grant you, however, either the supposed condition sine qua non, on the part of orthodox Jews, or your hypothetical conception of the degree of my patriotism.’ (32)

‘Were, really, the sacrificial cult an inseparable part of Jewish nationality, I would unhesitatingly accept it. But as long as I have not learned anything better, I am convinced to the contrary.’ (33)

‘Regarded by itself, the sacrificial cult, as described in the Bible, does not contain anything repellent to the spirit of humanitarianism. On the contrary, as compared with the horrible custom of human sacrifices practised by all the nations of antiquity, the Jewish practice of animal sacrifices was a splendid victory for the spirit of humanitarianism. Be that as it may, whether animal sacrifices are regarded as a concession on the part of the Torah to Paganism, in order to prevent a relapse on the part of the people idolatry, or whether it be maintained that it contains a hidden symbolism, the meaning of which is at present unknown, one thing is well established, that the Jews, in spite of their having brought “bloody sacrifices,” possess greater abhorrence for bloodshed and the eating of the blood than modern nations which consume the blood together, with the meat, without sacrifice or ceremony. But the sacrificial cult has not been practised for the last eighteen hundred years, and therefore our new-fashioned Jews are ashamed of it. And yet it seems that even to the present day, sacrifice is the natural expression of

the pious spirit of the child.’ (34)

‘On the other hand, the prophets of old, and even the rabbis of the Middle Ages, never considered the sacrificial cult essential to the Jewish religion as do the modern rigidly orthodox Jews, who look upon it as inseparable from our national restoration. Rabbi Jochanan ben Zakkai declared, basing his utterance on the prophetic saying of Hosea vi, 6, that sacrifices can be substituted by benevolence, and a number of modern rabbinical authorities, who do not recognise the right of the modern descendents of Aaron to the priesthood, have yet declared themselves zealously for the restoration of a Jewish State. The cult that we are going to introduce in the New Jerusalem can and must, for the present, remain an open question. Rome was not built in a day, and the New Jerusalem must needs take time for its construction.’ (35)

‘As the rabbi in the story symbolises our people, so does the knight of the legend signify the French people, which in our days, as in the Middle Ages, sent its brave soldiers to Syria and “prepared in the desert the way of the Lord.”’ (36)

‘What an example! What a race. You Roman conquerors led your legions in battle against the already ruined Zion and drove the children of Israel out of their ancestral land. Your European, Asiatic and African barbarians lent your ear to superstition and pronounced your curse upon them. You feudal kings brand the Jews with the mark of shame - the Jews, who, in spite of all your persecutions, supplied with the necessary gold wherewith to arm your vassals and serfs and who provided your markets with goods. You grand Inquisitors, searched among the children of the dispersed people of Israel, for your richest victims, with whom to fill your prisons and coffers, and in order to feed your auto-da-fe’s – and you revoked the edict of Nantes and drove out of the land the remnant that had escaped destruction of Apostolic fanaticism. And finally, you modern nations have denied these indefatigable workers and industrious merchants civil rights. What persecutions! What tears! What blood you children of Israel have shed in the last eighteen hundred years! But you sons of Judea, in spite of all suffering are still here! You have overcome the innumerable obstacles which the hatred, contempt, fanaticism and barbarism of the centuries have placed in your way. The hand of the Eternal has surely guided you.’ (37)

‘You are an elemental force and we bow our heads before you. You were powerful in the early period of your history, strong even after the destruction of Jerusalem, and mighty during the Middle Ages, when there were only two dominant powers – the Inquisition and its Cross, and Piracy with its Crescent. You have escaped destruction in your long dispersion, in spite of the terrible tax you have paid during eighteen centuries of persecution. But what is left of your nation is mighty enough to rebuild the gates of Jerusalem. This is your mission.

Providence would not have prolonged your existence until to-day, had it not reserved for you the holiest of all missions. The hour has struck for the resettlement of the banks of the Jordan. The historical books of the royal prophets can, perhaps, be written again only by you.

A great calling is reserved for you: to be a living channel of communication between three continents. You should be the bearers of civilisation to the primitive peoples of Asia, and the teachers of the European sciences to which your race has contributed so much. You should be the mediators between Europe and far Asia, open the roads that lead to India and China – those

unknown regions which must ultimately be thrown open to civilisation. You will come to the land of your fathers crowned with the crown of age-long martyrdom, and there, finally, you will be completely healed from all your ills! Your capital will again bring the wide stretches of barren land under cultivation; your labor and industry will once again turn the ancient soil into fruitful valleys, reclaim the flat lands from the encroaching sands of the desert, and the world will again pay its homage to the oldest of peoples. ' (38)

'You have contributed enough to the cause of civilisation and have helped Europe on the path of progress, to make revolutions and carry them out successfully. You must henceforth think of yourselves, of the valleys of Lebanon and the plans of Gennesareth.

March forward! At the sight of your rejuvenation, our hearts will beat fast, and our armies will stand by you, ready to help.

March forward, Jews of all lands! The ancient fatherland of yours is calling you, and we will be proud to open its gates to you.

March forward, ye sons of martyrs! The harvest of experience which you have accumulated in your long exile, will help to bring again to Israel the splendour of the Davidic days and rewrite that part of history of which the monoliths of Semiramis are the only witness.

March forward, ye noble hearts! The day on which the Jewish tribes return to their fatherland will be epoch-making in the history of humanity. Oh, how will the East tremble at your coming! How quickly, under the influence of labor and industry, will the enervation of the people vanish, in the land where voluptuousness, idleness and robbery have held sway for thousands of years.

You will become the moral stay of the East. You have written the Book of books. Become, then, the educators of the wild Arabian hordes and the African peoples. Let the ancient wisdom of the East, the revelations of the Zend, the Vedas, as well as the more modern Koran and the Gospels, group themselves around your Bible. They will all become purified from every superstition and all will proclaim alike the principles of freedom, humanity, peace and unity. You are the triumphal arch of the future historical epoch, under which the great covenant of humanity will be written and sealed in your presence as the witnesses of the past and future. The Biblical traditions which you will revive, will also sanctify anew our Occidental society and destroy the weed of materialism together with its roots. ' (39)

'Even to-day, the great majority of Occidental Jews pay homage to their ancient religion. Neither emancipation nor Christian proselytism, with its bait of material advantages, has succeeded in estranging the majority of Jews from their traditions. On the contrary, there have appeared of late, even among those who were formerly estranged from Judaism, men who display strong sympathies for the ancient Jewish mode of life. ' (40)

'The parasitic way of existence has played an important role in the development of human history and is by no means restricted to the Jews. ' (41)

'Every Jew, even the converted, should cling to the cause and labor for the regeneration of

Israel.' (42)

'It is in the interest of France to see that the road leading to India and China should be settled by a people which will be loyal to the cause of France to the end, in order that it may fulfil the historical mission which has fallen to it as a legacy from the great Revolution.' (43)

"'Frenchmen and Jews!' I hear you exclaim. 'If so, then the Christian German reactionaries were right in their denunciations of the Jews!'" Yes, my dear friend, the animal instinct which scents the enemy in the distance is always infallible. Reaction has everywhere recognized its mortal enemy in those who stand midway between reaction and revolution and who act as the midwife of progress, the giant who is to smite reaction over its head.' (44)

'Frenchmen and Jews! It seems that in all things they were created for one another. They resemble one another in their humane and national aspirations, and differ only in such qualities as can only be complemented by another nation, but which are never united in one and the same people. The French people excel in alertness, in the humanistic and sympathetic quality to assimilate all elements; the Jews, on the other hand, possess more ethical seriousness than the French, and in meeting other types, the Jew will rather impress his stamp on his environment than be moulded by it. The French can rule the world because they absorbed the best of the entire human race. The Jews can only be masters of their own flock, and with the holy fire which they have kindled in their own midst, they will warm and enlighten a world composed of heterogeneous elements, and thus prevent this world from disintegrating into its elements and relapsing into the chaos out of which it was raised once before by Judaism.' (45)

'For Jewish colonization on the road to India and China, there is no lack, either of Jewish laborers or of Jewish talent and capital. Let only the germ be planted under the protection of the European powers, and the tree of a new life will spring forth by itself and bear excellent fruit.' (46)

'On the common ground of Jewish patriotism, all Jewish classes will meet, orthodox and progressive, rich and poor. They will recognize themselves as the descendents of those heroes who fought the mightiest and most civilized nations of antiquity: the Egyptians, Assyrians, Greeks and Romans, and succeeded in carrying on their struggle to the very end of the ancient world, which they alone survived. They will look upon themselves as children of that race which, unlike any other people in history, has suffered a two thousand year martyrdom, and which has always carried aloft the banner of nationality, namely, the Book of the Law.' (47)

'Just as after the last catastrophe of organic life, when the historical races came into the world's arena, there came their division into tribes, and the position and role of the latter was determined, so after the last catastrophe in social life, when the spirit of humanity shall have reached its maturity, will our people, with the other historical people, find its legitimate place in universal history.' (48)

'This unified, divine plan of history is, at present, apparently in its last stage of historical development. But in antiquity, when the nations were still in the grip of natural life, it was only one people, the people of Israel, which, thanks to its peculiar genius, was able to perceive the

workings of the divine plan in the history of humanity, as well as in the organic and cosmic spheres of life.

If we consider the plan of history, as mapped out in the sacred Scriptures of the Jews, without prejudice, we shall see in it, not only the conception of the unity of mankind, but also the unity of all life, cosmic, organic and social. Our sacred Scriptures presuppose the unity of God, in spite of the apparent variety which the word presents, and the unity of the human genus, notwithstanding the differences of the races; because the total plan of the history of the world seems to have been always present to the spirit of the Jewish people, from the beginning of its history. The entire literature of the Jews is to be conceived only from this genetic point of view. Judaism is a historical religion, a historical cult, in contra-distinction to Paganism, which is a natural cult.

The revelation of the Jewish spirit, which was an isolated phenomenon at the dawn of history of humanity, would have been inexplicable and would appear supernatural, were it not for the fact that there existed originally different tribes, with typically individual mental qualities, which had evolved fundamentally different views long before the revelation of the Jewish spirit. This same remarkable manifestation of individuality is met in the divergent languages of primitive peoples. Primitive religions and primitive languages are, as Renan has rightly observed, race creations; though he himself had hardly conception of the importance of the ancient Jewish historical religion. History corroborates the story of anthropology, that there were originally different human races and tribes.’ (49)

‘This other-worldliness, in the course of historical development, in the measure that the nations approached the Jewish historical religion, assumed more and more of a secular character. And the more Jewish, the more humane the pagan world became, the more could Jews participate in the culture of this world and contribute to its progress. And finally, when after the long struggle between the pagan world of sensuality and barbarous force, on the one hand, and the spiritual, mystic, Jewish view on the other, the sun of modern humanitarian civilization shed its feeble rays upon a better and more perfect world, it was a Jew who was able to signal to the world that the final stage of the process of human development had begun.’ (50)

‘These manifestations of the Jewish genius are not a supernatural phenomenon, but form a part of the great eternal Law which governs all three life spheres, the cosmic, organic and social. The special field of operation of the Jewish genius, however, is the social sphere, and it is due to it that a unified historical development of humanity was made possible. The revelations of the Jewish spirit expresses the universal law in its entirety; its past workings as well as its future operations, using the scientific formula of to-day with the same facility as formerly the proofs of imagination and feeling.’ (51)

‘Spiritual creations, like the organic, have their paleontological and modern epochs, the last stage of which is the age of maturity, in which the development of social life will come to completion. The coming of the future epoch of social life will be hastened by the efforts and energy of the Jews, who have a special calling for conveying to the world revelations affection the social life-sphere.’ (52)

'What Jewish revelation emphasized most is the unity of the creative spirit, in opposition to the plurality of forces; and this idea has been expressed clearly also by Spinoza. The Bible, stripped of its anthropomorphic expressions, does not offer a single point which expressly contradicts the teachings of Spinoza. Moses himself says that the Knowledge of God is not found either in heaven or in the distances of space, but that the real revelation of God takes place within ourselves in our spirit and heart.' (53)

'These politicians and patriots forget, that if Germany were to conquer France and Italy to-day, it would only result in placing the entire German people under police law; and in depriving the Jews of their civil rights, in a worse manner than after the "War of Liberation," when the only reward granted by the Germans to their Jewish brethren in arms was exclusion from civil life.' (54)

'The race struggle is the primal one, and the class struggle secondary. The last dominating race is the German. But, thanks to the French people, which succeeded not only in reconciling race antagonism in its own land, but also uprooted every form of race domination within the borders of France, the race struggle is nearing its end. And along with the cessation of race antagonism, the class struggle will also come to a stand-still. The equalization of all classes of Society will necessarily follow the emancipation of the races, for it will ultimately become only a scientific question of social economics.

Yet it seems that a final race struggle is unavoidable, if the German politicians, failing to grasp the situation, do not attempt to oppose the tremendous current of reaction, which will ultimately involve Germany in a collision with the Romance nations, and will also entrap the progressive German democrats in the net of Romantic demagoguery. Medieval reaction succeeded twice during the present century, once during the "War of Liberation," and for the second time during the Italian war, in defeating the modern efforts of the German people for political and social regeneration, by inflaming race dominance instincts in the hearts of the lords of war, who think themselves lords of the land by divine right, and consider the people as their rightly inherited slaves.' (55)

References

- (1) Moses Hess, Meyer Waxman (Trans.), 1943, [1862], *'Rome and Jerusalem: A Study in Jewish Nationalism'*, 2nd Edition, Bloch: New York, p. 45
- (2) Hess, Op. Cit., p. 47
- (3) Hess, Op. Cit., p. 51
- (4) Hess, Op. Cit., p.52
- (5) Hess, Op. Cit., pp. 52-53, n. 2
- (6) Hess, Op. Cit., p. 54
- (7) Hess, Op. Cit., pp. 57-59
- (8) Hess, Op. Cit., p. 60
- (9) Hess, Op. Cit., p. 62
- (10) Hess, Op. Cit., p. 63
- (11) Hess, Op. Cit., p. 70
- (12) Hess, Op. Cit., pp. 70-71

- (13) Hess, Op. Cit., p. 75
- (14) Hess, Op. Cit., pp. 96-97
- (15) Hess, Op. Cit., p. 97
- (16) Hess, Op. Cit. p. 97
- (17) Hess, Op. Cit., p. 98
- (18) Hess, Op. Cit., p. 98
- (19) Hess, Op. Cit., p. 109
- (20) Hess, Op. Cit., p. 115
- (21) Hess, Op. Cit., pp. 123-124
- (22) Hess, Op. Cit., p. 124
- (23) Hess, Op. Cit., pp. 124-125
- (24) Hess, Op. Cit., p. 125
- (25) Hess, Op. Cit., p. 128
- (26) Hess, Op. Cit., p. 132
- (27) Hess, Op. Cit., p. 132
- (28) Hess, Op. Cit., pp. 132-133
- (29) Hess, Op. Cit. p. 134
- (30) Hess, Op. Cit., pp. 137-138
- (31) Hess, Op. Cit., p. 139
- (32) Hess, Op. Cit., p. 141
- (33) Hess, Op. Cit., p. 142
- (34) Hess, Op. Cit., p. 144-145
- (35) Hess. Op. Cit., p. 145
- (36) Hess, Op. Cit., p. 148
- (37) Hess, Op. Cit., pp. 155-156
- (38) Hess, Op. Cit., pp. 157-158
- (39) Hess, Op. Cit., pp. 158-159
- (40) Hess, Op. Cit., p. 164
- (41) Hess, Op. Cit., p. 165
- (42) Hess, Op. Cit., p. 167
- (43) Hess, Op. Cit., p. 167
- (44) Hess, Op. Cit., p. 168
- (45) Hess, Op. Cit., p. 169
- (46) Hess, Op. Cit., p. 169
- (47) Hess, Op. Cit., pp. 172-173
- (48) Hess, Op. Cit., p. 178
- (49) Hess, Op. Cit., pp. 181-182
- (50) Hess, Op. Cit., p. 211
- (51) Hess, Op. Cit., p. 212
- (52) Hess, Op. Cit., p. 214
- (53) Hess, Op. Cit., p. 215
- (54) Hess, Op. Cit., p. 225
- (55) Hess, Op. Cit. pp. 226-227

Sources on Jews and Communism (Part XI)

Saturday, 19 June 2010

Part XI

'Kersenski was elected Premier and the order was issued to work energetically. Students and army people were clamoured to put an end to the war. Many Jewish boys became cadets and some Jews were promoted to officers. All prices rose, the value of the rouble fell rapidly. Among the members of the Government were ministers of the Union of the Rural Self-Government and representatives of the War Industries Committee among them were two Jewish Ministers.' (211) [+J]

'President Sverdlov had taken over Count Lvov's place. The Sverdlov brothers were children of a foreman in a gas works, and who later owned a ship in Nizhni Novgorod. Both brothers were socialists and had visited Lenin in Switzerland. And this Sverdlov, told Zool, that they had decided to make me head of "GLAV-VOD".'

In peace-time, this was a medical and pharmaceutical department belonging to the Ministry of Communications and Roads. This post had been occupied by a qualified doctor of medicine who had the honorary rank of general. Under this department came all the hospitals situated on the rivers Volga, Kama, Don, also some parts of Siberia and Southern Russia.' (212) [+J]

'When we were alone in his room, I asked him for a certificate to enable my children, under the supervision of Comrade Schapiro, to leave Moscow and re-cooperate in the Koumiss. This certificate was issued and on it was written that they should be given any assistance that they might require.' (213) [+J]

'My wife's cousin, a Mr. Perez was shot, when a million dollars was found hidden in his place, but the local people and the emigrants thought that this wave of terror would not last and many accepted jobs with the Communists and were offered high positions.' (214) [+J]

'Next morning, I went into town to get a permit to cross the frontier. Great difficulties were made to obtain this document. Crowds were sitting and awaiting their turn. I showed my identification card to one of the officials, but was not called in for a very long time. At long last my turn came to see the official in charge. It was a 17 to 18 year old Jewish Bundist, who was issuing passes.' (215) [+J]

'Where the Ukrainian soldiers and Cossacks conquered a locality or town they treated the Jews very badly and therefore the Jewish population was jubilant when the Communists arrived.' (216) [+J]

'A week later documents arrived from the headquarters of the Plen-Bezh, indicating that I was nominated head of the Economic and Pharmaceutical Department of the Plen-Bezh in Moscow.' (217) [+J]

'At about eleven o'clock in the morning, I went to introduce myself to the Plen-Bezh

Headquarters. I wanted to hear more about my future duties there and to see who was in charge. It was the wife of the writer, Radek (he was imprisoned in Berlin at the time). Mrs. Radek was a doctor by profession and her maiden name was Elisabeth Marvikyevna Rabinovitch. She received me very politely and told me that I had been nominated head of the economic and pharmaceutical department of the Plen-Bezh head office and she suggested I should go down to the pharmaceutical department and have a word with the present manager, Comrade Shlosberg and then report back to her at about two o'clock.' (218) [+J]

'Many succeeded in making a fortune during this period, but later their money was taken from them and they were exiled to Siberia. Many of them died during the construction of the Moskva-Volga Canal, others were sent to Siberia and died there of hunger and cold. My cousin Grisha Ratner was exiled to Siberia for five years and also several of my wife's relatives.' (219) [+J]

'I consider that the immediate suppression of Bolshevism is the greatest issue now before the world, not even excluding the war which is still raging, and unless, as above stated, Bolshevism is nipped in the bud immediately, it is bound to spread in one form or another over Europe and the whole world, as it organised and worked by Jews who have no nationality, and whose one object is to destroy for their own ends the existing order of things.' (220) [+]

'Although five prominent literary figures were among those indicted – the Yiddish poets Peretz Markish, Leyb Kvitko, David Hofshiteyn, and Itsik Fefer and the novelist David Bergelson – the remaining ten defendants were not writers at all but were connected in various ways to the Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee, a group that the regime had created during World War II to encourage Western Jewish support for the alliance with the Soviet Union.

Several defendants were famous Soviet personalities. Solomon Lozovsky, who turned out to be the principal defendant, had been a long-time member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party and was deputy people's commissar for foreign affairs of the USSR throughout the war. Boris Shimeliovich had been the medical director of one of Moscow's most prestigious hospitals. Lina Shtern, renowned for her pathbreaking work in biochemistry and medicine, was the first woman member of the Soviet Academy of Sciences. And Benjamin Zuskin was the premier actor at the State Jewish Theater in Moscow, where he and Solomon Mikhoels had created a world-renowned repertory; after the death of Mikhoels in January 1948, Zuskin became the theater's artistic director.' (221) [J]

'The trade-union activist Joseph Yuzefovich; the journalist and translator Leon Talmy; the lawyer Ilya Vatenberg and his wife. Khayke Vatenberg-Ostrovskaya, who worked as a translator for the JAC; the editor Emilia Teumin; and the party bureaucrat Solomon Bregman, who joined the JAC in 1944 and quickly became an informer, sending denunciations about Jewish "nationalism" within the committee to party officials. Talmy and the Vatenbergs had lived for many years in the United States before deciding to move to Russia in the 1930s out of loyalty to communism.' (222) [J]

'The Jewish section of the Communist Party (the notorious Yevseksiya) was the driving force behind the broader party directives for the Jewish minority.' (223) [J]

'Asking to see him in private Markish showed Lederman an article by the writer Moyshe Nadir in which Nadir explained why he had broken his long-standing ties with the American Communist Party and the Yiddish communist newspaper the Morgen Freiheit (Morning Freedom) following the Hitler-Stalin pact.' (224) [J]

'On the other hand it seemed reasonable to put forward figures like the historian and philosopher Abram Deborin, the ophthalmologist Mikhail Averbakh, and the violinist David Oistrakh. All were Jewish and all seemed prominent enough in their fields, at least inside the country, to appear alongside Mikhoels, Markish, and the others. But the proposal also listed General Yakov Smushkevich – a renowned air force officer who had earlier, under the pseudonym General Douglas, been sent to Spain to assist Republican forces and who was appointed chief commander of the Soviet Air Force in 1939 following his heroic conduct at the battle of Khalkin Gol, where Soviet troops fought Japanese forces in Mongolia. Smushkevich had been wounded and was twice awarded the medal Hero of the Soviet Union.' (225) [J]

'Although Henryk Erlich and Viktor Alter had escaped the Germans after the invasion of Poland, Stalin's secret police arrested them in the fall of 1939. Denounced to Soviet officials by a Polish Jewish communist, Erlich was detained at the train station in Brest-Livtosk. Alter was arrested in Kowel in western Volhynia. But Stalin released them two years later in the wake of Hitler's advance. By the fall of early 1941, with the Red Army in full retreat, Stalin had no choice but to improve relations with the Western powers. Erlich and Alter enjoyed excellent contracts with labor groups in the West. With their release, Stalin hoped to reassure their supporters and enlist both men in Soviet plans against Hitler. At the behest of the Kremlin, Erlich and Alter proposed a committee that would involve Soviet Jews and refugees from German-occupied countries. They even suggested the formation of a Jewish Legion in the Red Army to be made up of American volunteers.' (226) [J]

'Jewish organizations in America lent their names and resources to making the visit a success. A National Reception Committee, head by Albert Einstein and B. Z. Goldberg, who were both sympathetic to the Soviet Union. Goldberg in particular was an articulate fellow traveller, an adept and prolific Yiddish journalists whose professional visibility was enhanced by his marriage to the daughter of the famous Yiddish writer Sholem Aleichem.

Mainstream Jewish organizations like Hadassah, the Jewish National Fund, the Zionist Organization of America, and B'nai Brith also welcomed Mikhoels and Feder, as did James Rosenberg of the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee.' (227) [J]

'The Red Army had just inflicted a mortal blow to the Wehrmacht, so it was altogether natural for American Jewry and sections of the broader American public to greet them with profound enthusiasm. Wherever they visited – Philadelphia, Chicago, Pittsburgh, Detroit, Boston – they were welcomed with fund-raising dinners and testimonials. Mass rallies were organized in Los Angeles and San Francisco. In Hollywood they met Thomas Mann, Theodore Dreiser, Upton Sinclair, Charlie Chaplin, and Edward G. Robinson. In New York, Jewish furriers presented them with three specially made, luxurious fur hats and coats, one for each for Stalin himself, Mikhoels, and Fefer.' (228) [J]

'Rabbi Stephen Wise denounced "Jewish Trotskyites" for their attacks on Mikhoels and Fefer. B.Z. Goldberg praised "the great leader Marshal Stalin," and James Rosenberg proclaimed that "Russia has given life, asylum, bread and shelter to a vast Jewish population."' (229) [J]

'Pravda quoted the belief of Nahum Goldmann, the leader of the World Jewish Congress, that the visit by Mikhoels and Fefer would reinforce ties between Soviet and world Jewry. The newspaper also made clear that the Polo Grounds rally had been the largest pro-Soviet rally ever held in the United States and that, for the most part, it had been organized by well-known American Jewish organizations.' (230) [J]

References

(211) Moses Gurwitsch, Dora Wirth (Trans.), 1958, *'The Autobiography of a Russian Jew'*, Vol. I, 1st Edition, Self-Published: Liverpool, p. 62

(212) Ibid, p. 66. Gurwitsch means here that he; a jew who had owned a substantial Pharmacist business in Imperial Russia, was appointed to be the head of 'GLAV-VOD'. The reference to the Sverdlov brothers is also to two prominent jews; Yakov Sverdlov (an important member of the Bolshevik Central Committee, the man who gave the order to execute Tsar Nicholas II and his family and who was presumably the one who appointed Gurwitsch) and Zinovy [formerly Yeshua Zalman] Sverdlov who became a 'French' general after getting himself baptised as an Eastern Orthodox Christian.

(213) Ibid, p. 69. It is important to note that the significance of this comment is the carte blanche nature of this order and that Gurwitsch's children were placed under the care of another communist jew; Genrikh Schapiro who was also given (according to p. 83) a job managing a soap factory by Gurwitsch and another important socialist jew named Dr. Lev Naumovitch Geller [Schapiro had previously been favoured by two other jews named Schlossberg with the running of a cotton oil factory], who was given this carte blanche to do what he thought necessary for his and their comfort (probably at the expense of the local population).

(214) Ibid, p. 70. This quote points to the fact that rich jews were also targeted by the Bolsheviks, but Gurwitsch also indirectly implies that many jews; like him, were offered and took high positions in the local and national government under the Bolsheviks.

(215) Ibid, p. 71

(216) Ibid, p. 81

(217) Ibid, p. 86. This is another example; similar to n. 212 above, of a jew; Gurwitsch, being appointed to high office under the early Bolshevik regime.

(218) Ibid, p. 88. The wife of the prominent jewish communist Karl Radek was herself jewish and 'Comrade Shlosberg' was also jewish as is indicated down the page. 'Comrade Shlosberg' is then revealed on pp. 88-89 to be one of the jewish brothers who ran the cotton oil factory that Genrikh Schapiro managed.

(219) Ibid, p. 90. The interesting implication made by Gurwitsch is that many jews made great fortunes under the Bolshevik regime of Lenin; particularly in the era of the New Economic Plan or NEP which 're-introduced' a limited form of capitalism, and that these newly rich jews were swept up in Stalin's purges of the 'Kulaks'. This might suggest that composition of the 'Kulak' class; as defined by Stalin's regime, would be an interesting subject for research and could potentially provide an earlier precedent for Stalin's supposed targeting of the jewish population as an 'enemy within' between 1948 and his death in 1953.

(220) HMSO, 1919, '*Collection of Reports on Bolshevism in Russia*', 1st Edition, His Majesty's Stationary Office: London, p. 3/Doc. 6. The author of this report was Sir M. Findlay. I have marked this quotation as potentially unreliable, because it seems to reference the '*Commissar Lists*', which were widely believed at the time the work was written and published, but which subsequently have been debunked by scholars as being without value.

(221) Vladimir Naumov, Joshua Rubenstein (Eds.), Laura Wolfson (Trans.), 2005, '*Stalin's Secret Pogrom: The Postwar Inquisition of the Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee*', 2nd Edition, Yale University Press: New Haven, pp. 2-3. I cite only a few relevant passages of this work, but the material contained in this book; in both the first (i.e. the 2001 edition) and second [which is an abridged] editions is of the first importance in forming an accurate and coherent anti-Semitic interpretation of the Soviet Union during the post-war period of Stalin's rule.

(222) Ibid, p. 3. It should be noted that all those mentioned by Rubenstein were Jewish.

(223) Ibid, p. 5

(224) Ibid, p. 6. Moyshe Nadir was the nom de plume of the well-known communist Jewish writer Isaac Reiss.

(225) Ibid, p. 8

(226) Ibid, p. 9

(227) Ibid, p. 15. It should be noted that this refers to the visit of representatives of Soviet Jewry to the United States in 1943. All those mentioned are Jewish and in addition it should be noted that James Rosenberg headed the United States delegation to the United Nations from 1947 to 1948 and was instrumental in getting the '*Convention against Genocide*' adopted. We may in addition quote Mark Ewell's excellent summation of the communist and Jewish role in the United Nations to give a short explanation of this: '*On the other hand, there are organizations such as the Consultative Council of Jewish Organizations, the World Jewish Congress and the B'nai Brith which are not ashamed of the part they have played in the U.N. work relating to human rights. In fact, The Jewish Chronicle has told us that the larger Jewish Organizations with consultative status "come into the councils of the U.N. not just with views but with complete drafts and arguments which they place before the delegates and the Secretariat as a basis for work."*

Elsewhere we can read of the Jewish claim to having played the major part in disseminating the ideals of the Declaration of Human Rights. But, in the view of the enormous threat to human rights which our study of the Draft Covenants reveals, these claims are a little unfortunate. It is indeed understandable that Jewish lawyers should be particularly interested in the battle for human rights for Jews have suffered time and time again when these rights have been ignored. But, so far, their experts have helped to forge an instrument which is ready-made for the use of international tyranny.' (Mark Ewell, 1964, '*Manacles for Mankind: An analysis of the UNO's championship of Human Rights*', 1st Edition, Britons: London, pp. 54-55)

(228) Naumov, Rubenstein, Op. Cit., p. 15. We should note that Thomas Mann's left-wing wife; Katia Pringsheim, was Jewish and Edward G. Robinson [nee Emanuel Goldenberg] was actually Jewish.

(229) Ibid, pp. 16-17

(230) Ibid, p. 17

The Rabbinical Roundup (W/C: 14/06/2010)

Sunday, 20 June 2010

Week Commencing: 14/06/2010

What have Yahweh's little lovelies been up to this week? Well we've had the entire British Petroleum fiasco with the resident manikin the Whitehouse throwing his toys out of the pram while screaming hatred of all things European and proclaiming; in effect, that the jews are so dissatisfied with their European subjects that they wish to teach them a lesson by attacking one of their major companies. (1) Of course we hear the whining about what BP supposedly did or didn't do, but when we listen to what the whispers in the background are really saying all we hear is: *'the British must be made an example of. Those goyim dared to defy our will and must pay.'*

We can see this in the fact that particularly large hooked nosed one has been *'appointed'* by the bonobo chimpanzee in the Whitehouse to *'administer'* (more like steal) the money; some \$20 billion if you can believe it, that BP is to pay as compensation, while more kosher firms like Halliburton get to stand on the sidelines and giggle like little girls. This member of tribe; one Kenneth Feinberg, will get to say where the money goes and who gets what (which is like giving the fox the key to chicken coup).

You can be sure that given the past record of the Chosen with *'funds for victims'*; such as that so aptly described by the jew Finkelstein (2) and the activities of the jew Bernard Madoff, that all this money will be either siphoned off to private bank accounts in Israel where it conveniently can't be extracted and/or the money will be spent by Feinberg and his Chosen friends on their own personal comforts with a little *'show program'* to act as a smoke screen. So say Feinberg will roll out some non-jewish elderly lady suffering from Alzheimers that he found in a decrepit nursing home and claim that she has been greatly aided by this fund (all behind his satanic smirk of course) and then promptly metaphorically shove her in front of the nearest car to be rid of the incriminating evidence (of course Feinberg being the observant jew that he is would promptly sue the driver and make a big public spectacle out of the whole thing).

But of course if you are a jew then you can just do as you please now can't you?

In other news we also found that in the Jerusalem Post a 'British' woman named Julie Burchill has decided to assert that any sensible British *'toff'*; i.e. someone of the upper class, should go and marry a jew and support Israel. (3) Apparently according to Burchill the British upper classes are genetically anti-Semitic, which is rather amusing given that Burchill doesn't seem to realise that if you go back to the family tree of most 'British' aristocrats you tend to find there is a jew hiding in the woodpile within the last two to three generations. (4) Hell a great many jews were made aristocrats in the twentieth century: Burchill of course simply slithers past this fact and defecates all over her tribal lovers accusing them; as Daniel Jonah Goldhagen did to the Germans in his slanderous 'book' *'Hitler's Willing Executioners'*, of being genetic anti-Semites (and therefore; in Burchill's logic, amalek who should then be wiped off the face of the earth to prevent her beloved masters being somewhat inconvenienced) or rather *'self-hating jews'*.

Burchill needs to be quoted to be believed:

'Jews are very clever and the English ruling class are very stupid, so naturally English Jews have taken from the poshos a bit of the wealth and property that once was theirs, snatched from the peasantry and bequeathed by robber barons long ago. Nowadays their thick, unemployable children can find an outlet for their inborn anti-Semitism in pro-Palestinian protest. And sure enough I turned on the TV the day after the flotilla was floored, and there was a man called Lort-Phillips, bewailing the plight of his sister, one Alexandra Lort-Phillips, late of the ship of fools, who was now hopefully getting what she deserved in Eretz Yisrael.'

Hilarious: no?

What it is even more amusing is Burchill's lampooning of undefined '*liberals*' and '*Gaza groupies*' who she accuses of everything from being '*terrorist-enablers*' to being part of an '*anti-Semitic conspiracy*' against Israel. Where is my invitation Julie dear? Did Iran forget to mail it or has the Mossad gotten sloppy again? I've been telling my Mossad handler for years to sort out the Israeli postal system: the jews employed in it have started stealing everything again.

This is amusing precisely because Burchill is speaking as a '*liberal*' and as somebody who pushes homosexuality in her work with the; for example, dramatisation of her novel '*Sugar Rush*', which focuses on a teenage lesbian relationship in Britain and is a disgusting piece of liberalism. So what does the foul Miss Burchill really want? Well apparently a jewess to love and to impregnate her with the genetic signature of the masters of the universe. After all we've all got to have homosexual marriage etc so I am sure Miss Burchill would just love to go to Israel and be part of the sexually-obsessed jewish liberal crowd who regularly get into fights with the ultra-Orthodox... Oy vey!

Well goodbye Miss Burchill... Oh Miss Burchill perhaps while you are at it you can just become the Israeli Ambassadors latest mistress and fellate him under the desk while he tells you he is going to make a jewess out of you yet. He just loves philo-Semitic liberal bimbos and so do I, but our interests in your type; Miss Burchill, are for very different reasons...

In a very short article the oh so kosher Jerusalem Post tells us that a male jew from the Beit Shemesh area in Israel; name not given of course [we can't have jews being convicted of paedophilia now can we? Oy vey!], was finally convicted after molesting three of his friend's children. (4) It is not stated whether this man or the children were jews, but we may presume for the Jerusalem Post's even deigning to report it at all and the extremely brief nature of the article that both man and children were jews. What this must signify for us is the very real possibility of jewish paedophiles that are out there in the world that the jews in general are just protecting because they are jews.

We hear all about claims of paedophilia in the Catholic Church: these receive headline news even in Israel's newspaper and media, but yet when it comes to jewish paedophiles especially those who are religious then all of a sudden the media becomes as meek as a still-born lamb and doesn't dare criticise the masters of the universe for fear that the sky will suddenly collapse and

fall on their heads.

After all we gentiles just wouldn't understand a member of the Chosen of Yahweh's need to fondle, fellate and sodomise little boys and girls; especially if they aren't jewish, and might think such horrible things about the jew in question causing us to potentially lose our awe for our leering and lecherous rulers.

All that said... it has been a slow news week for the masters of the universe without too much of particular note so we will end our little roundup there for this week.

Shalom!

References

- (1) All details mentioned are taken from the news story; *'Text of Obama's Remarks after BP Meeting'*, published by the New York Times on the 16th June 2010. This is available at the following address: http://www.nytimes.com/aponline/2010/06/16/us/politics/AP-US-Obama-Text.html?_r=1 [Last accessed: 20/06/2010]
- (2) In his Norman Finkelstein, 2001, *'The Holocaust Industry: Reflections on the Exploitation of Jewish Suffering'*, 2nd Edition, Verso: London. Where he aptly points and provides plenty of evidence for the assertion that the *'holocaust victim associations'* have been literally stealing money for decades and are now seeking to blackmail unrelated groups in order to get them to give them more money to fund their salubrious living.
- (3) All details mentioned are taken from the news story; *'How the British media get their kicks'*, written by Julie Burchill and published by the Jerusalem Post on the 18th June 2010. This is available at the following address <http://www.jpost.com/Opinion/Columnists/Article.aspx?id=178724> [Last accessed: 20/06/2010]
- (4) See for example Arnold Leese, n.d. (1951/1952?), *'Our Jewish Aristocracy: A Revelation'*, 1st Edition, Self-Published: Guildford. This is available online at the following address: http://jrbooksonline.com/HTML-docs/our_jewish_aristocracy.htm [Last accessed: 20/06/2010]
- (5) All details mentioned are taken from the news story; *'Man gets 14 years in jail for raping friend's three daughters'*, published by the Jerusalem Post on the 13th June 2010. This is available at the following address: <http://www.jpost.com/Home/Article.aspx?id=178270&outbrain=100613> [Last accessed: 20/06/2010]

Notice: *'The Rabbinical Roundup'* is hyperbole, informed comment and political satire not defamation or incitement to hatred and comes under the requirements for 'free speech' per United States law. *Semitic Controversies* also condemns and rejects violence, and seeks a peaceful solution to the Jewish Question.

Five Points of Anti-Semitic Belief

Monday, 21 June 2010

As a very short appendix to my article *'Why I am an anti-Semite'* I thought to produce five brief

statements of belief that I would assert define the modern anti-Semite. They are not conclusive of course, but they will hopefully serve to start the very necessary conversation in anti-Semitic circles about just what anti-Semitism is and what is required of someone to be classed as an anti-Semite.

1. I believe that anti-Semitism is the opposition to those individuals and groups; wholly or partly, of Semitic racial descent and that this includes the influence of both Jews and Arabs as both are racially alien groups and therefore as such are genetically opposed to the general interests of my race.

2. I believe that Jews and Arabs are; as a whole, a negative influence on my race and the civilisation and cultures that my race has created. I further believe that any good an individual Jew or Arab may have done; or may still do, is an isolated incident and that on balance Jews and Arabs have been a hindrance to rather than a boon for my race's civilisation and cultures.

3. I believe that Jews and Arabs have too much financial, media and legal clout over the governments that are supposedly to govern my race in their own best interests and that this Semitic influence has resulted in these governments becoming corrupt and serving Jewish and Arabic interests as opposed to my race's own interests.

4. I believe that Jews and Arabs are born into that status and that no religious or cultural ritual or rite can remove this inherited condition or the effect of their biological origin on their thought processes, interests and/or behaviour. Thus their religious and/or cultural persuasion has no bearing upon the scale of their negative influence upon my society.

5. I believe that a solution to the Semitic Question has to be found and that this solution must by preference be a peaceful one, but that no option should be ruled out in the long-term once an anti-Semitic government has been attained.

Feedback on and/or critique of these statements would; as always, be very much appreciated, which can be sent to the usual email address: Semitic.Controversies@gmail.com.

Hypocrisy 2.0

Tuesday, 22 June 2010

A Book Review of Denis MacShane's, 2008, *'Globalising Hatred: The New Anti-Semitism'*, 1st Edition, Weidenfeld & Nicholson: London

Denis MacShane is a person that if you don't follow British politics with a particular interest in anti-Semitism and the jews you wouldn't even know existed. MacShane is currently the Labour Member of Parliament for Rotherham and something of a philo-Semite par extraordinaire. He chaired the 2006 *'All-Party Parliamentary Group against Anti-Semitism'*, which produced a report that might as well have come from Tel Aviv as it showed little to no critical understanding of jewish claims and reports regarding *'anti-Semitic incidents'* and in fact showed an extreme

bias in simply accepting whatever it was told by jews. (1)

It was due to his sterling service to the jews; and particularly to the British '*Israel Lobby*' (so-called), that the jews gave MacShane the chairmanship of a favourite jewish mouthpiece on the subject of anti-Semitism: '*the European Institute for the Study of Contemporary Antisemitism*', which predictably conflates anything that could be considered as detrimental towards jews (such as somebody chucking a bucket of water over a jew by mistake causing the jew to be late to Shul) and actual anti-Semitism (i.e. actual opposition to jews). MacShane is also an advisory board member for the adjunct Israeli organisation '*Just Journalism*', which '*monitors*' the British media and howls with rage whenever anything remotely critical; or even neutral, about Israel is written by a British journalist.

MacShane's personal character is rather shady as well as since the 2009 Expenses scandal he is alleged, by '*The Daily Mail*', to have claimed £125,000 over 7 years for his garage, which he claims he uses as an office. An expensive office indeed! MacShane was also caught lying outright on British television when he claimed to not have described Gordon Brown's '*five economic tests*' as a '*red herring*', but was actually recorded on a Dictaphone doing so (which was played back to him to his great embarrassment). MacShane then amusingly publicly wondered why on earth he had been removed from the top post as '*he hadn't done anything wrong*'. It is also worth noting that MacShane's father; Jan Matyjaszek, was supposedly Polish, but given MacShane's almost inexplicable unconditional love for Israel and the jews (despite being on the political left who are normally critical of Israel and the jews) we are forced to wonder if there isn't a jew or two hiding in his father's family tree.

MacShane's 2008 book is really just a statement of his own personal convictions and is only interesting because of the prominence of the author rather than because of its actual intellectual content (or rather lack of it). Although that said we should note that MacShane seems to have deliberately made it semi-impossible to look up the sourcing for his claims as either he or his; jewish, publisher; Weidenfeld & Nicholson, have decided to not use footnotes or a conventional sourcing system, but rather have put their notes at the back of the book with only references to page numbers beside each without elaborating on what specific point they are supposed to evidence. This makes it rather difficult to expose what I suspect MacShane has been up to this work: systematically misrepresenting the literature to make it seem to be much more supportive of his general thesis than it is. As it is MacShane almost exclusively uses popular pro-Israeli and pro-jewish sources and cites basically no academic literature. Rather MacShane prefers to lose himself in making the most pointless remarks about his opponents or creating the rather novel thesis that there is an anti-Semitic conspiracy against the jews. That said this thesis isn't exactly new as it is has other notable advocates who are often just as silly and absurd as MacShane such as the corpulent John Loftus and Mark Aarons. (2)

Perhaps the reader may think I am being overly harsh and it is probably true that in some respects I am, but my reason for being so is rather simply that MacShane should firstly know better than to make the dozens of breathtakingly stupid claims and arguments and secondly that MacShane as an individual sheds a foul light upon his distortions, half-truths and outright fabrications in '*Globalising Hatred*'. In so far as he is not some bamboozled stuffed shirt with about as much common sense as your average wooden plank, but rather a slimy little toad who

dresses his self-importance and outright egocentrism up as some sort of original and thought-provoking treatise.

MacShane begins his 'book' with the following statement of his 'intellectual' position, which amounts to little more than philo-Semitic filibustering and blathering:

'Organised neo-antisemitism is like a rat in our entrails preventing just and equitable solutions to key world problems and replacing hope with hate. Combating neo-antisemitism should now be a major political priority for progressive politics. I am neither Jewish nor does the politics of 'Israel, right or wrong' make any sense to me. But I have spent my political life fighting racism, intolerance, hate and denial of a people's or a state's right to exist. I am intolerant of intolerance.' (3)

This is obviously a piece of absurd rhetoric as opposed to the statement of an intellectually valid position on MacShane's part. As firstly his politics **are** 'Israel, right or wrong', which can be shown by pointing to his uncontested involvement in adjunct Israeli organisations like 'Just Journalism', his quoting 'right-wing' Israeli sources; such as MEMRI, (4) without even the pretence of any criticism or filibustering about 'taking a critical view' and his extremely lavish praise upon Phyllis Chesler's rather absurd and poorly received book: 'The New Anti-Semitism'. (5) One is left wondering just how much of the substantial literature on the subject of anti-Semitism that MacShane has actually read and what he seems to have read is only what one can only class as 'hard-line Zionist' material of which Chesler can be considered a second tier proponent. (6)

We are thus within reason to meet MacShane's assertion that the intellectual left; which is predictably undefined by MacShane (being the rather deceitful character that he seems to be), with outright laughter in regards to its sheer absurdity. I quote:

'Many French intellectuals and political activists on the left suspend critical judgement when it comes to the Middle East.' (7)

Here MacShane shows his utter hypocrisy by accusing French 'left wing' intellectuals and political activists of 'suspending critical judgement' on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, but yet we find MacShane obviously suspending his own critical judgement; assuming that he has the ability to do so, when it comes to pro-jewish and pro-Israeli sources, but being overly critical of anti-jewish and anti-Israeli sources. One would be within reason to ask MacShane on what basis he has 'taken a side' and why on earth he is pretending to be 'objective' on the conflict when it is painfully obvious to any reader from either side of the debate that he is not and belongs to the 'hard-line Zionist'; if you will, camp.

This can be illustrated simply by pointing out that MacShane does not even mention the Jewish terrorism that was the foundation of the state of Israel or that these terrorist attacks were specifically targeted against British soldiers and civilians (whose descendents he supposedly represents in the British parliament). Instead MacShane simply makes the standard vapid claim; which is made by just about every Zionist and professional or amateur apologist for Israel in world, that Israel is justified in existing, because the Arabs already have plenty of land for

themselves. (8) So therefore would MacShane support a policy of say Londoners from Britain re-colonising New York State, because there is plenty of space in the rest of the United States for the Americans from New York to go live? I think not, but then this simple logical problem with his argument doesn't even seem to enter MacShane's head and he is much too busy copying the argument; without obvious attribution I might add (which as they say constitutes plagiarism as it occupies intellectual ground that is already occupied [ironic: isn't it?]), to give any critical consideration to his own; often wild and obviously untrue, statements.

One prominent example of where MacShane's '*hard-line Zionist*' nature comes to the fore is on the subject of Steven Walt and John Mearsheimer's famous 2008 book: '*The Israel Lobby and US Foreign Policy*', which MacShane dismisses in a few paragraphs that could well be out of an Alan Dershowitz book or Israeli Foreign Policy brief. I quote the most pertinent passage of MacShane's claimed '*demolition*' of Walt and Mearsheimer's work:

'The article and the book made allegations that American Jews decided US foreign policy on Iran, Iraq and Syria, and both the article and subsequent book were entirely solipsistic. There is not a single reference to any of the European policy discussions on the Middle East or a book published in a European language.' (9)

This is truly rather pathetic as I am sure even someone as apparently incapable of rational cognition as MacShane; in spite of his academic doctorate, would realise as MacShane is criticising a book about United States Foreign Policy (i.e. focusing on the Anglophone world not any other bits of this planet) for not including reference to European policy discussions or having included non-English language literature. This is obviously absurd. We can realise this by simply giving an alternative example: if you wrote a book about say modern English social history and you only used English language sources then MacShane is asserting that your work would simply be an '*invention of your own mind*' (the meaning of '*solipsism*') and that it would simply be intellectually invalid, because it didn't include German language reference materials regarding German social history.

MacShane is hardly making sense intellectually let alone logically now is he?

As we have discussed MacShane shows his deceitful side in the passage just quoted in so far as he presents an obviously ludicrous argument to his reader as 'the truth' knowing full well that it completely false, but yet because he doesn't want to break his argument down into a convincing case he hides his meaning in '*big, scary intellectual-sounding words*' (if you will). If MacShane had a real intellectual case: I would imagine (or rather I'd like to; as otherwise MacShane's mindset beggars belief) he would make it openly and simply without plagiarising Israeli propaganda or profusely blustering amateurish rhetoric in place of a sound detailed intellectual argument.

We further see MacShane malicious and deceitful side in another; this time veiled but obviously partisan, reference to Walt and Mearsheimer's work:

'I go to a bookshop in Paris and there is a French translation of a book by two American professors claiming to reveal that American foreign policy is controlled by Jews.' (10)

This obviously refers to Steven Walt and John Mearsheimer as there were no two other American professors who had just authored a book in 2008 that would have got quick translation and also argued that jews had a significant (as opposed to complete) say in American foreign policy. Of course MacShane knows he is lying by deliberately distorting Walt and Mearsheimer's thesis given that they make it explicitly clear on numerous occasions that their use of the term '*Israel Lobby*' includes both jews and non-jews as well as that the latter have a significant role to play in said lobby.

MacShane's lying takes on a whole new dimension in other places since he isn't just sneering at people he doesn't like, but actually outright making up insane claims that have no basis in historical fact what-so-ever. For example on page sixty-six MacShane claims that jews have never had any legal rights in the gentile world. This is simply absurd as of course they have had legal rights as that was the very basis of the contract between the jews and the state and is covered in detail by any good history of the jews.

Two prominent examples of well-known scholarly works that directly address this topic in detail are Benjamin Ginsberg's '*The Fatal Embrace*' (which deals with jewish legal status in relation to the state generally) (11) and Guido Kisch's '*The Jews in Medieval Germany*' (which deals specifically and in great detail with the legal status of jews within medieval Germany). (12) Both are standard works written by jewish academics on this subject, but yet MacShane simply ignores them and lies through his teeth to his reader in asserting that the jew has always; by implication, been mistreated and is really just a misunderstood poor darling of a creature.

Yes: I think we have gathered now that MacShane's projection of what the jew is really what is solipsistic here, but then one doubts whether MacShane really understands the actual application of all the '*big words*' he likes to throw into the mix to distract the reader from his lack of intellectual rigour.

We could go further into the huge number of factual and intellectual errors, which veritably howl from the pages of '*Globalising Hatred*', but to prevent the reader becoming bored: we shall stop our amusing gander at the diseased mind of an 'intellectual' philo-Semite there.

What is Denis MacShane? Is he a liar, cheat and a sophist? Yes: he is all of those things and more, but the most damning thing we can note about Denis MacShane is that he advocates complete and utter subservience to jews as the supreme arbiters of truth and to that affect we quote MacShane:

'The right wing Jew-baiter, the Islamist Jew-hater or all those liberal-leftists who proclaim they are not antisemitic but who deny Jews their Jewishness in the full sense of being Jewish, including their affection for the one state in the world where by definition antisemitism cannot exist, now have to come to terms with antisemitism being what Jews feel and say it is.'

That about sums up the extreme intellectually-absurd philo-Semitism of Denis MacShane: don't you think?

I do.

References

- (1) All the information that I present by way of biographical detail can be easily found as uncontested facts in Denis MacShane's Wikipedia page, which can be found at the following address: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Denis_MacShane.
- (2) Mark Aarons, John Loftus, 1994, *The Secret War against the Jews: How Western Espionage Betrayed the Jewish People*, 1st Edition, St. Martin's Press: New York
- (3) Denis MacShane's, 2008, *Globalising Hatred: The New Anti-Semitism*, 1st Edition, Weidenfeld & Nicholson: London, pp. viii-ix
- (4) Ibid, p. 90
- (5) Ibid, p. 63. The full reference for Chesler's 'book' is as follows: Phyllis Chesler, 2005, *The New Anti-Semitism: The Current Crisis and What We Must Do About It*, 2nd Edition, Jossey-Bass: New York
- (6) Chesler can be simply evidenced to be 'hard-line Zionist' in the fact she collaborates and works closely with Alan Dershowitz (who incidentally endorsed *The New Anti-Semitism*) despite the two being as disparate in political and intellectual ideology as it is possible to be (Chesler is a radical leftist and feminist and Dershowitz is a hawkish conservative). One would also get this impression by reading Chesler's 'book' and ascertaining for one's self the scale of her 'intellectual' depravity.
- (7) MacShane, Op. Cit., p. 46
- (8) Ibid, p. 66
- (9) Ibid, p. 128
- (10) Ibid, p. 3
- (11) Benjamin Ginsberg, 1993, *The Fatal Embrace: Jews and the State*, 1st Edition, University of Chicago Press: Chicago
- (12) Guido Kisch, 1949, *The Jews in Medieval Germany: A Study of their Legal and Social Status*, 1st Edition, University of Chicago Press: Chicago
- (13) MacShane, Op. Cit., p. 5

In Brief: The 'An Anti-Semite is someone who is hated by Jews' Argument

Wednesday, 23 June 2010

Over the last few years I have observed that an increasing number of self-described critics of jews have begun to use the rhetorical phrase to the effect that an anti-Semite is someone who is hated by jews as an explanation of and non-rhetorical argument for anti-Semitism. To simplify this slightly: rather than using this rhetorical phrase which aptly characterises jewish accusations of anti-Semitism some anti-Semites have begun to use this phrase to explain anti-Semitism as a point of ideology. This is both dangerous and absurd and we may reasonably assert that those wielding such ideas are probably not the best and brightest anti-Semitism has to offer, but in fact are co-opting a piece of rhetoric to give them an excuse to not seek a greater understanding of what they profess to believe. We must now consider the logic behind this new idea within anti-Semitism and briefly discuss just how problematic it is.

The idea that an *'anti-Semite is somebody who jews don't like'* (or a variant to that effect) is a good rhetorical position as it intellectually counter-weaponizes the cat-calls and character assassination that jews and their lackeys tend to use, but at the same time it is a fundamental denial of what we are. I mean; it is lovely rhetoric and all that, but it isn't doing anything about the problem of the fact that we are anti-Semites and that anti-Semitism is seen as a *'bad thing'* by most of our folk. That said this isn't set in stone as so many seem to assume: just look at the word *'fag'* as a derogatory term for homosexual. Homosexuals have now appropriated and turned it into something good and less harmful to their interests. It is possible and it is very do-able with anti-Semitism as well as faggotry, but it is going to take anti-Semites to deal with reality and use their collective and individual abilities to push forward a new highly rational form of anti-Semitism based on the principles of Jacques Ellul's theory of propaganda, intellectual rigour and the use of strong emotive and cause celebre themes to achieve its ends.

Using the rhetorical phrase an *'anti-Semite is somebody who jews don't like'* (or a variant to that effect) is essentially an anti-Semite or merely someone who is critical of jews trying to run away from his or her responsibility as an anti-Semite or critic of the jews. If you want to carry on the failures that anti-Semitism has suffered over the last three to four decades then you can just keep on going as you are, but if you want to change and to create a new rational anti-Semitism; an anti-Semitism 2.0 if I was to be a touch cliché, then you have to take responsibility to use your knowledge and abilities in anti-Semitism's best interests not whatever you feel like doing or not doing. For that latter kind of thinking is what got us into this mess in the first place and it certainly won't get us out of the huge hole that two generations of anti-Semites have managed to dig for themselves. We need change in anti-Semitism and we need it badly.

Now to come back to my original point again: if we were to argue *'anti-Semitism is merely a charge jews make against people they don't like'* (or a variant of that position) as the anti-Semitic answer to the standard jewish argument that anti-Semitism and anti-jewish sentiment is everywhere and is ipso facto irrational. Then we simply concede that anti-Semitism is just as the jews say; i.e. irrational, and that the only rational position is philo-Semitic sentiment. This is obviously rather dangerous as it leaves anti-Semites utterly exposed intellectually to attack and confirms to our potential friends all across the board that what we have to say about the jew is irrational and completely unfounded.

Obviously we have to challenge these assumptions and seek to recruit out potential friends into actively helping our cause and/or passively supporting it by not condemning or taking any demanded action against active anti-Semites otherwise we may as well pack our bags and go home. Can any proponent of this view give any cogent argument of its intellectual or strategic veracity? I doubt it, but many will no doubt whine that it has value; to which we must reply that it does indeed have some value rhetorically but as with any rhetoric that rhetorical value must not deceive us of a rhetorical argument factual and intellectual veracity. Otherwise we can only ever end up arguing absurdities within absurdities, which is about as useful to the anti-Semitic cause as a plot of land on the surface of the sun.

In summary then if you use the *'anti-Semitism is merely a charge jews make against people they don't like'* argument as anything more than a useful rhetorical tool; which is limited not universal

in its useful application, then you merely argue by implication that anti-Semitism and criticism of the jews is simply irrational and that therefore your own criticisms of jews; however strong or mild, are also irrational and intellectually and evidentially unfounded.

So please, please stop using this argument, because against most opponents capable of rational cognition you will become a cropper when they point out the logical implications of your own arguments to you in a reduction to absurdity.

Challenging Rabbi David Eidensohn to a Debate

Thursday, 24 June 2010

I wrote the below letter to Rabbi David Eidensohn (alternatively Dovid Eidensohn, which he prefers) of 'jewhaters' (<http://www.jewhaters.com/>) several months ago challenging him to a frank and open debate that would be published on Semitic Controversies and 'jewhaters'. I thought it apt to publish it to serve a specimen letter to jews if one wishes to challenge them to debate. As in it I qualify what I specifically know about and what I can and cannot reasonably discuss, which is an important part of the beginning of any anti-Semitic debate.

Unfortunately Rabbi Eidensohn; although initially accepted my invitation, he refused to get into specific issues despite my best efforts to do so and was far more interested in learning more about me than he was in the 'frank debate' his website promised. Eventually Rabbi Eidensohn claimed; in effect, that I was so evil that he wouldn't debate me (an extremely bad cop-out to be sure) and made death threats against me. I have already written about my encounter with Eidensohn in some detail (this can be found at the following address: <http://semiticcontroversies.blogspot.com/2008/06/rabbi-of-hate-my-encounter-with-rabbi.html>), but I thought that my open letter would help the anti-Semitic community construct their own such letters of challenge if that is their wish.

If any other jew wishes to debate me in Rabbi Eidensohn's absense then they are more than welcome and an email to Semitic.Controversies@gmail.com will do the trick to begin such an exchange.

Rabbi Eidensohn,

After a short correspondence on this subject with my good friend; Lionaxe (a sometime correspondent of yours), I thought it apt to write you a note to the effect that I would like to propose a duologue on the subject on jewish history and the role of the jew in history. My friend informs me that you are open to debate and having read 'jewhaters' I thought it might be an idea to write to you.

I write to you as what would be characterised as an 'anti-Semite' in the strongest sense of that word as it is usually applied; disregarding the intellectual worth or preciseness of the term here, with the view to understanding the subject of my research; the jewish question, from a new angle

(i.e. discussing ideas with a learned jew rather than the rabid and overly-paranoid zealots [secular or religious] found in the general jewish Diaspora). However; I would distinguish my own thoughts and cognitive frameworks as regards the jewish question from those commonly labelled as 'anti-Semites' since; as you might appreciate, that label stretches out a long way over various schools of thought in regards to jewry. It also; as you are I am sure aware, is always being distorted and many (unsuccessful) attempts have been made to extend this term to encompass critical positions on Israel and any discussion of what can only be described as jewish ethnocentrism, but what would be more accurately described as the jewish racial consciousness. In this I consider myself; and am considered by many others of my acquaintance, as an informed; but rational, critic of jews and jewry.

However I should like to make it clear that my interest and area of knowledge is heavily based in the historical arena and does not overlap very much beyond a general; and in some cases specific, understanding of Judaism, the Torah commentaries, religious notables and jewish mysticism. What I mean by this is that I comprehend Talmudic discussion but have not devoted myself to a minute study of (the immense) literature there-of and nor do I intend to, but I am very aware of the historical details surrounding specific religious figures. For example Sabbatai Zvi and the sect of loyal followers; known as the Donmeh as well as the Sabbatians who returned to what was to become the Pale (and who ultimately Bakan argues became the precursors of Sigmund Freud and 'psychoanalysis').

If you would like to discuss anti-Semitism in terms of common myths then I would also be happy to oblige since in order to come to a rational criticism of jews and jewry: I insist that a study of all anti-jewish arguments made throughout the considerable literature on the subject be studied and either accepted, partially accepted, tentatively accepted or rejected.

I would like to discuss; as before stated, jewish history and the role of the jew in history: in so far that history can only be properly understood my understanding the material upon which actions in time are based. Since I consider jewry to be one of the major forces in history it would be folly not to undertake a through and critical examination of them. I don't promise that you will like my conclusions or my arguments, but I do promise an educated duologue where we will both learn something even if that is just that we have confirmed both of our positions since we can never be a-like since we are opposites on that most important level: race.

Perhaps an apt place to begin such a discussion would be to ask: how do you as a learned jew account for the persecution you have received throughout history regardless of where you have gone? Do you subscribe to the thesis that anti-Semitism is economically motivated which would seem based on the assumption that the jewish people must therefore have some kind of superior business acumen?

Or do you perhaps take a broader view of the subject matter. As in do you account that in some cases jews were themselves responsible for their own persecution (for example in the infamous Reuchlinist/anti-Reuchlinist debates just before the beginning of the Lutheran Reformation caused by a jewish man named Pfefferkorn denouncing the Talmuds)? Do you consider anti-Semitism (and ergo by current Israel/jewish definition anti-Zionism) as inherently irrational; as many of your kinsfolk have maintained, or do you perhaps again take a broader view and

maintain that 'anti-Semitism' is rational in some instances and irrational in others?

You are; of course, free to decline this invitation: if you would like to do so please communicate this as soon as is convenient. I would; of course, be happy to accommodate your schedule (having looked into you a little bit) since I also have periods when I am extremely busy and others when I have less required of me.

Yours respectfully,

Karl Radl,

Hampstead Garden Suburb Synagogue: A Case Study in Egocentrism (Part I)

Saturday, 26 June 2010

Part I

Hampstead Garden Suburb Synagogue was and is a fairly modern synagogue, having only been formally established in 1935 (although the community is said to have been meeting for irregular services since 1932 at the Hampstead Garden Suburb Institute), on the outskirts of London, England. However it has seen much in the way of Jewish internal conflict in its short history, which makes it ideal for a short study to further our understanding of Jews from a critical perspective. Throughout this short case study I rely for my information about the synagogue and the internal conflicts within the Jewish community that arose through and because of it on the Hampstead Garden Suburb Synagogue's (hence forth referred to as HGSS for the sake of simplicity) own published history, (1) which I have recently acquired.

The first years of the HGSS' history consist of its foundation and its founders/supporters conflict with the United Synagogue (hence forth referred to as the US), which insisted that there was no need for a new synagogue to be built as the US alleged, with some basis, that those who were then attending services at the nascent HGSS could attend other synagogues which were within walking distance such as the Golders Green and Finchley synagogues. (2) Indeed several of the early HGSS regulars, such as Maurice and Sam Cohen, had originally attended the Finchley synagogue: (3) before beginning to attend services at the HGSS.

The HGSS countered this by asserting that there was a lot of potential for growth of the congregation (which in 1935 was only 14 men which was enough to form a minyan, which is required for a synagogue service to take place, but not enough to justify the financial and material outlay for a new synagogue) and it is implied by Grose, although not explicitly stated, that those Jews from Hampstead Garden Suburb preferred to have their own congregation rather than attending the synagogues at Finchley and/or Golders Green.

The US then attacked the HGSS by commissioning a report in 1935 regarding the attendance and practice at the HGSS congregation, which Grose describes without qualification as '*biased*'. (4) This report detailed some of the congregation (6 men and some family members were then

present), one for example is described as a '*beggar*' and not suitably attired for Shabbos, also noting that some pictures had been reversed, while a print of the Mona Lisa had not. (5) The report also notes that a Mr. Cohen (6) delivered the traditional talk on the passage of the '*Sedra*', (7) but that the presentation was rather disjointed.

Grose's assertion that the report was '*biased*' is probably true to a degree in that the motivation for commissioning it may well have been so (as the conflict between the HGSS and the US had obviously by this point become bitter), but the report itself seems relatively fair in that it highlights both good and bad points of the HGSS. For example it comments that despite the disjointed nature of Mr. Cohen's talk on the '*Sedra*': the style and content of the talk was praiseworthy and innovative giving room for the congregation's reflection and directly implies that the US should learn from this idea and consider introducing it elsewhere. On the other hand it does make the negative observation about one of the congregation looking like a '*positive beggar*', but this is not enough evidence for Grose to call the report itself '*biased*'. (8)

Grose's own implicit attack on the conduct of the US and attempted sanctification of the HGSS suggests that Grose is writing from a partisan viewpoint in so far he is seeking to impugn the conduct of those he perceives to be the opponents of his community (9) and to place that community on a pedestal of proverbial sainthood. This from an egocentric viewpoint is interesting in so far as we can understand Grose's underlying motivation in this matter. Grose is writing the booklet about the HGSS as a member of that community and therefore in order to gain the maximum egoistic fulfilment from that task: he writes the booklet in such a way as it will have the largest possible appeal to those whom it is aimed at (i.e. the HGSS congregation). To do this Grose plays to the collective mythos of the HGSS community by describing the struggle against the US for the formation of that community and implies that the HGSS has always been in the right, while the US has always been in wrong (i.e. because they are jealous and do not wish to dilute their power by creating another synagogue). (10)

If we try and interpret Grose's attitude from an ethnocentric viewpoint we run into severe problems. After all we have to presume that Grose is a Jew and we cannot get away from the fact that he is talking negatively about other Jews who only differ from him in that they were competing with Grose's community at an early period in its history. How can Grose possibly be thinking: '*what is best for Jews*' if he is attacking another group of Jews in publicly available literature over such a trivial matter?

The only way we can understand Grose's behaviour is by simplifying this question down into '*what do I think is best for me*', which can be answered as a variant as '*what do I think is best for Jews*' but the latter is only an offshoot of the former when the Jew in question associates his or her identity and future with the Jews (i.e. when he or she views it to be to their egoistic advantage to do so). (11)

The initial skirmishes between the HGSS and US in fact began as early as 1933 when the US; in a tactical move, began pressing the nascent HGSS congregation to amalgamate with that of Finchley and in 1934 blocked the attempt by a Dr. S. Blackman; a founding member of the HGSS, to acquire two Torah scrolls on loan from his father's synagogue in Hackney for use during the High Holydays. The US wrote to Blackman informing him that this would not be

possible and that the HGSS service would be surplus to requirements, because the Golders Green and Finchley synagogues were also holding services and were not expected to be completely full giving plenty of room for the HGSS congregation to attend one or the other. Blackman however refused this letter with a tactical move of his own and acquired two Torah scrolls from another source which Grose does not identify. (12)

It is notable that Grose once again presents this as a kind of cautionary tale where the hero; Dr. S. Blackman, is hurt by the dastardly tricks of his evil opponent; the US, but then comes through in the end by his ability and general saintliness in attaining his end by defeating his evil opponent's knavish tricks.

When in 1934 the HGSS voted to affiliate with the US: the affiliation process itself became a source of conflict between the two sides. This centred, predictably, on the amount of power the HGSS had over its own affairs and how much power the US could exercise over the congregation. The focus for this dispute was the issue of who should have the majority of trustees in the acquisition of the synagogue: the HGSS or the US? Grose's language is telling when he states that the HGSS '*demand*ed'; not asked or bargained for [i.e. a certain forcefulness and righteousness is implied], a majority of trustees. (13) In so far as it directly suggests that there was already an acrimonious conflict between the two sides or at least a feeling of superiority or righteousness on the part of the HGSS congregation.

The US' position however seems on the surface to have been less acrimonious, despite Grose's attempts to make it look like an act of revenge; in so far as they maintained that the '*long established practice*' for the US to appoint four or more trustees, while the synagogue (in this case the HGSS) should appoint one or two. (14) That said it would be remiss if we were not to state that the position the US took in regard to the number of trustees was likely the result of the egoistic need as opposed to actually believing it needed to be so, because of a tradition. I.e. control and power allow partial egoistic fulfilment for the Jews at the US as they do for the Jews of the HGSS: hence creating a protracted and bitter egoistic struggle between the two for control and maximum ego fulfilment. Tradition in this case is being used as an offensive weapon (i.e. to accuse the HGSS of not abiding by tradition, which is an important part of most forms of Judaism and thus is a powerful accusation) and a defensive weapon (i.e. to point out that it has always been traditional to do it in such a way and hence there is no reason not to do it that way).

The HGSS countered the US' claim to tradition by asserting the need for self-determination and the liberty of the individual synagogue, (15) which was not successful in winning an agreement by the US. The HGSS therefore evolved a new solution to get its way over the superior grounding in Judaism of the US' argument: blackmail. The HGSS; under the leadership of Dr. S. Blackman [who is again cast as the hero and the US as the villain by Grose], implied that they would stop the process of affiliation and '*go elsewhere*' (i.e. to a rival synagogue organisation or a competitor if you will) unless the US agreed to the HGSS demands. This; as I have said, effectively amounts to the HGSS blackmailing the US into getting what the HGSS wanted. The US predictably caved-in to the HGSS' demands and granted the HGSS most of what they had demanded, which the HGSS accepted (i.e. an equal number of trustees). (16) As for why the US caved-in to the HGSS: the reasons are rather obvious from an egocentric point of view in so far as from the US' perspective it was better to have one synagogue, which they had less power over

than one less synagogue (which would give the Jews in charge of the US a small ego drain, because they had been bested in a power struggle and had lost completely).

This informal agreement however did not stop the conflict or haggling between the HGSS and the US: with the HGSS; in the person of Blackman, refusing to sign any formal agreement until the US had formally agreed to the purchase of the desired Norrice Lea site (where the HGSS was to be built). In May 1934 Sir Robert Waley-Cohen, Vice-President of the US, suggested to Blackman that the HGSS should amalgamate with the Highgate Jewish community and that a compromise synagogue be erected between the two congregations. Blackman and Waley-Cohen met and according to Grose: *'toured the district looking for suitable sites, but the proposition was found to be impracticable.'* (17)

Although it is possible that Blackman and Waley-Cohen could find no sites that were practical: it is rather unlikely than none could be found that would theoretically and practically meet the needs of both communities. It is however rather more likely that Blackman was simply finding reasons to reject every site that Waley-Cohen suggested on some real or contrived grounds, because Blackman was holding out for the formalisation of the informal agreement with the US about the Norrice Lea site where he; Blackman, would hold more power over the community (i.e. keeping the concessions gained from the US) and receive more ego-fulfilment by being forever connected with the foundation and defence of the nascent HGSS (i.e. becoming immortalised in the congregation that he helped found and hence gaining ego-fulfilment by assuring himself that he will never be forgotten and will be talked of by history if only in a small way [i.e. self-assurance that he is and was important and not a nobody]).

It was only after this wasted tour that the US agreed to sign the formal documents for the affiliation of the HGSS and this was done on the 8th of October 1934. We may reasonably suppose that between May (the time of the tour) and October (when the formal agreement was signed) that there was a lot of horseplay, manipulation and argument between the US and HGSS over what the solution should be. I suspect; but cannot prove, that when the US was prolonging proceedings Blackman simply blackmailed the US and told them if they didn't do as he wished then he would look elsewhere for another organisation of synagogues to affiliate to as this is what he is recorded; sympathetically, as; in effect, doing at every strong roadblock or countermove the US played.

The formal agreement however did not end the vicious conflict between the HGSS and US: in fact it only intensified that conflict. On the 29th of November 1934 the US agreed to lend £1,000 to the HGSS to build their synagogue at the Norrice Lea site, which covered two thirds of the projected cost of construction: £1,500. The other £500 pounds was to be raised by the synagogue and on the 22nd of February 1935 a dance was held by the *'Ladies Guild'* of the HGSS, which raised £400 towards this cause. (18)

Grose however claims at this point the building was intended to be just the start and that further money would have to be available for rapid expansion. He tries to evidence this by asserting; using Blackman's assertion to the US in February 1935, that the HGSS had *'33 male members and 25 children who regularly attended classes.'* (19) However this is at variance with the US *'undercover report'* of the 16th of February 1935, which testifies that a *'Mr. Samuels'*, evidently

from the context a regular HGSS attendee [although apparently not an official of the synagogue], informed the investigator that the HGSS only had 14 male members on a good day attending Shabbos services. (20) We should briefly explain that although services are held daily in synagogues, as in most religions and faiths, the Shabbos service is rather like going to Church on Sunday, but is actually more obligatory in Judaism (and in Islam for that matter) than it is in Christianity.

This does leave us with a bit of a *'he said, she said'* situation, but the soundest position, in my opinion, we can take is to cautiously assert that the US report is probably the more accurate and although the *'14 male members'* might be an understatement (or perhaps a misinformed statement): it is more reliable than the testimony of Blackman who has obvious cause to overstate numbers (i.e. to gain a larger loan from the US for a larger synagogue for Blackman, as President of the HGSS, to dominate and rule as his personal fiefdom), while the US has less cause to misreport the numbers for its own use.

This is reinforced by the fact that at the time Blackman made the claim that the HGSS had *'33 male members'* he was meeting with Sir Isidore Salmon, M.P., who was then Vice-President of the US (21) to discuss the expansion of the synagogue that Blackman was proposing. Salmon made a simple condition to Blackman's considerable expansion plans by asserting that he wanted more Jews to commit themselves to the HGSS before anything further took place. Blackman on the other hand once again played his half of this egoistic dance by manipulating Salmon's words by counter-claiming that he could double the membership of the HGSS (i.e. from 33 to 66 male members) within six weeks if the synagogue construction went ahead as Blackman outlined. Salmon obviously somewhat annoyed at having been so manipulated by Blackman agreed that the US would *'consider the matter further'*. (22)

On the 4th of March 1935 Blackman played his next hand when he began daily campaigns to force the US to agree to his proposals; Grose emphasizes Blackman's claim that in order to meet his quota of doubling his membership he would need everything ready by the High Holydays, rather than to simply stonewall and stall him as Grose suggests they were doing. Blackman claimed that the long delays were causing his congregation to disintegrate, which was quite possibly the US' strategy to combat Blackman's manipulation as it is logically consonant with their attempts to get the US to amalgamate with or attend other synagogues. This is confirmed by a US internal document that Grose cites; although the conclusions he implies in his citation of it are another matter, which states: *'it was found necessary to be exceedingly careful with the correspondence of HGS and to keep a sharp eye open for "tactical" moves of Dr Blackman.'* (23)

This suggests two things. Firstly that the US was; in fact, deliberately playing a game against Blackman and HGSS to gain control of the community as it tells us that they were aware and looking to counter Blackman's *'tactical moves'* as opposed to just seeking to negotiate an amicable settlement that was best for both parties. Secondly that Blackman was also playing a very deliberate *'tactical'* game ostensibly on behalf of the HGSS against the US. This; we note in passing, confirms the basic thesis of this essay in that both sides were acting against their collective interests (after all how is the Jewish community served by such conflict especially at a time of rising popular anti-Semitism both in Britain and around the world) and engaging in a

vicious conflict with one another over who would in effect have control of the HGSS and the community (i.e. Blackman or the US leadership).

Blackman in the face of US behaviour decided to once again play his trump card by reminding the US that the HGSS would vote to disaffiliate with the US if this attitude remained. This led to the US deciding once again that they would rather cut their losses and keep what they had gained rather than potentially losing all their gains. This was in spite of the fact that HGSS membership still hadn't increased. Grose claims once again that there were 33 male members, but once again this seems unlikely, unless 19 male members were not regular attendees and had just purchased seats in the synagogue, (24) as I have already stated that the US '*undercover report*' is probably the more reliable of the two figures for the number of male attendees.

So on the 22nd of June 1935 the US decided to lend the HGSS an additional £800 to meet the now increased estimate for the construction of the synagogue building at the Norrice Lea site (making the total US loan some £1,800), which was now almost double its previous estimated cost at £2,700. Grose also informs us that the number of male members of the synagogue required of Blackman by the US had risen from 66 to 82. (25)

Grose lists two considerations on the part of the US for why they agreed to the increase in the loan. These are firstly that the HGSS had already raised £900 and secondly Blackman's threat of disaffiliation. Grose claims that the HGSS had shown '*that they were in earnest*', (26) but this is not really a viable explanation in anything other than the superficial sense. In so far as this is statement smacks of hindsight and an official rationale so that neither the US or HGSS would lose face, because if the HGSS had acquired £900 it meant that they could potentially raise the earlier estimate of £1,500 by a bit more energetic fundraising and thus build a smaller construction on the Norrice Lea site without the involvement or approval of the US, which would have humiliated the US. We must also consider the counter possibility in this face-saving claim by Grose that the HGSS might not be able to raise the additional £600 to attain the earlier estimate and thus be forced to go cap in hand to the US or another organisation of synagogues, which would cause a considerable egoistic crisis and loss of stature for Blackman and the communal leaders of the HGSS.

Grose also notes that some members of the US had begun to hedge their egoistic bets in the ongoing struggle between the US and HGSS such as a '*Mr. I. Kestenbaum*' who claimed in a letter on the 8th of November 1937 that he had always supported the HGSS and that he had supported their proposals at the US council. (27) This is plausible given that the battle between the HGSS and US had been going on for around three years by 1935 (which is the period Grose is referring to and we must presume the letter also refers to), in which time the HGSS had generally had the better of the fighting having extracted a number of major concessions from the US.

However the letter is suspect, because it comes from after the pre-synagogue fighting between the US and HGSS had concluded and could very easily be an example of Kestenbaum covering himself and trying to look like a good friend to both the US and HGSS (hence setting himself in a risky, but potentially rewarding, position to gain a large amount of egoistic fulfilment by becoming a peacemaker and informal negotiator between the two parties). That said we should

on balance assume that was some measure of hedging and advocacy for the HGSS within the US particularly by those parties who sought to challenge the established hierarchy of the US and sought to replace it within themselves and their friends and associates.

Eventually the construction of the synagogue on the Norrice Lea site was completed sometime after the 2nd of June 1935 and before the Rosh Hashanah celebration from the 5th of September (28) with the foundation stone being laid by Waley-Cohen on the 23rd of June 1935 and it being officially opened on the 22nd of September 1935 with the curious addition of a solid gold key to the synagogue being present to Morris Cohen as a token of his long support of the HGSS. (29) The ego fulfilment this would have generated for Cohen does not need to be elaborated as it is obvious and substantial, but it is worth noting that according to Grose's account Cohen seems to have been something of a henchman of Blackman's and hence was rewarded by him for his services to his personal, and ostensibly the HGSS, cause.

This thus ended the pre-synagogue struggle between the US and HGSS with the victory of the latter led by its President: Blackman. This however did not end the struggle and vicious conflict between the HGS and US: in fact in many ways it made that conflict take on even more of a bitter tone. Before we begin our analysis of this however we will give a short analysis of an interesting anecdote of an early Baal Musaf (better known as a chazan or chazzan) (30) and the storm in a tea cup that he caused in the HGSS. I include this in this essay because it is necessary to demonstrate that it is not merely Jewish organisations and blocs that are perpetually feuding and in constant conflict with one another, but individual Jews as well.

Grose describes the incident briefly as follows: during the first Rosh Hashanah an elderly chazzan was recruited from the East End of London. His performance on the first day was apparently so bad that the officers of the synagogue decided to dispense with his services, but the first rabbi of the HGSS Professor Isaac Cohen dissented from this on the correct grounds that to do so would be an utter humiliation to the elderly chazzan and refused to conduct the service if the officers went ahead with their decisions. The officers, perhaps predictably, decided to override Cohen's objections and hold the service anyway having found a temporary replacement for Cohen and having dispensed with the elderly chazzan. (31)

This little incident is interesting to us, because it demonstrates that the officers of the HGSS were quite willing to override custom if they didn't happen to like an official for whatever reason at the synagogue and would use any pretext to get rid of them. It is entirely possible that the chazzan was bad at what he did, but it is contrary to Jewish custom to simply get rid of a synagogue official if their first attempt does not go well.

After all we see a similar incident when Professor Cohen, in Grose's account in the paragraph above the story of the chazzan, left the shofar (32) in the damp synagogue overnight and then could not blow it on the first day, Yom Tov, of Rosh Hashanah. This is rather similar to the incident with the chazzan in that Cohen made a mistake that caused problems in the proceedings and although the chazzan's 'crime' was less important; i.e. probably singing out of tune, the officers of the HGSS decided to get rid of him, because they had taken a dislike to him and tradition could be overridden by their need to humiliate him for the perceived humiliation he had foisted upon them by some mistake on his first day as chazzan in a new synagogue.

This suggests to us that the reason the chazzan was dispensed with and thus humiliated was a need for revenge on the part of the HGSS officers who had suffered egoistic loss from the chazzan so they decided to do the same to him and thus regain their egoistic fulfilment by exercising their power to emotionally hurt and humiliate the chazzan personally in front of the whole Jewish community. Cohen's intervention is likely due to his own perception that he had made a considerable mistake and saw that if the officers got rid of the elderly chazzan then his position would be threatened to, which forced him to assert that he was making a principled stand, which is the position Grose implies he took. This ploy did not work and the officers of the HGSS simply humiliated Cohen as well by temporarily dispensing with his services in favour of another rabbi until such time as Cohen would come back. The probable reason the HGSS did not dispense with Cohen's services is that he brought prestige and wealth to the community being a Professor and presumably a man of some wealth, which prevented the officers of the HGSS looking for another more pliable rabbi from the many such individuals who were leaving central and eastern Europe at this time after anti-Semitism became governmental policy in many states. (33)

Thus we see that it is not only Jewish organisations that are in conflict, but also that Jewish individuals are also constantly in a battle with one another in order to gain egoistic fulfilment or avenge perceived or real humiliations and slights. In essence we can only understand this kind of infighting if we correctly assert that the Jew is perhaps the ultimate individualist and cares nothing for his fellow Jews except for in what will benefit the Jew individually and if that is anti-Semitism or philo-Semitism then the Jew will happily espouse either positions as long as it continues to be perceived by them to be to their egoistic benefit to do so.

References

- (1) Irving Grose, 1984, *Hampstead Garden Suburb Synagogue: The First Fifty Years*, 1st Edition, Hampstead Garden Suburb Synagogue: London.
- (2) Grose notes on p. 7 that what was considered a reasonable walk to and from shul was much longer in the 1930s than it was when the booklet was published in 1984.
- (3) Grose, Op. Cit., p. 7
- (4) Ibid, p. 5 It is worth noting that Grose here adopts the standard strategy of Jews seeking to attack their opponents work and literature in describing it as '*biased*' without qualification therefore imputing malevolent and conspiratorial tendencies on the part of their opponent, while making their own party out to be comparatively saintly and unjustly persecuted.
- (5) Ibid, pp. 5-6 It is tempting to conjecture that the pictures that had been reversed contained Christian symbols and/or perhaps the Royal family, but we cannot substantiate this. It is however of interest that pictures were reversed precisely because they were likely felt to insult or detract from the congregation's observation and attention to those conducting the service (which suggest an egoistic motivation), while the relatively neutral Mona Lisa print was not.
- (6) Presumably either Maurice or Sam Cohen: as both are listed as founding members on the HGSS foundation plaque.
- (7) Grose is referring here to the 'Seder' i.e. the weekly portion of the Torah that is read during Shabbos.
- (8) Grose, Op. Cit., p. 6
- (9) Irving Grose is a member of the HGSS congregation and it's Board of Management as of

1984 and hence is strongly affiliated with one side in the debate (Ibid, p. 40).

(10) For example Dr. S. Blackman on p. 6 is described as being optimistic about the congregation's ability to expand and is then vindicated with praise on p. 7 when Grose asserts that just one-two years later (Grose's chronology is somewhat confused): *'It is evident that even before the Synagogue was opened in 1935 the HGS Hebrew Congregation was already a flourishing, albeit small, community.'* This is also in open contrast to *'the opposition'*, i.e. the US' report of 1934, which directly implied this was not the case.

(11) As I go through this case study I will take the time to point to the egocentric motivation behind Grose's portrayal of the conflict in addition to applying egocentric theory to understanding the conflicts between the HGSS and the US.

(12) Grose, Op. Cit., p. 7

(13) Ibid, pp. 7-8

(14) Ibid, p. 8

(15) Ibid, pp. 7-8

(16) Ibid., p. 8

(17) Ibid.

(18) Ibid., pp. 8-9

(19) Ibid., p. 9

(20) Ibid., pp. 5-6

(21) It is unclear whether Sir Isidore Salmon was a successor to, or held a joint office with, Sir Robert Waley-Cohen mentioned earlier.

(22) Grose, Op. Cit., p. 9

(23) Ibid.

(24) In a synagogue it is not uncommon, both historically and currently, for the synagogue to raise funds for itself by allowing individual Jews to purchase seats for an annual fee, which means that in effect that they are members of a congregation even if they do not formally attend services.

(25) Grose, Op. Cit., p. 9

(26) Ibid.

(27) Ibid.

(28) Rosh Hashanah literally means *'head of the year'*, but is most simply put the Jewish new year ceremony and celebration. Its date varies, but I have listed the synagogue as being completed before the earliest date on which it can fall i.e. the 5th of September.

(29) Grose, Op. Cit., pp. 9-10

(30) I.e. the Chazan is the official in a synagogue who helps to lead the congregation in their prayers, which are sung as opposed to simply recited.

(31) Grose, Op. Cit., p. 11

(32) I.e. the shofar is the ram's horn that is ceremonially blown to announce a holiday, particularly on Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur.

(33) An example of this in relation to British synagogues can be found in David Daiches, 1974, *'Two Worlds: An Edinburgh Jewish Childhood'*, 2nd Edition, Sussex University Press: London, pp. 99-105 in relation to a *'Rabbi Lewisohn'*. Daiches was the son of the very prominent and unofficial Edinburgh-based *'Chief Rabbi of Scotland'*, Dr. Salis Daiches.

The Ritual Murder in Konitz

Monday, 28 June 2010

A Book Review of Helmut Walser Smith, 2003, *The Butcher's Tale: Murder and Anti-Semitism in a German Town*, 1st Edition, W. W. Norton: New York

Jewish Ritual Murder is one of those subjects within anti-Semitism that many anti-Semites shy away from because they consider it to be an absurd assertion: that jews have and do ritually murder people on occasion. What tends to get overlooked within that logic; also used by the jews and apologists, is that jews do murder people and also produce their own serial killers. The heart of the jewish and philo-Semitic argument that jews could not possibly have performed ritual murder because of the Decalogue (i.e. the ten commandments) is thus not only suspect, but utterly untenable. (1) This is not to say; of course, that some jewish ritual murder cases haven't been fabrications, because they have, but at the same time it is not plausible to generally assert that jews have not committed ritual murder just because some of the cases were discovered to have been fabricated (usually by the authorities at the time although later commentators have been quick to claim that they have '*uncovered new evidence of a conspiracy*'). (2)

Most jewish ritual murder cases occurred in and around the Middle Ages and Early Modern Europe: this isn't to say there haven't been others, but that rather these are the cases that we know about and we can suspect; although we cannot prove, that were many other instances of such an accusation being; rightly or wrongly, levelled against the jews. That said at the turn of the twentieth century there was a spate of new ritual murder cases levelled against the jews and one of the most famous of these was in the German town of Konitz in Prussia. This case perhaps fuelled purchases and interest in the best book from the philo-Semitic side of the argument to be written (3) and also inspired anti-Semitic investigation of the subject in greater detail.

This is the starting point for Walser Smith's well-received micro-historical study of the Konitz case and to be fair and frank it does; unlike so many books in this genre, deserve the fulsome praise that has been awarded to it and its author. The book itself is an excellent example of how academic books should be written: the tone is not overly partisan (although it is obviously not an '*objective*' study although it; of course, claims to be), the research is excellent and the narrative is like that of a good novel. If only more academic books were written like it then there would be less of a problem with undergraduates getting horribly bored while conducting research: unfortunately as far as that goes Walser Smith is a comparative rarity.

That said however Walser Smith's work and thesis has two major defects, which I cannot but believe that Walser Smith knows about considering that they are both fundamental to any intellectual method of writing about history that I know or have heard of.

The first of these two defects is that Walser Smith doesn't even once consider Adolphe Lewy; the jew accused of committing the ritual murder of Ernest Winter, as a suspect. This might not seem bizarre to the reader, but it will if we state that Walser Smith goes into great detail about all the other potential non-jewish suspects in the case and applies the results of his generally excellent research into discussing whether or not these individuals could have been the killer. The problem is; of course, that he simply leaves out Lewy, which is not only decidedly odd, but

it also suggests that something is off regarding Walser Smith's scholarship.

Why leave out Lewy?

I can see only two plausible situations which could motivate Walser Smith to make so absurd a claim by implication:

1) Walser Smith believes that Lewy does not merit consideration, because he sees Lewy as a victim of anti-Semitic prejudice and therefore there is no reasonable possibility in Walser Smith's mind that a Jew; or more specifically Lewy, could have possibly committed the crime.

2) Walser Smith believes that Lewy actually committed the crime that was ascribed to him and that in order to prevent Lewy coming under suspicion Walser Smith tacitly '*forgets*' to include him as a suspect in his analysis purely focusing on possible non-Jewish perpetrators as this would force Walser Smith to engage in an analysis, which would almost inevitably show Lewy to be the most plausible suspect (and therefore destroy his whole thesis in the process).

If we reflect on these two positions we must further take into consideration that Walser Smith does not; throughout '*The Butcher's Tale*', analyse any Jewish potential suspect and only analyses non-Jewish ones. This is notable because from Walser Smith's account he notes that the finger of suspicion quickly pointed towards the Jews and Adolphe Lewy was certainly not the only Jew to be singled out. That said he was however the only Jew to be seriously investigated, but this does not mitigate Walser Smith's omission, because Walser Smith analyses rumoured (and not seriously investigated) non-Jewish potential suspects so why not the Jewish ones?

I am tempted to suggest that the first solution is the more probable one. On the grounds that it focuses on the common rationale in academic literature on Jewish history and anti-Semitism to simply start off with the assumption that Jews are not guilty of what they have been accused of and are thus perpetual 'victims'. (4) The second involves more assumptions; and thus is less probable, but the fact that Walser Smith systematically suppresses all Jewish potential suspects could be held to suggest that Walser Smith's research led him to a potentially anti-Semitic conclusion, which would not have been endorsed by the academic community (for to even suggest that a Jew may have committed the murder in a Jewish ritual murder case is intellectual 'heresy' of the highest order). (5) It is impossible to decide between the two possibilities, but we must err on the side of caution and suggest that the first situation is more likely than the second, but we cannot rule the second situation out either.

By not considering Lewy; or any other Jewish potential subject, Walser Smith plays to his kosher academic audience as his book reinforces pro-Jewish stereotypes but it also detracts from the intellectual rigour of the book, which is otherwise excellent in its micro-historical narrative and attention to detail. It is not my purpose here to outline the; in my opinion, substantial case against Lewy as the murderer of Ernest Winter, which I will do elsewhere at a later date once I have the opportunity to collect the primary and secondary literature on the subject. I merely point out to the reader that the case against Lewy is substantial and that despite Walser Smith's intellectual dishonesty in not analysing Lewy as a suspect; he does a fine job (inadvertently) of discrediting all the other suspects with his otherwise rigorous analysis. In some ways we may compare

Walser Smith's analysis of the Konitz ritual murder case and his inadvertent strengthening of the case against Lewy in *'The Butcher's Tale'* to James Burnham's brilliant supposed defence, but actual inadvertent indictment of democracy as a political system in his *'The Machiavellians'*. We must therefore offer Walser Smith our thanks for producing such a useful book for anti-Semites to use as a means to defend an anti-Semitic interpretation of the Konitz Jewish ritual murder case.

The second of the two defects of *'The Butcher's Tale'* is found in Walser Smith's citation of the primary accounts of the event. This may be summarised simply as a massive imbalance in the credibility he gives to one side of the debate's literature and his absolute rejection, without critical analysis, of the other side's literature. To be specific: Walser Smith endorses all philo-Semitic interpretations and reportage of the case from the era of the trial as being *'factual'* and/or *'reliable'*, while he automatically rejects all anti-Semitic interpretations and reportage of the Konitz case as being *'fiction'* and/or *'unreliable'*. Walser Smith's rationale for this is simply: if he judges something as anti-Semitic then it is based on irrational hatred of the Jews and therefore is unlikely to be *'fact-based'*, because it is coloured with irrationality and selective interpretation. (6)

We may find irony in this in so far as Walser Smith does not even stop to consider that if this is true of anti-Semitic interpretations and reportage of the Konitz case then it must; ipso facto, be equally true of the opposing philo-Semitic interpretations and reportage that Walser Smith cites with intellectual gusto. We must disagree with Walser Smith here, because he is using a double standard to support his intellectual work and by not citing the anti-Semitic literature with an equal amount of credibility attached to its arguments then Walser Smith is engaging in selective interpretation, which as my reader will likely know is the bane of many an academic field; particularly in the humanities and the social sciences. In essence Walser Smith's work should be regarded as a philo-Semitic work that engages in active propaganda for Jews, but at the same time is of much value to the anti-Semitic cause for its trenchant and often devastating analysis of the non-Jewish suspects, which generally points to the one conclusion that Walser Smith is so desperate to avoid: Adolphe Lewy committed the murder of Ernest Winter. Whether or not it was a genuine case of ritual murder is far harder to ascertain, but on balance I think we must suspect that it probably was not, but rather the murder of a Gentile by a Jew.

We may then surmise that these two defects; while very important to keep in mind while reading and using Walser Smith's work for the anti-Semitic cause, do not impinge on Walser Smith's otherwise very useful and scholarly account of the Konitz ritual murder case. We merely need to get beyond Walser Smith's platitudes and into the meat of his arguments to find much to interest us as rational and informed critics of Jews. It is perhaps redundant to say that if the reader is interested in Jewish ritual murder then Walser Smith's *'The Butcher's Tale'* should be high on their list of books on the subject to acquire.

References

(1) The argument flows from the idea that because the Jews are forbidden to murder [their kinsfolk; i.e. other Jews, if you consult the latest scholarly works on the subject] they are therefore innocent. By the same token we might argue that a Christian couldn't possibly have committed the crime for exactly the same reason! Who could have committed the crime then? A

ghost: perhaps? For an example of this type of reasoning in action see Ronnie Po-Chia Hsia, 1988, *The Myth of Ritual Murder: Jews and Magic in Reformation Germany*, 1st Edition, Yale University Press: New Haven, especially pp. 137-151.

(2) For example see Jonathan Frankel, 1997, *The Damascus Affair: "Ritual Murder," Politics, and the Jews in 1840*, 1st Edition, Cambridge University Press: New York, which advances a 'conspiracy' thesis. Ronnie Po-Chia Hsia offers a similar explanation in his 1992, *Trent 1475: Stories of a Ritual Murder Trial*, 1st Edition, Yale University Press: New Haven and also in his *The Myth of Ritual Murder*, Op. Cit., pp. 86-110.

(3) Hermann Strack, Anon. (Trans.), 1909, [1891], *The Jew and Human Sacrifice: Human Blood and Jewish Ritual*, 1st Edition, Bloch: New York. This work went through at least eight editions in the original German in eighteen years, which gives the reader some idea of its importance and it is one of the few truly scholarly works from either side on this most controversial of subjects. Two other very important philo-Semitic (by a Jew no less) studies which touch on this topic are Joshua Tractenberg, 1939, *Jewish Magic and Superstition: A Study in Folk Religion*, 1st Edition, Behrman's Jewish Book House: New York and Joshua Tractenberg, 1943, *The Devil and the Jews: The Medieval Conception of the Jew and its Relation to Modern Antisemitism*, 1st Edition, Yale University Press: New Haven.

(4) For a recent detailed discussion of this please see Elliot Horowitz, 2007, *Reckless Rites: Purim and the Legacy of Jewish Violence*, 1st Edition, Princeton University Press: Princeton, pp. 192-198.

(5) A very recent example of this is the suppression of Ariel Toaff's, 2007, *Blood Passover*, which credited the Trent ritual murder case as being genuine and offered a very different perspective on it than that offered by Hsia: the main recent philo-Semitic author on the subject. It should be noted that prior to this and still to this day Ariel Toaff is a well-known Jewish studies scholar and his works are often cited in relation to Jewish communities around the Mediterranean.

(6) Walser Smith's interpretation can be considered little different from popular anti-Semitic accounts of the Konitz case for example see Hellmut Schramm's, 1941, *Der jüdische Ritualmord: Eine historische Untersuchung*, 1st Edition, Hammer Verlag: Berlin, pp. 289-332.

Twelve Prominent Jewish Anti-Apartheid Activists (Short Version)

Tuesday, 29 June 2010

The role of Jews in the anti-Apartheid and pro-Communist movements, particularly the African National Congress (better known as the ANC), in South Africa has largely been ignored by those who seek to challenge the present genocidal 'government' of South Africa. To write a longer exposition of the significant Jewish overrepresentation in anti-Boer South Africa politics, as well as comparing and reconciling this with Jewish participation in pro-Boer South African politics, would take more time than I can currently devote to this subject, but to provide a stop gap resource on this important subject I provide a short list of prominent Jews in the anti-Apartheid and pro-Communist movements in South Africa with a short summary biography of each Jew's involvement.

Before we start we should explain why even so few examples are very important in illustrating

the connection between jews and anti-Boer politics. Compared to Europe where jewish involvement in radical '*left wing*' political movements has often been noted and reasonably large jewish populations, which are, proportional to the rest of the population, often quite small. South Africa has a far smaller proportional population (less than one percent of the total and predictably circa eighty percent of South Africa's jewish population are clustered in and around to the urban centres: Cape Town and Johannesburg) of jews and so a significant overrepresentation of jews in a given political movement is both more obvious and significant (i.e. it suggests that there is something that attracts jews to radical '*left wing*' political movements as opposed to it just being a reaction against anti-jewish attitudes in the population as has been argued by my authors on this subject). It is also significant to note that South Africa under Apartheid treated the jews as '*Whites*' and they were not discriminated against because they were jews. Therefore we cannot, as I have said above, dismiss this significant involvement as being a '*reaction*' to something, but rather we must suggest something unique to jews which makes them get involved in this kind of politics.

So without further a-do let us introduce our proverbial rogues:

1. Harry Schwarz: Was co-founder of the '*Torch Commando*' fighting against the '*disenfranchisement of the colored people*'. In the 1960's he became leader of the opposition party in the Transvaal: the United Party. Harry Schwarz also signed the '*Mahlabatini Declaration of Faith*'. A declaration committed to opposing Apartheid in a '*non-violent*' manner. In the 1970's Schwarz acted as Chairman of the Committee on International Relations of the Jewish Board of Deputies. In 1991 he was appointed as South African Ambassador to the United States. He was also a close friend and associate of Nelson Mandela, Joe Slovo (see below) and Jimmy Kantor. Both Slovo and Kantor were jewish and were in the first instance a communist and in the second case a socialist.

2. Helen Suzman: Born Helen Gavronsky to jewish parents and later married a jewish man named Dr. Moses Suzman. Elected to the South African House of Assembly in 1953 for the opposition United Party. Abandoned the United Party in 1959 and joined the Liberal Progressive Party. Liberalism in South Africa was the key ideology that obtained jewish support: Suzman was a representative of the Houghton Constituency with Houghton being a primarily jewish wealthy suburb. Suzman's Progressive Party merged with that of Harry Schwarz (the Reform Party) [see above] to become the Progressive Reform Party.

3. Nadine Gordimer: A jewish writer primarily known for her literary activism against Apartheid, as well as her testimony on behalf of 22 individuals deemed to have committed treason against the South African state. Nadine Gordimer was a member of the African National Congress (better known as the ANC) and partially wrote Nelson Mandela's speech at the famous Rivonia Trial.

4. Arthur Chaskalson: A jewish defense attorney who defended Nelson Mandela at the Rivonia trial. It is amusing to note that Nelson Mandela was being prosecuted at Rivonia by the Attorney General; Percy Yutar, who was also jewish. Chaskalson's activism was primarily as a human rights lawyer and in challenging the implementation of numerous Apartheid laws. Chaskalson was also appointed President of the Constitutional Court of South Africa in 1994 and Chief

Justice of South Africa in 2001.

5. Denis Goldberg: Originally a Jewish member of the South African Communist Party, Goldberg later joined the Congress of Democrats, which allied itself with the African National Congress. With the establishment of the armed wing of the African National Congress; *'Umkhonto We Sizwe'*, in 1961: Goldberg became one of its technical officers. In 1963 he, along with several members of the armed wing including Nelson Mandela, were arrested and faced justice in the famous Rivonia treason trial of 1964. Goldberg was sentenced to four life terms. In 1985; some twenty-two years later, Goldberg was released from prison and went into exile in the United Kingdom. He resumed his anti-Apartheid activism from the African National Congress headquarters in London and acted as its spokesperson at the Anti-Apartheid Committee of the United Nations. Goldberg was appointed as Minister of Water Affairs and Forestry in 2004.

6. Ruth First: The Jewish wife of the Jewish communist Joe Slovo. First assisted in founding the Congress of Democrats: the *'white wing'* of the Congress Alliance. She assumed control of *'Fighting Talk'*: a propaganda journal supporting the Congress Alliance. In 1956 First, and her Jewish husband, were arrested for treason with the trial lasting four years and resulting in the acquittal of all the one and fifty-six accused. She fled to Swaziland after a state of emergency was declared; after the Sharpsville incident, returning to South Africa six months later; when the state of emergency had been lifted, to continue as the editor of *'New Age'* (successor to *'The Guardian'*). During this period she also organized broadcasts of *'Radio Freedom'* from mobile transmitters in Johannesburg. Detained in 1963 along with several members of the African National Congress' underground armed wing: *'Umkhonto We Sizwe'*. First was never tried for treason, but detained instead for ninety days. Following her release she and her children fled for the African National Congress headquarters in London after her Jewish husband Joe Slovo; humorously enough being the obviously caring husband and father he was, abandoned his Jewish wife and children in South Africa without telling them. Both First and Slovo subsequently resumed their anti-Apartheid activism in the United Kingdom. First then emigrated to Mozambique after being appointed Professor and Research Director of the Center for African Studies. She was subsequently killed by letter bomb. Coincidentally First's Jewish father; Julius First, was the treasurer of the South African Communist Party.

7. Albert Louis 'Albie' Sachs: Sachs' anti-Apartheid activism was mainly in the capacity of a human rights attorney defending Jewish and Negro clients against what he deemed to be *'oppressive and unjust laws'*. Sachs went into exile in 1966 in the United Kingdom, but emigrated to Mozambique in 1977. During his stay in Mozambique he was in close contact with Oliver Tambo who was then the leader of the African National Congress. On April 7th 1988 Sachs lost an arm and an eye when his car, which had been rigged with a bomb, exploded. Sachs was the principal architect of the post-Apartheid South African Constitution and was appointed in 1994 as a judge in the South African Constitutional Court by Nelson Mandela.

8. Rowley Israel Arenstein: Joined the South African Communist Party in 1938, becoming the organizer of the Durban district branch. In 1947 he withdrew from active politics, but remained a participant in the Durban branch of the Congress of Democrats during the 1950's. The extent of his subsequent anti-Apartheid activism is similar to that of Albert Louis Sachs (see above) as a human rights attorney. In the 70's Rowley Israel Arenstein was banned from practicing law and

placed under house arrest for his subversive activities and support of terrorism.

9. Arthur Goldreich: Although a transient fixture in anti-Apartheid circles; the short time that Goldreich spent in these circles was highly influential and thus important. Goldreich; a former member of the '*Palmach*' (the elite arm of the Jewish Zionist terrorist group: the '*Haganah*'), rented a farm near Rivonia, which he then transformed into the headquarters of the armed wing of the African National Congress: '*Umkhonto We Sizwe*'. Goldreich was among those arrested in the Rivonia incident, but unlike the others Goldreich along with a fellow terrorist; Moosa Moolla, managed to bribe a young guard on the 11th August 1963 and fled to Swaziland. Goldreich eventually made his way back to live in Israel.

10. Joe Slovo: An active Jewish member of the South African Communist Party in the 1940's who became a defense attorney for his politically active Jewish and Negro clients. In 1953 Slovo along with his Jewish wife; Ruth First, became one of the founding members of the Congress of Democrats. Following the Sharpsville incident: Slovo was detained for a four month period on the basis of being a communist agent under the '*Suppression of Communism Act*'. Slovo was also one of the earliest members of the armed wing of the African National Congress: '*Umkhonto We Sizwe*'. In June 1963 Slovo left for an '*external mission*' and a month later the police arrested the leadership of '*Umkhonto We Sizwe*'. Slovo resumed working for the African National Congress and the South African Communist Party abroad in the United Kingdom and acted as its Chief of Staff and General Secretary until 1987. In 1977 Slovo moved to Mozambique where he established an operational centre for the African National Congress. He was forced to leave the country following an agreement between Mozambique and South Africa, which entailed economic aid in exchange for a tough position against terrorist groups.

11. Raymond Suttner: A Jewish anti-Apartheid activist who in 1975 was charged with two counts of criminal behaviour to which Suttner pleaded guilty (on both counts). The specific charges were: taking part in the activities of an unlawful organization (the African National Congress and the South African Communist Party) as well as undergoing training, inciting or encouraging other persons to undergo training or to obtain information that would be useful in furthering the communist aims or the aims of any unlawful organization. Suttner was sentenced to seven and a half years in prison for his crimes.

12. Ronald Kasrils: A Jewish communist who; prompted by the Sharpsville incident, decided to join the African National Congress and who acted as secretary of the African National Congress aligned Congress of Democrats in Natal till it was banned as a subversive organisation in 1962. Kasrils was a founding member of the armed wing of the African National Congress; '*Umkhonto We Sizwe*', and was involved in its first ever operation. In 1963 Kasrils became the leader of its Natal Regional Command. Kasrils; like many of the other Jews involved in the anti-Apartheid movement, fled into exile in the United Kingdom and continued operating on behalf of the African National Congress in some of its international branches (such as those in Swaziland, Luanda and Rhodesia).

Kasrils also received extensive training in the Soviet Union during the 1960's. Kasrils was given courses focusing on general military training and intelligence operations. He was even trained to be a brigadier in the Red Army! This earned him the position of Chief of Intelligence for

'Umkonktho We Sizwe'. Ronald Kasrils held many other important positions in both the African National Congress and the South African Communist Party such as being a member of the African National Congress' Politico-Military Council in Lusaka from 1985, a member of African National Congress' National Executive Committee from 1987 and a member of the South African Communist Party's Central Committee from 1985. Kasrils' wife, Eleanor, was also a member of the African National Congress and *'Umkonktho We Sizwe'*. Kasrils was also related to Jacqueline Arenstein: a member of the South African Communist Party and the African National Congress who was also the wife of Rowley Israel Arenstein (see above).

Johann Luther contributed materially to this article with information and advice based on his research on South African history and politics.

In Brief: Socialism before Jews?

Wednesday, 30 June 2010

Unfortunately this evening I don't have time enough to write anything particularly substantive for Semitic Controversies, but I thought what I would present to you is an indicative quote from an old pro-jewish history of socialism in Britain. It indicates that socialism as an intellectual and political position was not always based on the ravings of the diseased minds of its Jewish 'prophets'. I quote:

'Quite different from the attitude of the rebellious aristocrat was that of the fighting democrat, William Cobbett. Though in his cheap weekly edition of the Register, begun in the autumn, 1816, he represented Labour as the creator of all wealth and the foundation of the State (Political Register, November 2, 1816), he soon appealed to the Luddites to desist from destroying machinery, and to join, instead, the movement for Parliamentary reform. Not machinery, but oligarchic rule, the debased state of currency, the heavy load of taxation consequent upon the enormous expenditure for war, pensions and sinecures, borough mongering and Jewish Stock Exchange jobbery, were at the bottom of the misery of the working classes.' (1)

This suggests to us that at least some socialists were aware of the problem posed by the Jews and their habit of exploiting the nations, which give them shelter from the last nation they exploited. This suggests that pursuing further research in the nature of this early anti-Semitic socialism would be of interest to the anti-Semites of today and tomorrow. I will be undertaking such research in the near future, but I cannot promise a series of articles upon the subject until I have gained an understanding of what the scale of this anti-Semitic feeling in socialism was.

References

(1) Max Beer, 1929, [1919], *'A History of British Socialism'*, Vol. I, 2nd Edition, G. Bell and Sons: London, p. 135

Is Yuri Ivanov's 'Caution: Zionism!' anti-Semitic?

Thursday, 1 July 2010

'Caution: Zionism' (1) is one of the oddest books I have ever read on the subject of the jews, because although it is a staunchly anti-Zionist work written from a Marxist-Leninist perspective (of Soviet Union post-Stalinist orthodoxy): it has also been credited with being an important example of *'Soviet anti-Semitism'* by prominent jewish authors on *'neo-Nazism'* and anti-Semitism in Eastern Europe such as Semyon Reznik. (2) As you; as my reader, might be aware I have long doubted the veracity of this claim in so far as it tries to equate anti-Semitism with anti-Zionism, which are two very different intellectual stances as one can be anti-Semitic and not anti-Zionist as well as vice versa. It however must be confessed that most often anti-Semites are also anti-Zionists, but in addition that most anti-Zionists are not anti-Semites.

The separation of these different intellectual stances; although debatably linked, is difficult in practice. I will discuss this in detail elsewhere, but as it is related to Ivanov's *'Caution: Zionism'* I will briefly discuss this and offer my thoughts on how we can separate these two; often deliberately confused, positions.

One of the first rules of interpreting the evidence that you are taught in higher education is to *'keep it simple'* and not to attach meaning that is not implicit in an argument or statement (for example reading anti-Semitism into a liberal's criticism of Israel). The fact is that anti-Zionism is simply *'opposition to Zionism'* or perhaps more specifically in the current context *'opposition to the formation and/or the expansion of the jewish state of Israel'*. While anti-Semitism is not the *'irrational hatred of or opposition to the jewish people'*, but rather simply *'the view that jews are generally a negative part of a society'* (if we define it any other way, e.g. as *'opposition to the jewish people'*, we simply attach emotional points to our understanding of anti-Semitism leading to the conclusion that any criticism of jews is anti-Semitic).

We could get into a detailed discussion in support of my definitions and my criticism of the many other attempts to define the difference between the two intellectual stances in addition to a discussion of the almost habitual attempts to equate the two as being the same thing. However I will avoid the first part and briefly focus on the second to explain as simply as I can why it is such awful logic.

To explain the Zionist position let us use an example: a Marxist-Leninist jew could try to argue that anti-Semitism is anti-Communism because Karl Marx was; and a significantly disproportionate number of European and American communists were, of jewish origin, which we wouldn't consider any more cogent, but that is the essence of the Zionist argument. In so far as they *'reason'* that Israel is a jewish state and anti-Zionism is therefore opposing (and viewing) jews as being a negative part of society and is therefore anti-Semitic. The problem with that logic is that although Israel is officially a jewish state not all its citizens are jews: many of them are; for example, Muslims and Christians. Therefore for the Zionist logic to be true anybody who criticised say the United Kingdom would have to be not only anti-British, but anti-Christian as well since the United Kingdom is officially a Christian country and therefore one could not help but equate the two if the Zionist logic was to hold true.

It is obvious then that the Zionist attempts to conflate the two stances are largely based on absurd premises that if applied to other like situations would cause all kinds of uncomfortable intellectual repercussions; such as Christians who criticise say British foreign policy of close alliance, the so-called '*special relationship*', with the United States logically being anti-Christian. Bizarre: isn't it? However that is what the Zionist conflation of the two terms, anti-Zionism and anti-Semitism, is essentially doing.

Perhaps the worst and most damning point of all about this Zionist habit is the fact that it is selectively applied so that it is only Israel which cannot be critiqued therefore implying in the logic that because Israel is Jewish it is somehow special and above criticism (i.e. that further implies that Jews are special and above criticism, which is also easily equated with the concept of the Jews being '*Chosen of Hashem*' and therefore are the '*teachers and priests of the world*' etc). Of course Zionist authors; like the infamous Alan Dershowitz, claim that they '*criticise*' and '*disagree*' with Israel (as well as endorse other '*reasonable*' '*criticism*' and '*disagreement*') and it is a '*question of degree*'. The obvious and damning response to that is: from whence is this '*question of degree*' objectively; relatively speaking, determined? After all if it cannot be determined with a relatively decent amount of objectivity then how is it anything other than a sophistic way of asserting: '*I determine who is an anti-Semite and who is not!*' With that we can dispense with the debate over what is anti-Zionism and what is anti-Semitism and return to our original focus: Yuri Ivanov's '*Caution: Zionism!*' and whether it is anti-Semitic or not.

In regard to Ivanov's '*Caution: Zionism!*' we must address the assertion made by authors such as Reznik that it is '*anti-Semitic*' and this is fortunately relatively easy to do. The idea that '*Caution: Zionism!*' is anti-Semitic is rather absurd and is based on the above discussed equation of anti-Zionism with anti-Semitism without the necessary recognition of the considerable distance between the two intellectual stances. It could be argued that Ivanov uses '*anti-Semitic charges*', but this would be placing Ivanov's argument well out of its context. The '*anti-Semitic charge*' that you can most easily associate with Ivanov's work is the '*Jewish conspiracy*' (and the often congruent position, that is also endorsed in a different expression by Marxists, international finance) as Ivanov often discusses '*Zionist control*' (which is not the same thing as '*Jewish control*' in the same way criticism of the '*Israel Lobby*' is not the same as criticism of the '*Jewish lobby*'), but at the same time Ivanov makes it often implicitly and explicitly clear that when he is talking about Zionism and its relation to Jews: it does not include Jews who are anti-Zionist and particularly those who are anti-Zionist and of a Marxist-Leninist persuasion.

It is no fault of Ivanov's that those authors who are pro-Zionism or pro-Zionist explicitly and implicitly identify Zionism with the specific interests of the Jewish people as a whole and that Zionism as an ideology is exclusive to the Jewish people. The idea that Ivanov is anti-Semitic, because he rejects Zionism and therefore the Jewish people is obviously absurd. If it was true that the rejection of Zionism was anti-Semitic then anti-Semitism itself wouldn't have historically and currently have factions that are for and against Zionism: now would it?

Ivanov's criticism of the Jews is limited to their history, their religion (i.e. Judaism), their capitalistic practices throughout history and the strong Jewish nationalist currents throughout Jewish history. Ivanov doesn't criticise Marxist-Leninist Jews; which he would have to if he was anti-Semitic, but rather he only criticises Zionism and Ivanov rightly recognises that because

Zionism is based on the assumption of a unique nationalist and racialistic identity of the Jewish people that he has to criticise the aspects of Jewish history which he believes have informed Zionist ideology. These are specifically: early Jewish history, Judaism and Jewish capitalists, which Ivanov implicitly and explicitly argues are deluding the '*Jewish masses*' with false promises and distracting; as well as dissuading, them from looking at the '*objective economic conditions*', which would force '*class struggle*' and '*class war*' to occur leading the '*Jewish masses*' to support the Marxist-Leninist position and the Soviet Union.

It is really as simple as that, but yet Reznik; among others, makes a mountain out of a molehill and declares that Ivanov's '*Caution: Zionism*' is a '*classic example*' of '*Soviet anti-Semitism*'. If Reznik and his fellow Jewish '*thinkers*' would simply step back for a moment and look at '*Caution: Zionism*' rationally and dispassionately: they would see the book does not attack Jews as a whole, but rather criticises general Jewish behaviour at various points in history as being conducive to nationalism and Zionism: therefore leading; in Ivanov's eyes, to a negative spiral necessarily contributing to the misery of the working class, which incidentally; according to Ivanov, the Jews are a part in the Marxist-Leninist world.

How on earth is that anti-Semitic?

It is merely criticism of Jews from a Marxist-Leninist perspective! It isn't describing the Jews as being a negative part of society: it is describing some Jews and some Gentiles as a negative part of society because they are capitalists or '*delude the masses*'.

For heaven's sake: that is standard left-wing fare. What are we to do, but condemn the entire intellectual left for being '*anti-Semitic*', because they criticise an action or two of Yahweh's little darlings? Of course not, but this is; in effect, what Reznik et al's argument is!

After all the one piece of Marxist-Leninist doctrine that Reznik et al have conveniently '*forgotten*' is that nationalism in any form is; supposedly, a tool of the capitalist to divide the international working class and that there are no significant differences within the working class except those created and exploited by capitalists to keep labour from uniting against them. This realisation completely neutralises Reznik's logic, but yet Reznik seems completely unaware of the implications of Marxist-Leninist orthodoxy and rather prefers to see anti-Semitism being masked in Marxist-Leninism. What is Reznik going to tell us next? That he has seen Moses Maimonides in his gefilte fish? Reznik is but one of many Jewish '*thinkers*' who prefer to construct massive conspiracy theories about anti-Semites rather than deal with the cold, hard facts of our age, but yet when have Jews not loved self-delusion and basking in their own falsely-created light?

My challenge to Reznik and his fellow '*Soviet anti-Semitism*' theorists is to provide a systematic evidential basis for their claims rather than going off half-cock about a book that I severely doubt they have read let alone taken the trouble to try and understand.

Go on Reznik: I dare you...

References

(1) Yuri Ivanov, 1970, *'Caution: Zionism!': Essays on the Ideology, Organisation and Practice of Zionism*, 1st Edition, Progress Publishers: Moscow. The edition is unstated in the PDF that I have acquired and in addition Jim Saleam and Alec Saunders who digitized it did not include the pagination.

(2) I am told by a friend who has had some correspondence with Reznik that he now lives in the United States although he is all but unknown to English-speaking audiences as he writes prolifically in Russian. Although some of his books have now been, or have begun to be, translated into English and have received typical laudatory reviews in parts of the mass media: he is still barely known to the Anglophone reading public.

An Analysis of a Jewish Anti-Defamation Handbook (Part I)

Saturday, 3 July 2010

Recently I came into possession of an unusual literary item: an anti-defamation speaker's handbook, which was produced for the sole reason of defending the Jewish people from their detractors (like me).

It is a truism to state that such work rarely falls into the hands of anti-Semites as it is by its nature an item that is quickly thrown away once it has served its purpose and such advice as to what to use and what to avoid in arguments tends to being tacit rather than explicit in nature. We can explain this simply by suggesting that obtaining such a handbook even at a considerably later date than the time it was meant to answer is akin to obtain the minutes of meetings of Jewish propagandists and officials who seek to attack anti-Semitism.

This is true in so far as those seeking to make a propagandistic case necessarily wish to keep their arguments amongst themselves so that their opponents cannot anticipate them and use this knowledge to their advantage in any confrontations. In addition handbooks of this kind necessarily operate a policy; which in military terms would be known as elastic defence, in so far as they have a series of counter-arguments and information to challenge their opponents, but these are often covertly or overtly contradictory and should they fall into the hands of their opponents much can be made of this. Hence this handbook is a rare and valuable find for an anti-Semite and I would be lying if I said I was looking for such material: I found it quite by accident at an auction of Judaica that I attended and bought it after realising what it was.

What we shall do here is to look at this work and analyse it in order to understand the mentality of the arguments offered and what the handbook's internal evidence suggests about the mentality of the Jewish and pro-Jewish partisans it was designed to aid. We shall also briefly look at some of the arguments offered in terms of their factual accuracy for Jews, as a group, specialise in making apparently cogent arguments by misrepresenting literature, sources and making un-evidenced logical jumps. (1)

This dependence on the appearance of an intelligent argument; as I have stated before in much of my published work as well as in private correspondence, is central to why Jews propound the

types of conspiracy-based arguments in both the scholarly and popular literature. It is also why so few of those who label themselves as '*skeptics*' notice that the very arguments they decry amongst the majority of what they term '*Nazis*', '*racists*' and '*fascists*' (etc ad infinitum) are used regularly by those whose arguments they often use against said labelled individuals and groups. That this contradiction remains unnoticed is more down to the current mythos, which remains relatively unquestioned among intellectual orthodoxy that the jews are a '*special case*' and that they have a '*unique*' place in world history. That claim of '*special status*' has allowed jews to use their jewish identity as a shield from criticism as for example has been seen in more recent years with the creation of '*new anti-Semitism theory*', which seeks to use the status of Israel as jewish state to defend Israel from criticism by labelling all criticism of Israel as anti-Semitic. (2)

Thus when we are analysing this handbook we are gaining a valuable insight into the mind of the jewish opponents of anti-Semitism and the logic that they are using to defend jews. As it happens that logic is less than flattering to the apparent '*victim*', i.e. the jews, than the apparent '*aggressor*' as it depicts very markedly their true; rather than their projected and claimed (by both themselves and their apologists), character.

The handbook itself is a small pocket size volume of rather cheap; but somewhat hardy, construction entitled '*Jewish Defence Campaign Speakers' Handbook*' and as is common to handbooks intended for practical purposes each page only contains a single side of text with the reverse side of the page given over as a '*Notes*' page presumably to allow the jew or the pro-jewish advocate to note down thoughts, ideas or references that may occur to him or her during the use of the handbook.

The handbook itself was authored by one Frank Renton. (3) Whether Renton was a jew or a pro-jewish gentile cannot be determined or inferred from the contents of the handbook (4) and nor is the surname listed as one commonly used by jews in Kaganoff's dictionary (5) on the subject. The hand book itself was first published in 1937; which can be inferred from date in the foreword, (6) and was evidently re-issued as a new edition in early 1939 as we can learn from the references to Kristallnacht throughout the text. There are few historical references, but Appendix E '*British Political History in a Nutshell*', (7) runs up to the 9th of January 1939 (8) and with no reference to any date past this. It is therefore safe to conclude that the new edition was completed shortly after this date as the outbreak of war would have made much of the material in the handbook redundant and the handbook contains no mention of the run up to events in Czechoslovakia and Poland that lead to outbreak of hostilities between the Third Reich and the British Empire.

The handbook's authoritative nature as being representative of jewish opinion and organisations is confirmed by the author of the foreword, Neville Laski, who was at the time of his writing, 1937, President of the Board of Deputies of British Jews. (9) This is further confirmed by the identity of the publisher, '*The Woburn Press*', (10) which was the official publisher of the Board of Deputies of British Jews, which is the representative body of jews in Britain to the Government having been established by Sephardi jewish merchants and physicians in the 18th century to provide fulltime advocacy for jewish interests in the domestic and international politics and policies of the United Kingdom.

That the President of the Board of Deputies of British Jews has endorsed the handbook and that it has been published by the Board of Deputies themselves informs us that the contents of the work were themselves endorsed by Jews resident in the United Kingdom and can be taken as representative of their intellectual positions. Whatever the defects in the work these cannot be solely subscribed to Renton for an endorsement written as a foreword as well as using the official Board of Deputies publishing house to bring out the work suggests that that organisation, which is the official representative of Jews in Britain is also responsible as the active proponents of any errors that Renton may or may not have made as well as any libels he may or may not have authored.

The handbook begins with a list of twenty-four '*Practical Hints for Public Speakers*' (11) and contains some points of interest to us beyond the more usual list of oratory-related tips, which seem somewhat unique to Jews as a group. I quote several points that in particular seem to reflect the specific points that are common among Jews:

'(5) Rancour and spite will not help our cause.

(6) Avoid pomposity and arrogance; not too much of the "Chosen People", or "That Jewry stands at the graves of her traducers".

(7) Speak to a non-Jewish audience as fellow-citizens and not as non-Jews, Christians, or Gentiles.

[...]

(9) Whilst rhetoric may be used at open-air meetings, refrain from over-acting and an incessant thumping of the platform edge.

(10) Never commit yourself to possible misstatements of facts and figures. If you cannot answer a question through lack of knowledge, assure your heckler that a reply will be either sent to him or given at next week's meeting. ' (12)

'(14) Dress neatly but not conspicuously.

[...]

(18) Speakers are advised to read the speeches of such champions of liberty and justice as Abraham Lincoln, John Stuart Mill, Edmund Burke, Lord Macaulay, Ralph Waldo Emerson, and Lloyd George. Reference to poets such as Byron (Hebrew Melodies), Shelley, Wordsworth, Tennyson, William Morris, and Alexander Pope will enable you to cull quotations and perorations for use at public meetings.

(19) Remember that your non-Jewish audience is not definitely anti-Semitic and that it is your duty to state our case in a calm, dignified, and dispassionate manner. You will lose the sympathy of a non-Jewish audience by indulging in a mud-slinging contest.

(20) Bear in mind that you have been entrusted by the Jewish community to defend its honour, and it behoves you to present our case to the British public in a dignified manner. Strict adherence to our case from a non-political angle and your regular attendance at the Speakers' Practice Class will help you carry out this great task with efficiency and dignity.' (13)

The points that I have quoted above, as we might expect, are linked with each other and so in order to understand them we must split up what we can ascertain from them by theme.

It is noteworthy that Renton repeatedly states that vicious attitudes should not be entertained openly while advocating the Jewish cause, but does not actually condemn those attitudes; both in their treatment of gentiles and gentile religion in general, which directly contradict his hint that using what he refers to as '*champions of liberty and justice*' (14) should be used to bolster the Jewish case (when they would condemn his tacit endorsement of anti-gentile principles as opposed to their championing of '*liberty and justice*'). When we point out that the non-condemnation of these attitudes is a tacit endorsement. We do so on the grounds that the pro-Jewish case that Renton outlines is based on nineteenth century; so-called rationalist, ideals of '*liberty and justice*'; some of the major influences on and authors of which Renton cites in point 18, but that while endorsing these ideas Renton selectively interprets the logic against those of which he disapproves rather than applying that logic to the Jews as well (who Renton implicitly informs us are exempt from any criticism or having to conform to what they preach to others). This makes Renton a hypocrite in his underlying logic and does not bode well for the factual nature of his case or the validity of the strategy he recommends against the case he offers (i.e. his strategy in promoting pro-Jewish arguments contradicts the actual pro-Jewish arguments he is promoting).

Instead of condemning the pro-Jewish arguments he is actually promoting which go against his ideas. Renton merely gives advice to his audience as to their presentation and specifically; by implication, to make the argument less about what the pro-Jewish cause entails, but rather about the problem of Jewish suffering. So; in essence, Renton is telling his reader to defend the Jews by subtly switching the ground on which the argument is based from having to argue a positive thesis to merely arguing against something, which as anyone who has written extensively on almost any subject will know is a lot easier than trying to present your own thesis on a given subject. Renton however does realise that a positive thesis is also required, but as an ancillary to the negative case that the handbook suggests so he does in fact provide some positive arguments to use, but comparatively speaking they are very few compared to the '*rebuttal*' type of arguments that Renton focuses on.

If we think about these two observations regarding Renton's advice to his Jewish and philo-Semitic audience. It suggests that what Renton is doing is implicitly recognising that; and explicitly pointing out to his reader, the general weakness of Jews as a people in argument, debate and propaganda is that they have an extreme tendency towards egoism, which causes them to become extremely irate and insulting very quickly when challenged on a subject or talking about a subject, which they believe is vital to their egoistic and/or physical survival. Renton's focus on presenting a negative case plays to the strength of these weaknesses in so far as if a Jew screams and hyperventilates on a speaking platform then it can be ascribed by him or

those who are also speaking to his or her '*passion*' for the subject and thus potentially turned from a propagandistic nightmare to a propagandistic tool on behalf of jewry. However it should be noted that Renton also implicitly recognising the possibility; and even likely probability, that jewish speakers will simply engage in flinging insults and accusations against their opponents thus giving credence to the anti-Semitic motto: '*the jew is the great master of the lie*'.

The next theme that we encounter is the jewish view of gentiles that is implied by Renton in his statements. When Renton admonishes his reader in point 19 to '*remember that your non-Jewish audience is not definitely anti-Semitic*' what he is implicitly telling us is that jews; then as now, naturally perceive any gentile to be naturally anti-Semitic, because of the explicit and implicit jewish assumption of their absolute superiority as the '*Chosen of Hashem*'. This is made explicit by Renton when he tells his reader in point 6 to avoid referring to themselves as the '*Chosen People*' and then in point 7 to not refer to their audience as anything other than fellow human-beings. What Renton is telling us as anti-Semites here is that the jewish weakness; as indicated above, is their individual and collective ego, which is heavily tied in to their collective and individual vision of themselves as the '*Chosen People*' (either of Hashem or in some other religious or secular way) and if you prick that ego then the jew will shoot themselves down in the eyes of their audience.

This again demonstrates that Renton is no empty prophet who does not practice his preaching in so far as he consistently advises jews to be careful and to present; like he does, a '*case for humanity for the jew*' rather than merely a case for the jews as the '*most wonderful people in the world*' and therefore further drive a wedge between the jews and their victims. Instead Renton suggests; and indeed practices, that the tactics and techniques of the con-man be adopted by the jews and their philo-Semitic supporters in order to gain as much support as possible from those who don't know much about jews as a people and just assume that they are '*like everyone else*' and have '*particularly suffered from injustice*'.

We can also note that the jewish attitude implicit in Renton's comment that things like '*jewry stands at the graves of her traducers*' is not exactly complementary to gentiles as the implication; likely based on the jewish assumption that their opponents are part of Amalek and therefore they should be physically exterminated as decreed by Hashem and explained by the great jewish sage Moses Maimonides in his '*Mishneh Torah*', is that all opponents of the jews will be systematically killed by the jews for their opposition to the '*Chosen of Hashem*'.

In summary of this then we can say that Renton is advising his jewish and philo-Semitic readers to not show the fact (and even outright deny) that jewry has a disdainful attitude towards non-jews and that jews '*are just like everyone else*' thus effectively conning the audience into unwarranted sympathy for the jews through lying by omission. Renton is ruthless in this, but this we may say is probably justified in his mind by the fact that he believes; understandably perhaps, that world jewry is fighting for its very existence against the anti-Semitic developing superpower of the time: the Third Reich.

The next theme we should notice from Renton's points is the egocentrism that he implicitly acknowledges as being the basis of jewish behaviour and thought processes. Renton notices this by his comments about the jewish habit of becoming very irate very quickly about being

challenged as the sub-text of that comment is that a jew; generally speaking, cannot stand to be corrected and that they will necessarily see it as a criticism of themselves (i.e. an attack on their ego), and will respond accordingly by what Renton calls: *'mud-slinging'*. This Renton implicitly acknowledges distinguishes jews from gentiles in so far as gentiles are less likely to see a criticism of their thoughts, arguments or general beliefs to be an attack upon their person (i.e. gentiles are generally speaking less egoistic than jews) and that gentiles are also less likely to respond by *'mud-slinging'* than jews are.

We need to note Renton's implicit recognition of the egocentric basis of jewish behaviour and thought processes in his comments about the jewish identity as the *'Chosen People'* in so far as he implicitly tells his jewish readers that they need to swallow their ego and pretend; like any good con-man, to be *'just like everyone else'* in order to defend themselves from harm appealing to the self-awarded authority of the jewish community over individual jews in point 20.

We should also notice that in point 20 Renton shows us that he recognises another easily confirmed observation about jews in so far as he admonishes his jewish reader to attend speakers classes so that they can best represent the jewish community, but what is implicit within in this is that jews are extremely egoistic creatures and believe that they; as the *'Chosen of Yahweh'*, will naturally have the oratorical prowess of a Cicero or an Ingersoll. This is amusing of course; as one can but easily imagine a slightly rotund jew waddling onto the speakers platform and; per Renton, screaming hatred at gentiles for an hour and then at the conclusion of the speech demanding that the gentiles serve the jews as a dog serves its master. This amusing as it is to observe does demonstrate to us the fact that jews are extremely egocentric in so far Renton constantly; throughout the handbook, admonishes his jewish readers to stop thinking they can do everything themselves and are already perfect. Well they are supposedly the children of Hashem now aren't they?

Further Renton notices other indicators of the egocentric nature of jews when he tells his jewish and philo-Semitic reader in point 14: *'dress neatly but not conspicuously.'* This; of course, implies that jews have a tendency to buy the most expensive and flamboyant clothing that they possibly can in order to show off how wealthy they are and *'keep up with the Goldbergs'*. This informs us by implication that in Renton's judgement the jews are egocentric characters and are want to tell the barely clothed starving gentile workman or the struggling gentile single mother what to do while sitting on their fat rump, in their flashy clothes dropping mildewed crumbs from their table that they expect gentiles to believe, because the words come from a jew.

The last theme which we should notice from Renton's list is that in point 10 he admonishes his jewish and philo-Semitic reader not to engage in gross distortion of facts and figures (although Renton implies that subtle distortions are acceptable, because they are much harder to detect), because that lends itself to the standard anti-Semitic argument that the jew is a habitual liar and does not really care about truth, but rather is simply out for himself and does not care one jot what happens to non-jews (or even other jews for that matter). Renton is so concerned that jewish speakers will simply lie through their teeth to their gentile audiences and be caught out by those who happen to know something of what they are talking about that he goes as far as to tell his jewish readers to assure their detractor/heckler/opponent that a response will be forthcoming to them *'soon'* (i.e. Renton provides a simple standard response). Of course Renton likely

recognised that the jewish speakers he is trying to reach out to would not actually send any 'response' to their detractor, but would instead use his suggested counter as a way out of the sticky situation of being caught knowingly lying by an adroit individual or group.

With that we conclude our analysis of Renton's list of *'Practical Hints for Public Speakers'* and we can now move onto the quotes, assertions and claims that Renton suggests his jewish and philo-Semitic readers use in their own speeches defending the jews and attacking anti-Semites.

References

- (1) The classic modern example of this is Alan Dershowitz's defence of Israel that was intelligently dissected and shown to be deliberately misleading by an anti-Zionist jew in Norman Finkelstein, 2005, *'Beyond Chutzpah: On the Misuse of Anti-Semitism and the Abuse of History'*, 1st Edition, Verso: New York.
- (2) A concise and learned, although essentially liberal and somewhat illogical, analysis of this can be found in the controversial recent work: Matti Bunzl, 2007, *'Anti-Semitism and Islamophobia: Hatreds Old and New in Europe'*, 1st Edition, University of Chicago Press: Chicago.
- (3) Frank Renton, 1939, *'Jewish Defence Campaign Speakers' Handbook'*, 2nd Edition, Woburn: London
- (4) Although Neville Laski in his Foreword mentions Renton's *'long experience'* in *'communal work'* in the jewish community (Renton, p. iii), which would seem to imply that Renton was active in the jewish community, it does not indicate whether he himself was jewish, but merely that he was pro-jewish for reasons that we cannot determine and do not wish to speculate unduly upon.
- (5) Ben Zion Kaganoff, 1978, *'A Dictionary of Jewish Names and their History'*, 1st Edition, Routledge & Kegan Paul: London.
- (6) Renton, p. iii
- (7) Ibid, pp. 80-85
- (8) Ibid, p. 85
- (9) Ibid, p. iii
- (10) Ibid.
- (11) Ibid, pp. 9-11
- (12) Ibid, p. 9
- (13) Ibid, p. 10
- (14) Ibid.

Part II will analyse the *'Useful Sentences, Dramatic Phrases, and Perorations for Defence Speakers'*, *'Useful Material for Anti-Defamation Speeches'* and *'A Specimen Speech'* sections of Renton's handbook.

Sources on Jews and Communism (Part XII)

Thursday, 8 July 2010

Part XII

'A more telling argument is an analysis of the April 9th and 10th Pravda, in which the Stalin prize winners are listed. People thoroughly familiar with Russian have gone over the lists carefully for us and have found over 120 obviously Jewish names. Here are only a few of the names that appear in the April 9th list:

*Lev Benyaminovich Marmorshtein, chief engineer of the factory "Serp and Hammer,"
Ephraim Feitelevich Schwartzberg, aeroplane engineer*

Binyomin Bezalelevich Gurevich, engineer of the factory " Electro-Apparat, "

Aharon Isakovich Liberman, engineer of Moscow instrument factory,

Samuel Moisieyevich Silbergliet, engineer-constructor of building construction,

Yuri Aronovich Shapiro, engineer of the Yaroslav Auto factory,

Yaakov Solomonovich Epstein, engineer,

Shlomo Izakovich Amrom, chemist,

Gershon Shimonovitz Brodsky and Abraham Samuelovich Feinstein, plastic engineers,

Leib Davidovich Yaffe, radio constructor,

Yisroel Pinyevitch Weiner, constructor of new military weapons, ' (231) [J]

'[...], it must be remembered that the Jewish people in the Soviet Union constitute about one percent of the population, which means they are exceptionally well represented in all the fields in which the Stalin prizes were awarded. ' (232) [J]

'We were four and each of us was the native of a different country: my father German, my mother Russian, my brother French and I British. My father and brother were Gentiles, my mother Jewish. The language used at home was German, which both Rudolph and I spoke as fluently as English.

These singularities were complemented by the political orientation of the household. My parents were both avowed anarchists, believers in the social revolution, in a society based on freedom and equality in which political coercion and economic exploitation would no longer be tolerated. They were members of a movement which, although small in numbers, was feared by some and abused or ridiculed by others. ' (233) [#J]

'Although the group my father worked with in London was in the main a Jewish one, he was himself a man of international stature. ' (234) [#J]

'My father was something of an anomaly. Although a Gentile himself, he had learned to read and write Yiddish and eventually was entrusted with the editorship of the Arbaiter Fraind, a Yiddish anarchist weekly. His first contact with Russian and Polish Jews had occurred in Paris where he lived for several years before coming to London. Many of them had been involved in revolutionary activities and were forced to seek asylum abroad as he had done. ' (235) [#J]

'The Arbaiter Fraind was published in Jubilee Street, a short distance away from us, in a building which, in addition to the press, held two meeting halls and various other facilities. The paper had a rather modest circulation, but since the copies often passed through several hands,

it was probably read by more people than might have been supposed and its influence in the affairs of the Jewish community was not inconsiderable. This was also true of the group as a whole. While small in numbers, it too had a greater impact on the life of the ghetto than would have seemed warranted. A steady stream of immigrants and exiles in the early years of the century helped to replenish and increase the ranks of the anarchist group, which grew steadily until the outbreak of war in 1914.’ (236) [#J]

‘Our friends in the East End were nearly all members of the “Arbaiter Fraind” group. A number of them lived in the neighbourhood and a few were even fellow-tenants of ours in Dunstan Houses. Among those in the building were the Linders and the Schapiros, while others such as the Lenobles, Tapler, and the Ploschanskys lived close by. The Linders were across the yard from us in the wing where Polly and Ernest lived. Solo Linder, a pleasant fun-loving fellow, always ready with a quip or a joke, was a popular figure in the group and at the same time a man valued for his astuteness. My parents were always very fond of him and also of his wife, Polly, or Pola as she liked to call herself, despite the fact that some of our friends were a little put off by her aloofness. Although not a bad looking fellow, Linder had that characteristically Semitic profile that Jews are commonly supposed to have but relatively few possess.’ (237) [#J]

‘Next to my father, Schapiro was probably the most erudite member of the Dunstan Houses community. Despite his comparative youth, he was widely travelled and had lived in Turkey, Russia, France, and possibly other countries before coming to England with his family. Like my father, a disciple and friend of Peter Kropotkin, the dean and theoretician of the movement, Schapiro was already at that time a man of some consequence in anarchist circles.’ (238) [#J]

‘A number of our friends had lived in Paris for a while, as my father had done, before coming to London. Unlike Milly, who had also lived in Paris for a period, but on whom that sojourn had left no lasting impression, the Goldbergs were very French in their ways.’ Marthe, their daughter, had a bilingual background very similar to Rudolph’s and mine, except that her second language was French instead of German. French was the language spoken in the Goldberg home, alternating at times with some Russian, for the Goldbergs were that rarity among Russian Jews, who spoke and understood the language of their mother country.’ (239) [#J]

‘Polly and Rose, each in their turn, went to live with a “goi” and, following my mother’s example, each decided to forgo a legal marriage. Fanny, alone among the four sisters, married a Jew, the one ray of cheer in an otherwise dismal picture.’ (240) [#J]

‘A similar measure of recognition was extended to the anarchist group as a whole. Many a time on our walks through the East End, we were accosted by complete strangers who, having heard of my father’s role in the great strike, wanted to express their gratitude and admiration. Even religious Jews would sometimes approach him and give him their benediction, a most unusual distinction for an anarchist and a “goi”.’ (241) [#J]

‘Misha, by the time that I knew him, had already seen quite a bit of the world. His parents had been activists in the Russian revolutionary movement and the boy, I believe, went with them when they were banished to Siberia. Among other places, the family had resided in Brussels for

a time before coming to England, and while Russian was spoken in the Rafkin household along with some Yiddish, Misha also knew a little French.’ (242) [#J]

‘The militants and idealists were, of course, among the first to leave for Russia. The “Arbaiter Fraind” group soon found itself bereft of its ablest and most dedicated members.’ (243) [#J]

‘It was the last I ever saw of my friend. Many years later I met his parents again. This happened, strangely enough, in New York where they had taken up temporary residence as members of a Soviet trading mission. The Rafkins had joined the Communist Party shortly after returning to Russia and evidently risen sufficiently in the ranks to be sent abroad on important assignments. They also had the political astuteness to back the right horse when the split in the party occurred and were now loyal adherents of Stalin. Their son, alas, did not have their acumen. Misha’s guilelessness and honesty were not qualities calculated to advance his standing in the Party. He was a person of strong loyalties and could see no reason to disavow a friend if that friend happened to be a Trotskyite. This, of course, was an unfailing recipe for trouble. Expelled from schools and denied the possibilities of further study, he was sacked from every job he managed to get and eventually found himself facing an almost hopeless future.

Bad as this was, what I found even worse was the attitude taken by Misha’s parents. Not a trace of indignation at the treatment meted out to their son by the rulers of their country, not a hint of sympathy for the victim whose only crime had been to follow the dictates of his conscience instead of the strictures of the party. The fault was entirely his own, in their view; and he got exactly what he deserved. If he refused to obey the rules laid down by the Party leadership, if he was determined to remain friends with dissidents and subversives, he had only himself to blame. A strange view, indeed, for people who once called themselves anarchists and denounced every diminution of personal freedom by the state.’ (244) [#J]

‘In political thought they are still numbered among the most ardent supporters of the great coalition of Russian Mensheviks, which has its headquarters in Stockholm, and – another significant fact – is captioned by a Jew, the well-known Socialist writer Paul Axelrod. There are probably quite as many Jewish leaders in the anti-Bolsheviks coalition as there are Jewish Commissaries among the Bolsheviks.

Nor are the upper and middle-classes of Russian and Polish Jewry merely passive spectators of the struggle. Politically they belong in an overwhelming proportion to the moderate Liberal party known as the Cadets, and many of them are active in the councils and Press of that party. The present leader of the Cadets, who succeeded Professor Miliukoff, after his unhappy but temporary defection from the cause of the Entente, is the distinguished Jewish lawyer M. Vinaver, equally conspicuous for his devotion to his co-religionists and the cause of ordered liberty in Russia. Admiral Koltchak and General Denikin, in spite of their compromising anti-Semitic associates, had no more strenuous supporter and no wiser counsellor than M. Vinaver. Another eminent Jew who may frequently be seen in consultation with MM. Sazonoff and Maklakoff at the Russian Delegation in Paris is Baron Alexandre de Gunzberg, at one time the most conspicuous member of the Jewish Community in Petrograd.’ (245) [J]

References

- (231) Moses Miller, 1948, *'Soviet "Anti-Semitism": The Big Lie!'*, 1st Edition, Jewish Life: New York, pp. 13-14
- (232) Ibid, p. 15
- (233) Fermin Rocker, 1998, *'The East End Years: A Stepney Childhood'*, 1st Edition, Freedom Press: London, p. 14. Fermin Rocker was the half-jewish son of Rudolf Rocker: one of the most important anarchist ideologues of his time and whom is still to this day revered in anarchist intellectual and political circles. On Rocker and jewish anarchists in London in general please see William Fishman, 1975, *'East End Jewish Radicals 1875-1914'*, 1st Edition, Duckworth: London especially pp. 97-310.
- (234) Rocker, Op. Cit., p. 15
- (235) Ibid, p. 16
- (236) Ibid, p. 18
- (237) Ibid, pp. 45-46. It should be noted that the reference to *'Polly and Ernest'* is referring to another jewish (Polly) and German (Ernest) mixed anarchist couple, which is clarified by Rocker on p. 41.
- (238) Ibid, p. 49
- (239) Ibid, p. 50. It should be noted that the Goldbergs were also jewish anarchists from Russia.
- (240) Ibid, p. 65. It should be noted that all four sisters; including Rocker's mother, were jewish anarchists and Rocker's maternal grandparents were also sympathetic to anarchism despite being devout Orthodox jews.
- (241) Ibid, p. 96
- (242) Ibid, pp. 119-120. It should be noted that Misha Rafkin and his (unnamed) parents were jews.
- (243) Ibid, p. 168. The return to Russia; of course, refers to the 1917 period when the Tsar had fallen and the jewish socialist Kerensky had taken power only to be replaced by the partially jewish Lenin.
- (244) Ibid, pp. 168-169
- (245) Lucien Wolf, 1921, *'The Myth of the Jewish Menace in World Affairs: The Truth about the Forged Protocols of the Elders of Zion'*, 1st Edition, MacMillan: New York, p. 49. It should be noted that Lucien Wolf was an extremely powerful jewish figure in British politics and wielded a great deal of influence inside as well as outside the jewish community during his lifetime. On Wolf influence on; and actions relating to, world affairs please see Mark Levene's, 1992, *'War, Jews, and the New Europe: The Diplomacy of Lucien Wolf 1914-1919'*, 1st Edition, Oxford University Press: New York.

Popular Television Franchises and the Jews (2010 Short Edition)

Friday, 9 July 2010

Television is by any standard an important part of everyday life in the twenty-first century and many individuals and their families regularly sit down in their time off of work and spend a significant amount of time viewing programs that appeal to them. With this captive audience: it is our concern to make sure that what they are watching is representative programming. As without the programming being representative then the programming merely becomes part of a state and/or corporate propaganda franchise, which merely promotes what it wants you to believe

rather than giving a representative space to views that differ from those of the current establishment.

This also applies to those who create and/or produce the programming as if those who create and/or produce the programming are of one particular interest group then the programs will; generally-speaking, be in that group's favour and will purport their particular viewpoint. It is possible that you are feeling somewhat confused; and no I am not telling you there is a '*conspiracy*', but this will clear if we use an example that is popularly understood.

If most of your television programmes were produced by avowed communists then you would see that the programs would obviously be significantly pro-communist in their bias and that pro-capitalist programs would be shut out and rejected as not being in the public interest. If therefore you have a group, which is heavily overrepresented in the ownership and/or in the creative/productive functions within the media, then this is as significant a cause for alarm as much as it would be if the media contained a large proportion of the members of the Communist Party.

After all if the Communist Party held significant sway over the media would the programming not be pro-communist?

Of course: it would!

There is such a group which is significantly overrepresented in the media and that group is the jews. This is no secret and; in fact, there have been numerous books and academic studies written specifically about this predominance and sometimes these works even overtly boast about it. The jews; like the Communist Party, have their own particular agenda and while that agenda; like a communist's, is not uniform: it does have close similarities to the ideology of other jew's like a communist's ideology would be far more similar to a fellow communist's; rather than a non-communist's, ideology. This therefore informs any action they undertake and especially when they seek; as in the case of television programming to hold forth their views as both desirable and normal.

This short article is not meant to convince you that jews are a significant threat and/or potentially problematic as no rational man or woman would merely take the few examples that I produce at sheer face value. What this short edition is meant to do is to indicate to you; my reader, that looking into this significant overrepresentation of jews in the United States media (and consequently having a disproportionate affect on the rest of the world given that American television is; and has historically been, a key American export) would be in your personal best interest. You may convince yourself of the reasonable or unreasonable nature of my argument by looking up your favourite American television franchises and then looking at those listed as being executive producers and/or creators. That is all I ask of you and I believe you will find the results surprising and dare I say it: alarming.

The executive producers and creators are the important individuals to look at for you precisely because they are the individuals who have created the concepts and ideas behind a franchise and/or have seen that franchise through the production phase and have the ultimate say as to

what goes into the *'final cut'* that we see on our television screens.

So without further a-do let us list some ten recent well-known American television franchises and their creators and executive producers:

'Angel' Franchise: **20 Percent Jewish**

Joss Whedon (creator and executive producer) is not jewish, but claims to be a 'feminist' and is of pronounced liberal/socialist political views.

David Greenwalt (creator and executive producer) is jewish.

Jeffrey Bell (executive producer) is non-jewish and of liberal political views.

Tim Minear (executive producer) is non-jewish and of liberal political views.

David Fury (executive producer) is non-jewish and of liberal political views.

'Buffy the Vampire Slayer' Franchise: **33.3 to 66.6 Percent Jewish**

Joss Whedon (creator and executive producer) is not jewish, but claims to be a 'feminist' and is of pronounced liberal/socialist political views.

David Greenwalt (executive producer) is jewish.

Marti Noxon (executive producer/supervising producer) is non-jewish and of liberal political views. She is also sister-in-law to the jews: David and Jenji Kohan.

'Beverly Hills, 90210' Franchise: **50 Percent Jewish**

Darren Bennett Star (creator) is a jewish homosexual of pronounced liberal/socialist political views.

Paul Thompson (executive producer) is not jewish and of unknown political views.

'Crime Scene Investigation' Franchise (including *'CSI: Crime Scene Investigation'*, *'CSI: New York'* and *'CSI: Miami'*): **75 Percent Jewish**

Anthony E. Zuiker (creator) is jewish (Zuiker also helped write the script for the recent film: *'Terminator Salvation'*).

Ann Donahue (creator) is a non-jewish homosexual of liberal/socialist political views.

Carol Mendelsohn (creator) is jewish and of liberal/socialist political views.

Jerry Bruckheimer (executive producer) is jewish and of liberal/socialist political views.

'Friends' Franchise: **63.6 Percent Jewish**

David Crane (creator and executive producer) is not jewish and of pronounced liberal/socialist political views.

Marta Kaufmann (creator and executive producer) is jewish and of liberal/socialist political

views.

Kevin Bright (executive producer) is jewish and of liberal/socialist political views.

Michael Borkow (executive producer) is jewish and of liberal/socialist political views.

Michael Curtis (executive producer) is not jewish, but of liberal/socialist political views.

Adam Chase (executive producer) is not jewish, but of liberal/socialist political views.

Greg Malins (executive producer) is not jewish and of unknown political views.

Scott Silveri (executive producer) is jewish and of liberal/socialist political views.

Shana Goldberg-Meehan (executive producer) is jewish and of liberal/socialist political views.

Andrew Reich (executive producer) is jewish and of unknown political views.

Ted Cohen (executive producer) is jewish and of liberal/socialist political views.

'Good Morning, Miami' Franchise: **100 Percent Jewish**

David Kohan (creator and executive producer) is jewish.

Max Mutchnick (creator and executive producer) is a jewish homosexual (his *'partner'*; Erik Hyman, is a jewish lawyer).

'Sex and the City' Franchise: **66.6 Percent Jewish**

Michael King (executive producer) is non-jewish, but is a homosexual of liberal/socialist political views.

Darren Bennett Star (creator and executive producer) is a jewish homosexual of pronounced liberal/socialist political views.

Sarah Jessica Parker (executive producer) is jewish and also the star actress of *'Sex and the City'*.

'Twins' Franchise: **100 Percent Jewish**

David Kohan (creator and executive producer) is jewish.

Max Mutchnick (creator and executive producer) is a jewish homosexual (his *'partner'*; Erik Hyman, is a jewish lawyer).

'Weeds' Franchise: **100 Percent Jewish**

Jenji Kohan (creator and executive producer) is jewish and of liberal/socialist political views.

'Will and Grace' Franchise: **100 Percent Jewish**

David Kohan (creator and executive producer) is jewish.

Max Mutchnick (creator and executive producer) is a jewish homosexual (his *'partner'*; Erik Hyman, is a jewish lawyer).

Response to Timothy Minear (listed in 'Angel' Franchise)

Friday, 9 July 2010

Timothy,

You claim that I am wrong and that David Greenwalt isn't jewish: it is quite possible he is not, but at the same time from what I've been able to ascertain about him he more than likely is (the name itself is unclear, but from what I've read he seems to be [being jewish is a biological as opposed to a mere cultural or religious phenomenon as so many like to presume]).

Also your claim that you are '*not*' a liberal, because you are a '*libertarian*' is borderline hilarious as they are fundamentally identical political ideologies, which only differ in the expression of their ideas as opposed to the fundamental assumptions and priorities which underlie them. It is rather like me asserting that a spade and a spatulous device for abrading the surface of the soil are completely different things when in fact they are fundamentally the same thing: i.e. intellectually absurd and the kind of hair-splitting that even Marxists and rabbis find pointless and tiresome.

So yes Timothy: you are a liberal and unless you've actually got evidence that David Greenwalt isn't jewish then I won't correct what I have said (I don't accept '*personal testimony*' as being valid generally-speaking).

Kindest Regards,

Karl,

Hampstead Garden Suburb Synagogue: A Case Study in Egocentrism (Part II)

Sunday, 11 July 2010

After the foundation and construction of HGSS the conflict between it and the US did not lessen, but in fact increased and indeed it began to escalate.

In December 1935 the HGSS; led by Blackman, opened Pandora's box when it suddenly did a tout face and asserted that in order for the HGSS to stay affiliated with the US it would require; what Grose explicitly dismisses as, '*certain amendments in the legal documentation regarding the building*'. (34) This seems rather contrived in so far as Grose implies that these changes were minor, but yet the US' reaction to these demands was at odds with their behaviour thus far in the narrative. In so far as the US had far more cause to disavow the HGSS at an earlier time without the same scale of egoistic loss, but now; as the HGSS was officially affiliated with the US, it would cause a major egoistic blow to the US and it would correspondingly take a much larger

demand to force the US to even consider taking the egoistic loss on the nose so-to-speak. This consideration is evidenced by Grose when he cites the comments of Sir Robert Waley-Cohen from a US memo as follows: '*Sir Robert [Waley-Cohen] evinces a desire to have nothing more to do with them [the HGSS]*'. (35)

Thus we cannot take what Grose asserts at face value, because it would take a lot more than just '*minor changes*' to '*legal documentation*' to cause such an upset. While we do not have any direct evidence: we may however take from Grose the probable tenor of what occurred. In so far as the HGSS; under Dr. Blackman's direction, once more began to '*tactically manoeuvre*' and now that it was affiliated with the US: Dr. Blackman gambled that the egoistic loss that the US would stand to suffer from the loss of the HGSS community would force the US to agree to his demands; which were likely change to the clear majority control of the HGSS [and thus practical independence] part of which would have been a demand for the ownership of the HGSS building. In essence Blackman and the HGSS were gambling that their blackmail of the US would still be effective.

We can see this egoistic confidence on the part of Blackman and the HGSS when after re-igniting the conflict with the US. He saw fit to push his demands even further when the HGSS advertised for a rabbi independently of the US, which directly broke the HGSS' legal agreement; upon its affiliation, with the US. (36) This was a deliberate slap in the face and challenge to the US by Blackman and the HGSS who where; as I have said, seeking to see how far they could push the US in gaining their independence while still being under the protective aegis (which they would of course fully exploit) of the US.

The ending of this conflict between the US and HGSS is not stated by Grose who simply claims that '*the difficulties were finally resolved*', but does not tell us in whose favour the result of the negotiations between Ellis Josephs (Financial Representative of the HGSS), Maurice Tanchen (Honorary Secretary of the HGSS) and Sir Robert Waley-Cohen (of the US) went. (37)

We can surmise that it did not go well for the US on the basis of the internal US memo cited by Grose (which evinces Waley-Cohen's unwillingness to compromise further with the HGSS and to just take the egoistic loss as being preferable to the continuing egoistic humiliation of the US by the HGSS) and the fact that Dr. Blackman '*resigned*' from the HGSS soon after in March 1937. (38) Thus indicating that the HGSS had suffered an egoistic loss and that Blackman was likely pushed out of office, which Grose then covers up as '*bowing out*' for unstated and by implication honourable reasons (but this seems very unlikely given Blackman's track record while at the HGSS). This is also compounded by the observation; made by Grose, that Blackman could have no part in the negotiations with Waley-Cohen, because they were no longer on speaking terms and no solution would be possible if Blackman and Waley-Cohen were the representatives as they; as they say; had history. (39)

Grose is; of course, looking to his own benefit in writing his short history by seeking to minimize the provocation of the HGSS and maximising the belligerence of the US. He tells us much about the US positions, but refrains from telling us much about the HGSS position especially when Grose observes; we might add that this seems to be an implicitly correct observation on his part, that the historical record shines a negative light on the HGSS community. Thus as a part of that

community Grose seeks to present the best possible account of the synagogue's history to his community so that he will receive laurels and further support from the community (i.e. fulfilling his egoistic needs temporarily), which then consolidates Grose's position within the community itself.

We cannot but help to find it difficult to see the ethnocentric explanation for these events so far narrated as there is little benefit to the Jewish community and the fight is between Jewish community's orchestrated by Jewish individuals, while there is the inevitable backbiting and internal struggle going on inside these communities. How can the Jews be asking themselves the question: '*what is good for Jews*' without the fundamental assumption of '*what is good for me is good for Jews*', which therefore indicates that the Jew is an egocentric not an ethnocentric creature. (40)

Returning to our narrative: in the aftermath of this major clash between the HGSS and US; which seems to have resulted in a humiliating defeat for the HGSS at the hands of the US, the HGSS requested and acquired the services of its first full-time rabbi: Dr. Isaac Levy. Levy wasted no time in stamping his mark on the HGSS; probably helping upstage and subsequently uproot Dr. Blackman, and as Levy himself put it to Grose: he '*moved in with the furniture*' on new Jews/Jewish couples relocating to the Hampstead Garden Suburb area and spent a lot of time trying to 'persuade' them to become regular members of the HGSS. (41)

This was; of course, an egocentric move on Levy's part to bolster his first appointment to his own synagogue (as opposed to being a junior rabbi [i.e. something of a religious afterthought in Judaism]) and therefore to massage his ego by gaining as large a congregation as possible, to which he could then '*minister*' and play a leading role in. In essence similar to how a theatre company will try and gain as many '*bums on seats*' as possible in order to play their part in their success and how important they feel themselves to be as actors and actresses. The same applies to Levy in so far as in order to gain the maximum amount of egoistic fulfilment Levy has to fill the HGSS and then this will allow Levy to further his egoistic ambitions by expanding the synagogues for which plans were approved by the US in May 1937. (42)

The second major event to occur in this period was the unseating of Dr. Blackman from his position as President of the HGSS, which occurred in March 1937. (43) We have already described Blackman's removal from power and the reasons for strongly supposing that he; in fact, did not go quietly and was pushed. In much the same way we might add that CEOs of dependent companies are often '*asked*' to '*resign*' rather than be sacked as it looks much better for the parent company and it can be claimed that there are other reasons at play other than the reasons that are actually responsible for the perceived necessity of an individual's resignation.

Blackman's resignation was rather transparent in so far as he claimed; in his official resignation letter, that the reason that he could not carry on was that his profession (presumably that of a medical doctor) precluded him from attending the synagogue regularly and thus he could not be classed as a sufficiently observant Jew ergo he should not be in such a responsible position within the synagogue. (44) This is; as I have said, rather transparent in so far as had Blackman been so lacking in observance he could hardly have been '*suitable*' for creating a synagogue and serving as its President in the first place and had he not been available to attend the HGSS much

he would certainly have not engaged in his considerable '*tactical manoeuvring*' against Sir Robert Waley-Cohen and the US. So we can only locate the origin of this decision on the part of the HGSS '*Board of Management*' in Blackman's presumed defeat at the hands of the US and thus his egoistic humiliation, which was then capitalised on by his enemies with the HGSS to seize power from him (in order to re-assert their own importance in their own minds after their humiliation by the US).

We may reasonably suspect that much of this change in Blackman's fortunes had to do with the recruitment of the new rabbi; Isaac Levy, to the HGSS who then; we may presume, worked against Blackman's influence as Blackman would have been seen by Levy as a competitor in accruing the egoistic benefits available from the HGSS and thus would need to be; in Levy's mind, removed from power as soon as possible and this opportunity presented itself a little over a year after Levy was appointed when the '*Board of Management*' was '*persuaded*' to eliminate the office of President; which Blackman held, and to create two wardens (one senior and one junior) in the President's place.

It is possible to locate three key movers; in addition to Levy, in this decision from the re-organised HGSS structure. These three jews are the three that Grose informs us changed their positions (i.e. moved upwards in the proverbial food chain) as a result of Blackman's swift fall from grace. (45)

They were:

Maurice Tanchen: Senior Warden (formerly Financial Representative) of the HGSS.

Barnet Birk: Junior Warden (formerly Warden) of the HGSS.

Ellis Josephs: Financial Representative (formerly Honorary Secretary) of the HGSS.

It is self-evident that these three individuals played an important active or tacit role in the removal of Blackman from his position of President of the HGSS and then proceeded to capitalise on it. This once again indicates to us the extremely individualistic and egoistic nature of jewish behaviour in spite of their professed objectives in gaining power for themselves. This again indicates to us that we must understand jews and their relationship to both jews and gentiles in terms of egocentrism as opposed to ethnocentrism.

After disposing of Dr. Blackman the HGSS '*Board of Management*'; led by the triumphant Isaac Levy, put their new plan in action in dealing with the US and in May 1937 applied for and received permission to extend the HGSS from the US. (46) This extension took the shape of four classrooms, which would have folding partitions between them as to allow them a dual use as teaching facilities and a synagogue enlargement for jewish special occasions such as Yom Kippur. This required some £2,000 to be raised by the HGSS community of which £750 was raised by the HGSS itself and £1250 was acquired in a loan from the US. Part of the money provided by the HGSS was gifted to the synagogue by one of its jewish benefactors; in this case a generally very notable and influential one, Oscar Deutsch who was the Chairman of '*Odeon Cinemas*'. (47) Oscar Deutsch also happened to be the brother-in-law of Maurice Tanchen and it is not surprising that Tanchen had roped Deutsch into the HGSS community and began conning his fellow jew out of his ill-gotten gains for '*the glory of G-d*'.

We should also note that according to Grose the HGSS' regular male membership had now increased to 140 and that by the autumn of 1937: it was projected; by Isaac Levy no doubt, to rise to 200 male members. (48) This gives us an idea of the scale of Levy's campaign to increase membership by 'moving in with the furniture' and all but force jews/jewish couples down to his synagogue at bayonet point. The newly extended synagogue was consequently opened by the Chief Rabbi of Britain: Dr. Hertz on the 1st of September 1937. However Isaac Levy's eyes were now roving to more attractive prospects to fulfil the ever-increasing needs of his ego and in 1939; Grose does not say precisely or even roughly when, Levy left the HGSS for the more prestigious Bayswater synagogue. (49) It is however clear that Levy had made provision for himself to leave as quickly as he might need to in that he; on the 3rd of April 1938, had brought in a junior rabbi; Harry Bronstein, to serve under (and eventually replace him). Levy also successfully recruited the HGSS' second chazzan (Grose for unknown reasons claims it was the first contradicting himself); the first being the elderly Ashkenazi jew from Stepney who only lasted for a day who we discussed in some detail above, Emil Nemeth (who also only lasted a short time; a year, at the HGSS). (50)

We may bring our account of Isaac Levy's tenure at the HGSS to a close by informing our reader of an amusing anecdote that Grose recounts to show '*how wonderful*' Levy was (again Grose is playing to his community readership's egos to support his own position and potential advancement within the community). In so far as Grose tells us that there were no major incidents during Levy's tenure other than a severe problem with the synagogue and its grounds being '*unkempt*' and leading to it becoming absolutely infested with so many rats that it caused such a considerable amount of formal complaint from the local residents that the HGSS' landlord; Co-Partnership Tenants Limited, forced the (predictably kvetching [complaining]) Levy to have '*his*' synagogue cleaned up. (51) This is amusing precisely because it is a very common claim among philo-Semites that jews are extremely clean and conscientious people who keep everything spic and span to such a degree that it shows up their gentile neighbours and '*puts them to shame*'. (52) One wonders how much this claim on the part of jews and philo-Semites is really just hot air blown at anti-Semites to try and scare them off.

Before the outbreak of the Second World War in September 1939 there was one more major incident in the relations between the HGSS and the US, which yet again resulted from the HGSS' plans to enlarge their synagogue at the expense of the US. This occurred in February 1939 when the HGSS put forward a proposal to the US to the effect that a new synagogue was to be built on land next to the Norrice Lea site of the HGSS; which had recently become available, and the exiting synagogue would then be in turn used for classrooms, overflow services and as a general jewish community hall. This new synagogue would contain enough room for more than 500 male jews to attend services, but would cost a whopping £6,300 to build. Of this total cost only £1,440 would be provided by the HGSS and the remaining amount of £4,860 would be paid for by a loan from the US. (53)

Grose does not detail the fighting and conflict that arose on the basis of this proposal as it undoubtedly would have provoked significance concern from the US about the viability of such a synagogue which still only 255 male members in its congregation. Grose here; once again, implicitly shows us his egocentric motivation behind his writing of his small history of the

HGSS in that he suppresses any mention of the conflict that likely erupted over this proposal and only very briefly deals with the secondary conflict in November 1939 when the new synagogue was finished and then consecrated on the 23rd of December 1939. (54)

This suppression is because; predictably, in Grose's eyes this reckless expansion could be seen as negative to the modern HGSS community; of which he was a leading member at the time of writing, which then requires Grose to gloss over this episode. Grose does this by only briefly noting the financial wranglings with the US over the fact that the HGSS had an income shortfall of £661 in 1939 and Grose does not mention any details other than to suggest that it '*required prompt action*' on behalf of the HGSS community to deal with this situation, which Grose implies was somehow magically solved. (55) One suspects that the HGSS benefactor Oscar Deutsch came to the rescue once again and stumped up the cash. Grose then speedily moves on to the consecration ceremony without so much as mentioning any details for the clash, but from what Grose does say (and more importantly his lack of narrative and/or explanation on this point) we may reasonably suggest that the confrontation was both long and bitter with the end result being the defeat once again of the HGSS by the US.

References

(34) Grose, Op. Cit., p. 11

(35) Ibid.

(36) Ibid.

(37) Ibid.

(38) Ibid, p. 12

(39) Ibid, p. 11

(40) When I talk of the manner in which jews should be understood I am primarily engaging in a pointed critique of the theories of Dr. Kevin MacDonald who argues for an ethnocentric theory of the jewish relation to gentiles with which I disagree and propose an egocentric theory of jews in general, which then informs their rather complicated and convoluted relations with both jews and gentiles.

(41) Grose, Op. Cit., p. 12

(42) Ibid, pp. 12-14

(43) Ibid, p. 12

(44) Ibid.

(45) Ibid, pp. 11-12

(46) Ibid, pp. 12-14

(47) Ibid, p. 14. Odeon Cinemas for those unacquainted with Great Britain is one of the major chains of cinemas in the United Kingdom and at this time was one of the largest ventures of its kind in the world. That Oscar Deutsch was a jew and the chairman of this firm speaks volumes about the scale of jewish power in inter-war Great Britain.

(48) Ibid.

(49) Ibid.

(50) Ibid, p. 15

(51) Ibid, p. 14

(52) For an example of this common assertion made by a jewish '*scholar*' of jewish history in London please see William Fishman, 1975, '*East End Jewish Radicals 1875-1914*', 1st Edition, Duckworth: London, p. 72. The root of this assertion is found in the jewish practice of taking a

ritual bath called a mikvah; which has to be free-flowing and not still water [hence a mikvah can also be a river or a lake only depending on whether privacy and modesty can be maintained], before every Shabbos/Sabbath (to '*ritually purify the body*') and after a woman's period of nidah (which roughly coincides with the menstrual cycle and involves a jewess having blood in her vagina and hence being ritually impure and she officially cleanses herself of this by the full submersion of her body in a mikvah at the end of her period of nidah [it is between the periods of nidah that a jewess has to have coital relations with her jewish husband and beget children]).

(53) Grose, Op. Cit., p. 15

(54) Ibid.

(55) Ibid, p. 16

The Secret Language of the Jews: Leshon Hakmah

Monday, 12 July 2010

The Tales of Rabbah bar-bar Hannah refer to a total of sixteen short '*tales*'; for lack of a better term, from a third century jew of Palestine; known as Rabbah bar-bar Hannah. (1) We may assume from the content of the tales; being that it consists of quoting or citing the; then in a state of flux, Talmudic literature and the Torah, that Rabbah bar-bar Hannah was a rabbi/priest of some description and that he was almost certainly part of the jewish; i.e. largely rabbinical, resistance within Palestine against the Roman Empire. Who had by this point dispersed the jews due to their habit of constantly revolting against Roman rule (as well as massacring any non-jew or jew they happened not to like that they could get their hands on) and then in a final act of sheer lunacy organised a huge jewish conspiracy across the Mediterranean sea to revolt from Rome taking most of Roman north Africa and Syria with it as part of a new jewish empire lead by a Messiah (of some description). This understandably annoyed the otherwise very tolerant Romans somewhat. (2)

In this '*persecuted*' heavily jewish environment: it was common practice for religious jews to cover up their religious communications/purposes by combining their need to organise and communicate with the legalistic and alliterative nature of rabbinical education into seemingly innocent; although somewhat nonsensical, short tales, which would communicate a specific message by alluding to a particular passage in well-known Talmudic literature or within the Torah itself. (3) As rabbis; even at this early period, placed a lot of store by rote and alliterative learning: it was rather easy to use passages that every highly religious jew would know off by heart to communicate a specific meaning to them. This isn't to say that there probably were not instances of confusion where one rabbi's meaning by alluding to a specific passage in the Torah was misunderstood to mean something completely different by another. (4) However what we can say with some assurance is that there was at the very least a common vocabulary and that the gist; if not the very specific points, was obvious to those receiving a given rabbinical message.

Obviously as they could not indicate precise specifics the jews of Palestine adapted a companion to these tales, which involved using hand gesticulation; passed down through rabbi to student and within frum (i.e. pious) families, to indicate the specific instruction given or point made by the allusion within the Talmudic literature or the Torah. This; together with the hinting at

specific well-known passages in the Talmudic literature and the Torah, was and is called leshon hakmah (literally: the *'language of the wise'*). (5)

What is interesting here is the implication of this identification in so far as it implicitly asserts that the clever jew is duping the gullible gentile (or perhaps the pejorative; *'goyim'*, (6) would be better applied here) by talking in a special/secret language in which the clever jew can make themselves understood, while deceiving the goyim that he/she is talking about something completely different or even simply banal/mundane. In essence what is implicit in the very title of this jewish secret language is the allegedly superior status; as the supposed *'Chosen of Yahweh/Hashem'*, of the jews over their; allegedly inferior, neighbours (and at the time of its creation: conquerors) around the world. This indicates to us the mentality that Judaism; as well as jews as a people, explicitly holds towards gentiles.

This kind of thinking; particularly in relation to the messianic fervour in which leshon hakmah was created, is perhaps most aptly described by Lionel Kochan when he summarised it simply in the following words:

'Not only does messianic thinking and exposition associate itself with particular historical events but its point of reference is also historical in that it encompasses the political and physical destiny of Israel.'

This must necessarily be so. The idea of the messiah is here understood as that concept which encompasses all those other concepts – the election of Israel, the covenant with God, the Torah – which have history as their 'all-pervading dominant sanction'.' (7)

As the 15th century jewish former royal treasurer, rabbinical scholar and traitor to the King of Portugal and then to the King of Spain (then proceeding to serve the King of Naples who he was also trying to topple at the time of his timely death) (8) put it even more simply:

'The people of Israel is unique in its divine leadership [...]' (9)

We can thus understand that when jews talk of; and communicate with, *'the language of the wise'*: they are speaking of their own self-ascribed superiority over gentiles and that the leshon hakmah is merely an expression of this as it allows them to *'be above'*; and to *'prove their superiority'* over, non-jews. This is; of course, extremely egoistic as it allows each individual jew who has even a passing knowledge of the leshon hakmah to feel that he or she has *'an edge'* and therefore is superior to those who had at this time ostensibly conquered them and later: those that ostensibly ruled over them (i.e. a powerful; if temporary, egoistical *'fix'* if you will). (10)

The use of leshon hakmah is still current today particularly in the orthodox and ultra-orthodox (or *'haredi'/'chassidic'*) communities and is used to indicate particular nuances to the meaning of what a jew says. As far as I am aware leshon hakmah has received no recent academic attention to my knowledge and nor has the language been codified in print to my knowledge (references to it in the literature are few and far between, which seems extraordinary given just how interesting and novel a subject it is for research). However from what Eisenstein says of it; and my own observations, we can form a reasonable idea of what it entails.

It is perhaps best to quote Eisenstein's words in regard to how leshon hakmah is used by jews:

'The Talmud, occasionally uses metaphors, allegories, and parabolic figures, and even brings in pantomime and gestures, as a meanings of covering a secret conversation, which may be a criticism of historical events or serve as a warning against the enemies of Israel and Judaism.' (11)

Eisenstein here is making it quite clear that leshon hakmah actually means in so far as it a device to allow jews to talk about non-jews without them being able to understand and most importantly to do so without knowing that the jews are doing so. Eisenstein also makes it clear that jews use leshon hakmah as a means to identify and talk about their enemies. We may assume this refers specifically to those designated by jews as '*Amalek*' and therefore the statement is specifically targeted against mortal enemies of the jews who according to the extremely important jewish sage Moses Maimonides (better known as '*Rambam* ') still exist and are to be exterminated by all observant jews. (12) However we should clarify this by stating that '*Amalek*' status can; and is, given to whole peoples as necessary by jews: most recently it has been assigned to Germans and Arabs, which can be seen in the vile '*Germans/anti-Semites are Amalek*' thesis of Daniel Jonah Goldhagen's controversial; although heavily lauded within the jewish community particularly those significant parts of it with a Zionist slant, '*Hitler's Willing Executioners*'.

This statement by Eisenstein also implicitly informs us that jews will and have organised and conspired against gentiles using leshon hakmah as we must be careful to remind ourselves that leshon hakmah was originally devised in order to enable religious conspiratorial communication between the rabbis/priests of the jews in the third century. We may also go slightly further; which Eisenstein does not himself do or note, in that the rise of leshon hakmah and its use against the Romans is probably predated by an earlier more primitive form of the language, which was used by the senior members of the various jewish conspiracies to revolt against the Romans to communicate with their fellow members of the tribe in places as far off as Alexandria and Cyrene. (13)

We can suggest this because it seems rather unlikely that leshon hakmah would have spontaneously arisen in Palestine amongst the jews if it had not been innovated at an earlier date and then was improved upon by the rabbinical conspirators in their hideouts from the Roman patrols seeking to carry out the Emperor Hadrian's will and stamp out Judaism (and thus it was thought; incorrectly with the benefit of hindsight and modern science, the jewish menace) forever. This is attested to because the rabbinical academies of the jews had by this time become expert in dissembling the meaning of their words so as to hide it from prying eyes and to make it seem all rather innocuous to any inspection of their holy and commentary texts that might be ordered by the authorities on whose land the jews were then residing. (14)

Moving into more modern times: we can see the use of leshon hakmah in the habit of jews of gesticulating wildly with their arms, fingers and hands during conversation. This; as Eisenstein tells us, is simply the jews understanding each other's words (and communicating responses) in a secondary far more meaningful way when they feel that they may be overheard by someone; presumably a gentile or a jew behind whose back they are talking, who they do not wish to

understand their actual conversation.

If you have ever been to a place with a large jewish population you will understand what I mean when I say that I have always wondered what the wild gesticulation was about and why precisely jews only tended to use it when they talked to each other rather than to non-jews. This is what they are doing: they are having a secret conversation behind your back that you are not meant to understand and the reference points that they use are the Talmuds (not just the Babylonian but the Palestinian as well) (15) and the Torah (as well as the whole Tanakh today).

We; as anti-Semites, should be mindful of this and seek to understand that when a jews says something then one must not merely take it at face value, but rather look deeper to try and understand the actual meaning of it and how; more importantly, jews would understand this statement in the light of their own thought processes and history. Anti-Semitism must be based on a keen-edged understanding of the jewish question and not simple jew-bashing: for anti-Semitism is an extremely rational ideology not a reactionary way to explain events that we happen not to like at any given time.

References

- (1) The version from which I cite is Judah David Eisenstein's, 1937, *The Tales of Rabbah bar-bar Hannah*, 1st Edition, Behrman's Jewish Book House: New York, which contains both the original Aramaic text and the original Hebrew translation in addition to an English translation and short exposition on each tale.
- (2) Please 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 & Stoughton: London for a useful summary account from critical scholar in the field. A more recent; but very uncritical, summary account of the relationship between the Greco-Roman imperium and the jews can be found in Peter Schaefer's, 1995, *The History of the Jews in Antiquity: The Jews of Palestine from Alexander the Great to the Arab Conquest*, 1st Edition, Routledge: New York.
- (3) Eisenstein, Op. Cit., pp. 5-7
- (4) This probably would have caused quite the argument between rabbis given the general jewish theological habit of arguing about just how many times you could split the number of angels dancing on the head of a pin. For a peek into the verbose and often absurd legalism of rabbinical discourse please see Eugene Borowitz's, 2006, *The Talmud's Theological-Language Game: A Philosophical Discourse Analysis*, 1st Edition, State University of New York Press: New York and Daniel Boyarin's, 1993, *Carnal Israel: Reading Sex in Talmudic Culture*, 1st Edition, University of California Press: Los Angeles, which should serve as an adequate introduction to those interested in this subject.
- (5) Eisenstein, Op. Cit., p. 5
- (6) Literally *'soulless being'/'carcass'*, which is derived from the Hebrew root of *'gowy'*, *'gevah'* and *'gviyah'*; as listed in Strong's Biblical Lexicon, meaning in effect; although we must stress not literally, that gentiles/goyim are the equivalent (although not quite the same as) any other animal like a pig (which seems the most apt given that the pig is non-kosher animal in much the same way as non-jews are viewed by jews). It can also figuratively mean a troop of animals.
- (7) Lionel Kochan, 1977, *The Jew and His History*, 1st Edition, MacMillan: London, p. ix

- (8) Isaac Abrabanel had been a central lynchpin in the conspiracy of Duke of Braganza against Alfonso V of Portugal and was subsequently forced to tactically up sticks and home in on his next; fortunately more jew-aware, target: King Ferdinand and Queen Isabella of Spain. For more information please see the apologetic biography of Abrabanel by the current Israeli Prime Minister: Binyamin Netanyahu, 1968, *'Don Isaac Abrabanel'*, 1st Edition, The Jewish Publication Society of America: Philadelphia.
- (9) Isaac Abrabanel, *'Ateret Zekenim'*, p. 34 (1894: Warsaw Edition)
- (10) For a more general introduction to the history of the region in which these events/beliefs took place/hold please see Jonathan Golden's, 2004, *'Ancient Canaan and Israel: New Perspectives'*, 1st Edition, ABC Clio: Santa Barbara and for an older; if rather more complete narrative-cum-analysis, please see W. Oesterley, Theodore Robinson, 1932, *'A History of Israel'*, 2 Vols., 1st Edition, Clarendon Press: Oxford.
- (11) Eisenstein, Op. Cit., p. 5
- (12) On the use of the concept of amalek in Judaism and jewish culture in general please see Elliot Horowitz's, 2007, *'Reckless Rites: Purim and the Legacy of Jewish Violence'*, 1st Edition, Princeton University Press: Princeton, especially pp. 107-146.
- (13) Allegro, Op. Cit., pp. 243-249
- (14) This can be seen in the case of much later important jewish sages in Nahmanides' (better known as *'Ramban'*) defence of Judaism against the charges of Pablo Christiani (a jewish *'convert'*) during the Barcelona Disputation of 1263 when Nahmanides essentially inverted his own beliefs to *'win'* the argument (endorsing positions that were by any score heretical in Judaism and were the exact opposite to his own writings on the subject). On this please see Robert Chazan's, 1992, *'Barcelona and Beyond: The Disputation of 1263 and its Aftermath'*, 1st Edition, University of California Press: Los Angeles. Also see Eisenstein, Op. Cit., pp. 5-7.
- (15) For an introduction into why it is important; in order to understand the concept and complexities leshon hakmah, to comprehend and understand the substantial differences between the two Talmuds in order to understand the given message a jew is trying to get across to another jew using leshon hakmah then please see (for example): Christine Elizabeth Hayes, 1997, *'Between the Babylonian and Palestinian Talmuds: Accounting for Halakhic Difference in Selected Sugyot from Tractate Avodah Zarah'*, 1st Edition, Oxford University Press: New York.

Echoes in the Synagogue: The 1615 Hebrew Chronicle of Prague (Part I)

Wednesday, 14 July 2010

Introduction

The Hebrew Chronicle of Prague of 1615 is one of only a several major jewish historical works to come down to us from European history. (1) The reason that we have so few contemporary jewish historical works (although we do have quite a lot of rabbinical and jewish devotional literature) is due to the fact that jews did not consider non-jewish sources to be truthful (as they did not come from the pen of jews), the events of the real to be of any great importance apart from in so far as they affected jews and that to dwell on the affairs of *'this world'* meant to infect one's biological holiness as one of the *'Chosen of Yahweh/Hashem'* with the impiety, immorality and dishonesty of gentiles. (2)

This attitude is still commonly expressed among those affiliated with mainstream Orthodox and ultra-Orthodox Judaism. (3) For example the ‘dean’ of modern Jewish studies; Rabbi Jacob Neusner, has explicitly commented thus:

‘The basic theory of gentiles, all of them assumed to be idolaters, is, first, gentiles always and everywhere and under any circumstance are going to perform an act of worship for one or another of their gods. Second, gentiles are represented as thoroughly depraved (not being regenerated by the Torah), so they will murder, fornicate, or steal at any chance they get; they routinely commit bestiality, incest, and various other forbidden acts of sexual congress. Here is how the Mishnah law expresses these premises: do not leave cattle in gentile’s inns, because they are suspect in regard to bestiality. And a woman should not be alone with them, because they are suspect in regard to fornication. And a man should not be alone with them, because they are suspect in regard to bloodshed.’ (4)

Neusner then clarifies the attitude of mainstream Judaism; in general, towards non-Jews as follows:

‘The basic thesis is identical: the gentiles cannot accept the Torah because to do so they would have to deny their very character... Now the gentiles are not just Rome and Persia. There are others. The claim is, it is natural for the gentiles (not just Rome and Persia) to violate some of the Ten Commandments – specifically, not to murder, not to commit adultery, not to steal - yet these are essential to the Torah. So, the reason that the gentiles rejected the Torah is that it prohibits deeds that the gentiles do by their very nature. The subtext here is that Israel ultimately is changed by the Torah, so that Israel exhibits traits nurtured by God and imparted by their encounter within the Torah.’ (5)

Neusner’s words account for the general opinion of Orthodox Judaism; as few would or could reasonably contend that Neusner is not only a major figure in Orthodox Judaism, but a highly-respected academic authority on it, but we should also cite another authoritative opinion in the form of the now deceased Lubavitcher Rebbe; Menachem Mendel Schneerson, who headed one of the largest and certainly the fastest growing Hasidic movement in modern Judaism. Schneerson is recorded; in an official devotional book published by his followers, as insisting and believing as follows:

‘Before I left his [Schneerson’s] office the Rebbe gave me a newly printed copy of Tanya and his blessing for a successful trip. Then he gave me an additional copy and told me, ‘Sometimes one encounters Jews on a flight. In that event you should have another Tanya ready.’

“I asked what the book was about, but couldn’t understand a word of his answer. I opened it to the bookmark, and asked him to at least tell me what was on that page. He read and translated it into English. Most of it was beyond me, except for one passage describing how even the lowliest of Jews would sacrifice his life for Kiddush Hashem, to sanctify G-d’s Name. (6) And in a flash I understand what my parents had been hollering about the whole time: even the worst Jew is forbidden to marry a gentile.’ (7)

It would be redundant to analyse these statements as this is not our purpose here, but they will suffice to indicate to the reader the sound factual basis on which we can make the statement that jews; historically and currently, view non-jews (and thus necessarily anything produced by non-jews such as literature) with disdain, which then allows us to understand why the Hebrew Chronicle of Prague; from now on referred simply as the Chronicle, is rather unusual as opposed to being '*just one of many*' such contemporary jewish historical sources, which I am sure you; my reader, assumed there would be.

The Chronicle was originally written about 1611 by an unknown author and later additions in different handwriting were added by its owner or owners between 1631 and 1708 who we may reasonably assume were different people from the original author. (8) The Chronicle's importance for anti-Semites and those interested in a critical approach to jewish studies is firstly; as we have said, that it is a rare jewish contemporary historical record of events: secondly; because the Chronicle demonstrates historical jewish attitudes and interpretations of the events of the day and thirdly; it refers to several important interactions and largely unreported events in relation to uprisings and attacks upon the jews by the non-jewish populations of central and eastern Europe.

Jewish primary sources; such as the Chronicle, deserve far greater scrutiny than has been afforded to them by contemporary anti-Semites and do repay the effort of tracking down translations and/or original works as they nearly always contain much in the way of explicit and implication information that is of practical use to anti-Semites whether intellectually-inclined or not. Information; we might add, that jewish and philo-Semitic opponents of anti-Semitism and critical perspectives within jewish studies rarely have the ability to cogently respond to. This is opposed to the very ready; even '*off-the-shelf*' answers and critiques, (9) that these same jewish and philo-Semitic opponents use against those who tread the well-worn paths of anti-Semitic critique of the jews using arguments that have not often been updated to take into account; or more specifically counter, jewish counter-arguments and/or new research on the jewish question from either side of the debate.

Our rallying call as anti-Semites *must* be: up and at 'em! We can no longer afford to sit around trotting out old outdated arguments on the jewish question: we must seek to innovate and evolve to match swords with the ancient enemy once again. That is what it means to be an anti-Semite!

The second part of this article; to be published tomorrow, will be a full and complete analysis of the Hebrew Chronicle of Prague and should; I hope, provide plenty of useful information and a fresh perspective on an important historical source that anti-Semites and those adopting a critical perspective in jewish studies have largely ignored.

References

(1) The edition to which I refer is Abraham David (Ed.), Dena Ordan (Trans.), Leon Weinberger (Trans.), 1993, '*A Hebrew Chronicle from Prague, c. 1615*', 1st Edition, University of Alabama Press: Tuscaloosa. In referring to the Hebrew Chronicle I shall give both the page reference from David and the original folio reference.

(2) Lionel Kochan, 1977, '*The Jew and His History*', 1st Edition, MacMillan: London, pp. 19-87. This isn't to say however that we cannot pick up hints and what jews generally thought about

specific events from the rabbinical literature, but rather that is often hard to discern and an amount of subjective license has to be used in order to apply it to our knowledge of the events of the world and in Jewish history itself as a sub-discipline. For a standard in-depth discussion of Jewish historiography and the sources which it utilizes please see Salo Baron, 1964, *History and Jewish Historians: Essays and Addresses*, 1st Edition, Jewish Publication Society of America: Philadelphia.

(3) More extreme sentiments are often expressed on the fringe of Orthodox and Ultra-Orthodox Judaism: in spite of the fact that the sentiments of the mainstream are pretty extreme by their very nature.

(4) Jacob Neusner, 2004, *Making God's Word Work: A Guide to the Mishnah*, 1st Edition, Continuum: New York, p. 74

(5) Ibid, p. 77

(6) *'Kiddush Hashem'* refers to the Jewish concept of martyrdom and in Schneerson's usage it means that one cannot be a martyr if one marries a gentile, because one is not living in accordance with the divine laws of Hashem (and strictly speaking against them) as laid down for the Jews; as the *'Chosen People'*, in the Torah.

(7) Aharon Dov Halperin, Tuvia Natkin (Trans.), 1998, *'Our Man in Dakar and other stories of the Lubavitcher Rebbe'*, 1st Edition, Sifriyat Kfar Chabad: Kfar Chabad, p. 17

(8) David, Op. Cit., p. 8

(9) For a simple example of the kind of *'off-the-shelf'* critiques of anti-Semitic arguments authored by Jews please see the Anti-Defamation League, 2003, *'The Talmud in Anti-Semitic Polemics'*, 1st Edition, Ktav: New York

Echoes in the Synagogue: The 1615 Hebrew Chronicle of Prague (Part II)

Friday, 16 July 2010

The Chronicle begins with the customary appeal to Yahweh/Hashem by the author to *'send the Messiah, son of David, that we [the Jews] may praise Your name forever, and inherit the everlasting world. May the Temple be rebuilt speedily in our day.'* (10) This may seem innocuous to the modern reader as it is not uncommon in religious literature of any age to find devout individuals beginning their works with well-worn aphorisms such as this. However what is important is to realise just what a given aphorism actually means in the religious context that it is used and if possible to discern the meaning that the individual author ascribes to it as many a phrase or aphorism can be interpreted any number of ways because of the inherent subjectivity of the author and those interpreting the text.

In the case of the Chronicle: we cannot reasonably ascertain the individual author's particular meaning as we know almost nothing about the author of the Chronicle: not even his [we may presume it was a he as Jewish women were not known for producing much written until the nineteenth century (11)] name.

We are; however, on much stronger ground when we seek to understand what the meaning of this passage is in the religious context of Judaism. In so far as this aphorism is still commonly used by Jews today and its meaning has not particularly altered; as far as I am aware, from the

seventeenth century to the twenty-first.

That meaning is simple in that when the Chronicle talks of the Messiah; the son of David, being sent it is invoking an idea which lies at the absolute centre of Judaism: that Yahweh/Hashem has 'chosen' the jews to be 'his' (12) people and that he will one day send a (jewish) Messiah to lead them to the new promised land when the jews; which we need to remember is defined as a biological group within Judaism, (13) shall rule the earth in Yahweh/Hashem's name. This is summed up concisely and very aptly by the prominent Orthodox Rabbi; Emanuel Feldman, when he states:

'David: I do not want to repeat what is obviously a cliché, but doesn't chosenness imply superiority? Do we actually consider ourselves superior to the rest of mankind?'

Rabbi Emanuel Feldman: That is another false supposition. Superiority per se is not an evil. Certain athletes are superior to others; certain musicians are superior to others; certain doctors are superior to others...

The fact is that certain nations are superior to others in specific areas of endeavor. Yes, we believe that the Jewish people is chosen for its mission by God because it possesses certain God given talents; a clear vision and knowledge of God and how He wants mankind to live on His earth, and the ability to connect with God and with the sacred in life... The Jewish people was seen by God as having certain qualities – steadfastness, spiritual resilience, courage, faith, self-discipline – which made us the most suitable agent for bringing the concepts of God and holiness into the world. That is to say our national character.' (14)

Feldman thus informs us that jews are considered the 'Chosen' by Yahweh/Hashem and are therefore superior to all non-jews in Judaism. He also implicitly informs us of the true meaning behind the Chronicle's aphorism: in that the Messiah will come, but the purpose of the Messiah will be to bring the non-jews into accord with the jews as the representatives of God on earth. This is particularly noteworthy, because the non-jews are not; as you might expect, to simply 'become jews'; because they in fact cannot become full jews as they were not born a jew, but rather have to be Noahides who are explicitly deemed to be of less worth in Judaism as they are considered inherently; i.e. biologically, unable to undertake all but a very few mitzvot extracted from the Torah. In essence the Noahide in Judaism is a virtual religious slave; whose status as a slave is dictated solely by his or her biological origin, to jews as the representatives; i.e. the 'Chosen', of Yahweh/Hashem on earth. If the Noahide disobeys the jews he or she is; in effect, disobeying Hashem/Yahweh in Judaism and therefore will suffer according (probably with a longer stint in Gehenna, which is more akin to purgatory than hell). He or she even may even be classed as part of amalek; i.e. those non-jews who do not bow down and worship jews upon the advent of the jewish Messiah, and systematically exterminated because of this acquired status. (15)

We may evidence this simply by quoting the Babylonian Talmud on how Noahides; as gentiles, are thought of; in terms of value, in Judaism compared to jews. I quote:

'R. Jacob b. Aha found it written in the scholars'2 Book of Aggada:3 A heathen is executed on

the ruling of one judge, on the testimony of one witness, without a formal warning, on the evidence of a man, but not of a woman, even if he [the witness] be a relation. On the authority of R. Ishmael it was said: [He is executed] even for the murder of an embryo. Whence do we know all this? — Rab Judah answered: The Bible saith, And surely your blood of your lives will I require;⁴ this shows that even one judge [may try a heathen].⁵ At the hand of every living thing will I require it: even without an admonition having been given;⁶ And at the hand of man: even on the testimony of one witness;⁷ at the hand of man:⁸ but not at the hand [i.e., on the testimony] of a woman; his brother: teaching that even a relation may testify.’ (16)

This may at first seem confusing to the reader; as the legalistic Talmuds are difficult; as best, to read let alone to interpret cogently. However we may cite an authoritative summary on this particular point by the ‘*Jewish Encyclopaedia*’:

‘The many formalities of procedure essential when the accused is an Israelite need not be observed in the case of the Noachid. The latter may be convicted on the testimony of one witness, even on that of relatives, but not on that of a woman. He need have had no warning ("hatra'ah") from the witnesses; and a single judge may pass sentence on him (ib. 57a, b; "Yad," l.c. ix. 14). With regard to idolatry, he can be found guilty only if he worshiped an idol in the regular form in which that particular deity is usually worshiped; while in the case of blasphemy he may be found guilty, even when he has blasphemed with one of the attributes of God's name—an action which, if committed by an Israelite, would not be regarded as criminal’ (17)

This explicitly tells us that halakhah (jewish religious law); which serves as the basis for historical and most of current Judaism, does not regard non-jews and jews as equal even if that non-jew has placed themselves en hoc to the jews by becoming a Noahide. Thus we cannot but conclude that Judaism has biological tiers to which it adheres and that you my reader; as a non-jew, would be classed as the lowest of the low in Judaism (as the Lubavitcher Rebbe taught: you would be ‘*lower than the lowliest jew*’ simply because you were not born a jew [see n. 7]). So that when; as the Chronicle explicitly prays for, the Messiah comes: you would become little more than a beast of burden-cum-slave to the jews and when the Chronicle talks of the rebuilding of the Temple: it merely refers to another core; but closely-related, doctrine within Judaism. That asserts that when the jewish Messiah comes: the Temple of Solomon will be rebuilt for the last time and it is from there that the jews will rule the non-jews in an earthy paradise for jews in payment for their ‘*long suffering*’ at the hands of non-jews. (18)

So we can see that in that short aphorism at the beginning of the Chronicle: it’s author immediately ritually calls for the enslavement; well sorry ‘*enlightenment*’, of the non-jews by Yahweh/Hashem and the divine payment that; we may presume he felt, should be rightfully given to the jews as the Yahweh/Hashem’s ‘*Chosen people*’. This also indicates to us the importance of paying attention to the meaning behind the words that jews utter and understanding them in their religious and cultural context we comprehend the character and the oft-hidden true intentions of the people that uttered them.

The Chronicle next refers to the 18th April 1389; despite that date being approximately two hundred years in the past from when the Chronicle was written, (19) when approximately three thousand jews were burned to death/killed by Prague’s indignant citizens; as well as its clerical

and secular authorities, after some of the jews openly attacked and desecrated a Church in Prague and deliberately insulted all the non-jews in the city by further publicly desecrating the consecrated host (which we must remember; in Catholic doctrine, is literally the body of Christ so such an act is akin to a literal re-enactment of Deicide). (20) (21)

The jews; of course, claimed they had done nothing wrong (22) and a special prayer was said for the dead jews as they were regarded as martyrs on the altar of Yahweh/Hashem. (23) This was; of course, probably a partial truth as many of the jews of Prague are unlikely to have been directly involved, but by shielding those who committed the crime: they forced the non-jewish population of Prague onto themselves by placing themselves in-between the criminals and justice. Some might bewail the injustice of such mob violence, but it is understandable when we consider that in the medieval period: committing so awful an act was regarded as something akin to how committing genocide is today.

We should however note that the underlying reasons for the massacre of the jews of Prague had been building for many years and included such jewish practises as usury and the habit that jews had of deliberately swindling their non-jewish customers (who were regarded rightly or wrongly as '*easy-marks*'), (24) while being far more equitable and amiable to their jewish customers. The causes of massacres of jews throughout Europe; well most places that jews settled actually, are usually regarded as '*economic*', '*religious*' and/or '*social*' in origin and in truth these are the factors which sustain; as opposed to actually cause, the violence in the short term in so far as the massacres allow the venting of long suppressed feelings against the oppressors and the exploiter. (25)

The actual cause is far more fundamental in that jews and non-jews are at odds with each other on a biological level and look at the world very differently: thus creating inevitable biological; i.e. racial, friction, which is compounded by economic, religious and social conflicts and then triggered into a proverbial fireball; generally-speaking, by the acts of a relative few jews who break the non-jewish camel's back with a straw and unleash a conflagration of suppressed animosity from the non-jewish population against the jews. This inevitably creates the cyclical nature of anti-Semitic violence and outbursts, which has been much remarked on and discussed by jewish historians and specialists in anti-Semitism directly leading to the cyclical, high-intensity violence and anti-Semitic sentiment that pervades European history. (26)

References

(10) David, Op. Cit., p. 21; Heb. Chron. Pr., Folio 3r

(11) There is one obvious reasonably contemporary exception in the memoirs of Glückel of Hameln, which is a semi-autobiographical account of a seventeenth century jewess that was never intended for publication. We will cover Glückel of Hameln's memoirs in a future article on Semitic Controversies. For further information please see Glückel of Hameln, Marvin Lowenthal (Trans.), 1932, '*The Memoirs of Glückel of Hameln*', 1st Edition, Harper & Brothers: New York.

(12) Jews have historically always recognised that Yahweh/Hashem is a male God even to go so far as to give him a wife (the Shekinah; formerly the Canaanite goddess Astarte), who was then converted; as Judaism became less polytheistic, into being a kind of '*holy spirit*'; which is still recognised to be female by the three largest mainstream sub-denominations (Conservative, Orthodox and Ultra-Orthodox) and jews '*make love to*' the Shekinah in order to get

Yahweh/Hashem's undivided; and apparently wandering, attention for their prayers. For more information please see for example William Dever, 2005, *'Did God Have a Wife?: Archaeology and Folk Religion in Ancient Israel'*, 1st Edition, Eerdmans: Grand Rapids and Aryeh Wineman, 1988, *'Beyond Appearances: Stories from the Kabbalistic Ethical Writings'*, 1st Edition, Jewish Publication Society of America: Philadelphia, pp. 8-11.

(13) For example see the following folios within the listed tractates in the *Babylonian Talmud*: *Kiddushin*, 69a; *Tractate Kiddushin*, 73; *Tractate Yebamoth*, 78b, which strictly codify biological status and its resultant ranking [in terms of desirability] in Judaism. Further see Moses Maimonides' authoritative comments on this in *Mishneh Torah, Laws of Forbidden Relations*, 15. In case some of my readers might not believe me. I quote from the Jewish Encyclopaedia article on Illegitimacy in Judaism: *'The real mamzer ("waddai"), who may not intermarry with Israelites; "even to his tenth generation shall he not enter into the congregation of the Lord" (Deut. xxiii. 2). He may, however, marry a woman who is of the same status or a proselyte.'* This is available at the following address: <http://www.jewishencyclopedia.com/view.jsp?artid=98&letter=L>

For still the best general summary of jews as a biological group please see John Baker's, 1974, *'Race'*, 1st Edition, Oxford University Press: New York, pp. 232-247.

(14) Emanuel Feldman, 1998, *'On Judaism: Conversations on being Jewish in Today's World'*, 2nd Edition, Shaar Press: New York, pp. 269-270. Also see Moshe Davis, 1978, *'I am a Jew'*, 1st Edition, Mowbray's: Oxford, pp.49-54.

(15) On this point see Elliot Horowitz, 2007, *'Reckless Rites: Purim and the Legacy of Jewish Violence'*, 1st Edition, Princeton University Press: Princeton, pp. 107-146

(16) *Babylonian Talmud, Tractate Sanhedrin*, 57b

(17) <http://www.jewishencyclopedia.com/view.jsp?artid=113&letter=L>

(18) We can say that it is notable by its omission from this doctrine in Judaism is the sufferings of non-jews at the hands of jews (which are implicitly thought of to be completely justified) and this once again indicates to use the comparative worth of non-jews compared to jews in Judaism. An interesting apologia for; and indirect confirmation of, this by a liberal jewish rabbi may be found in Jonathan Wittenberg's, 1996, *'The Three Pillars of Judaism: A Search for Faith and Values'*, 1st Edition, SCM Press: London.

(19) Davis, Op. Cit., pp. 132-133

(20) David, Op. Cit., pp. 21-22 (especially see n. 1); Heb. Chron. Pr., Folio 4r. On the validity and history of the charge of Host Desecration (as well as the religious jewish habit of attacking Christian Churches and clergy); which is still carried out today, see Horowitz, Op. Cit., pp. 167-182.

(21) For the jewish anti-Christian arguments; noting especially how vicious and anti-gentile they tend to be in their implication, please see Daniel Lasker, 1977, *'Jewish Philosophical Polemics against Christianity in the Middle Ages'*, 1st Edition, Ktav: New York; Hyam Maccoby (Ed. And Trans.), 1996, *'Judaism on Trial: Jewish-Christian Disputations in the Middle Ages'*, 3rd Edition, Littman Library of Jewish Civilization: London and Horowitz, Op. Cit., pp. 149-185.

(22) We may easily demonstrate how absurd this claim is by pointing out that no orthodox; in the academic sense, history of the jews even mentions anything negative that jews have done as a people and focuses almost exclusively on the *'sufferings'* of the jews at the hands of non-jews; particularly Christians [who are often denounced and traduced by jews in their popular and academic writings on this subject], without even mentioning that some; even most, of this suffering was actually retaliatory actions by non-jews against jews for the jews own actions. For example Myer Lew, 1944, *'The Jews of Poland: Their Politics, Economics, Social and*

Communal Life in the Sixteenth Century as reflected in the Works of Rabbi Moses Isserls, 1st Edition, Edward Goldston: London, pp. 128-130 for the lengths that rabbinical authorities went to (i.e. ordering death sentences for jews who 'informed' the authorities of the considerable number of illegal jewish activities) in order to prevent their abuses being known. One may see this claim repeated ad infinitum in such notable works on jewish history and more particularly anti-Semitism such as Stephen Eric Bronner, 2003, *'A Rumor about the Jews: Antisemitism, Conspiracy, and the Protocols of Zion'*, 1st Edition, Oxford University Press: New York; Dan Cohn-Sherbok, 1992, *'The Crucified Jew: Twenty Centuries of Christian Anti-Semitism'*, 1st Edition, Harper-Collins: New York; Simon Dubnow, Moshe Spiegel (Trans.), 1967, [1941], *'History of the Jews'*, 4 Vols., 4th Edition, Thomas Yoseloff: New York; Dennis Praeger, Joseph Telushkin, 1983, *'Why the Jews?: The Reason for Antisemitism'*, 1st Edition, Simon & Schuster: New York and Leon Poliakov, Natalie Gerardi (Trans.), Richard Howard (Trans.), George Klin (Trans.), Miriam Kochan (Trans.), 2003, [1955], *'The History of Anti-Semitism'*, 4 Vols., University of Pennsylvania Press: Philadelphia.

(23) David, Op. Cit., pp. 21-22, n. 1; Heb. Chron. Pr., Folio 4r. For other primary sources regarding this incident I suggest Otto Muneles, 1952, *'Bibliographical Survey of Jewish Prague'*, 1st Edition, Jewish State Museum of Prague: Prague.

(24) Robert Chazan, 2006, *'The Jews of Medieval Western Christendom 1000-1500'*, 1st Edition, Cambridge University Press: New York, pp. 217-219. One can also see this attitude most keenly expressed; or rather exposed, in Egon Corti, Beatrix Lunn (Trans.), Brian Lunn (Trans.), 1928, *'The Rise of the House of Rothschild'*, 1st Edition, Victor Gollancz: London and Leon Poliakov, Miriam Kochan (Trans.), 1977, *'Jewish Bankers and the Holy See: From the Thirteenth to the Seventeenth Century'*, 1st Edition, Routledge & Kegan Paul: Boston. Anti-Semitic arguments on this point have been voluminous, but a representative example maybe found in George Armstrong, n.d., [1940], *'Rothschild Money Trust'*, 1st Edition, Omni: Palmdale.

(25) Benjamin Ginsberg, 1993, *'The Fatal Embrace: Jews and the State'*, 1st Edition, University of Chicago: Chicago, pp. 7-18. Also please see Guido Kisch, 1949, *'The Jews in Medieval Germany: A Study of their Legal and Social Status'*, 1st Edition, University of Chicago Press: Chicago and Michael Toch, 2003, *'Peasants and Jews in Medieval Germany: Studies in Cultural, Social and Economic History'*, 1st Edition, Ashgate: Burlington.

(26) Ginsberg, Op. Cit., pp. 6-8

Hans Anderberg contributed materially to this article with helpful suggestions regarding the halakha and the meaning of certain points within different jewish denominations.

Hampstead Garden Suburb Synagogue: A Case Study in Egocentrism (Part III)

Monday, 19 July 2010

The coming of the Second World War was in many ways an unprecedented boon for the HGSS as it spurred the national; as well as the local, jewish community into placing a greater emphasis on their jewishness and in particular on Judaism as a religion. This was; of course, caused by the early and near total victories of the anti-Semitic Axis powers and hence jews began to attend

synagogues across Britain in fairly large numbers to beg Yahweh/Hashem to save them from the Axis Blitzkrieg and the massive loss in their personal status and egos that conquest by the Axis would represent. (56)

Within the HGSS community the increase in attendance was palpable with an increase to 300 male members of the synagogue; of which 100 were regular Shabbos/Sabbath service attendees during the months between the declaration of war and the beginning of Battle of Britain. In addition some 103 jewesses joined and were active in the HGSS Women's Voluntary Service; which supported jewish servicemen in the field by '*producing articles*' for them (we may reasonably presume that this largely took the form of kosher gift boxes and jewish knitwear). (57) The advent of the Second World War also increased what Grose calls '*jewish cultural activity*', which we may presume consisted of apologetic egocentric diatribes on behalf of '*oppressed jews of the world*' and the evangelization of Zionist ideas in order to buck up the; at this time; rather depressed jewish community. (58)

It is interesting to note that Grose; once again, attributes this massive increase in synagogue attendance not to the war; which I might add would be the obvious cause given the nature and conception of it by jews (as a war against anti-Semitism and later for '*the very existence of jewry*'). Instead Grose attributes this considerable growth to the 'energetic visitation work' of one Max Weinbaum and one Captain L. L. Franks. (59)

Grose once again shows he egocentric credentials and motivation here when he explicitly alters the more likely reason for the high growth of attendance at the HGSS by asserting; by implication, that it had nothing to do with the war; for which the jews as a group had been campaigning for quite some time, and that instead it had to do with the '*efforts*' (or perhaps rather hustling) of two heads of the '*Contacting Committee*'. (60) It is plausible that both Weinbaum and Franks had a role in making the local jews aware of the HGSS' existence, but they would and could not have been responsible for the high increase in attendance in general in so far as the circumstances that they attempted to gain new members; and hence egoistic fulfilment in laurels and personal power, cannot be described as normal and with the jewish national consciousness asserting itself to an increasing volume: it is far more probable that the increase in membership was more down to the Second World War and the very real jewish consciousness that they were battling for their economic, political and social survival as a power in the world against the righteous fury of the formerly exploited Axis nations. Once again it is difficult to see Grose's ethnocentric motivation for doing this, but it is rather simple to see his egoistic motivation for deliberately introducing this obvious distortion of history into his '*official history*' of the HGSS as it would ultimately; Grose believed, help further his position in the HGSS community and the resultant power structure.

On the 22nd of September 1940 the old synagogue building of the HGSS suffered a direct hit from a bomb dropped by the Luftwaffe during the Battle of Britain; which severely damaged it. Grose does not comment on the amount of damage, but from what we may ascertain from what he does say: it was considerable. The bomb blast also caused a significant amount of damage to the new synagogue building; particularly to the roof tiles, which resulted in the roof leaking severely with the result that service on the first day of Rosh Hashana the services were nearly flooded by rain. (61)

The damage to the HGSS and the '*Blitz*' in general helped remove some of the newly founded religious ardour among the local jewish community with many jews being '*evacuated*' to the countryside by the British government, while the British people were largely left to suffer the rain of bombs and anti-aircraft shell fragments. The HGSS Annual Report; cited by Grose, tells us that the membership was rapidly decreasing. Grose attributes this reasonably to jews attending the HGSS suddenly joining up (and probably demanding '*behind-the-lines*' officer's positions; such as one Barnet Samuel, in a similar vein to Captain L. L. Franks), jews being '*evacuated*' from London by the British authorities and more generally to jews being '*otherwise involved in their country's service*'. (62)

Grose's assertion on this point is necessarily vague as we can reasonably suspect that Grose is trying to generalise as the kind of thing that his fellow jews were getting up to as profiteers and shysters swindling and/or cheating the local population out of their ration coupons, stealing from government stores and generally dominating the flourishing black market. (63) Grose naturally wishes to conceal the probable involvement of parts of the HGSS congregation in these quite unpatriotic activities on the part of the HGSS so he simply asserts that they were '*in their country's service*' elsewhere. Thereby inserting a proverbial fig-leaf over the probable involvement of members of the HGSS community in these sordid activities, but what this tells us is quite valuable in so far as Grose is acting in his own personal interests, which in this case coincide with what; we may assume, are jewish interests in general.

This interests us because it impacts quite heavily on the credibility of ethnocentric theory as a way to understand the jews as a people. In so far as Grose in writing his '*official history*' of the HGSS cannot be writing for the world in general, but is in fact writing only and exclusively for his fellow jews ostensibly wishing to inform them of the traditions and history of the religious community of which they are a part. Therefore he cannot be writing '*for the benefit of the jews*' as a people as he isn't propagandising on behalf of jews to gentiles, but rather he is propagandising to a small jewish community on behalf of himself and ostensibly a few other jews.

This informs us that Grose cannot be using the conscious/unconscious question: '*what is good for jews?*' But rather is more likely using the conscious/unconscious question: '*what is good for me?*' After all Grose's purpose in writing the '*official history*' of the HGSS is not to tell gentiles or even other jews outside the community how wonderful it is, but rather to create a closer sense of community within the HGSS by a common shared tradition and history, but also to feather his own nest and improve his own position by gaining praise and laurels for undertaking such a task. Therefore we cannot help but point out that when faced with a more holistic interpretation of jewish history: ethnocentric theory can no longer be judged as a cogent method of understanding the jews as it simply leaves too many unanswered questions and has too many obvious exceptions to the rule. The HGSS so far has proved to be a significant one and one that can be roughly approximated to a much larger base of jewish behaviour that is simply not cogently explainable in ethnocentric theory.

Returning to our narrative: in late 1939 the second chazzan of the HGSS; Emil Nemeth, left to take up a new position at the synagogue in Highgate. (64) As we have said: this seems to speak

to the highly politicised nature of the HGSS community at this time in so far as religious staff often come only to disappear shortly afterwards. Grose does not much; usually not any, emphasis on the reasons why the various religious staff left the HGSS, but we may reasonably infer from what he does say that the HGSS community was a rather difficult one to get along within: possibly because of its constant political intrigue with the US as well as its internal bickering, which seems to have had much to do with the '*resignation*' of Dr. Blackman that was discussed in detail earlier.

Selected to replace Emil Nemeth as the HGSS' third chazzan in May 1940 was one; M. Perlmann, who had formerly been the chazzan at the synagogue in Carlsbad, which is now in the Czech Republic. The appointment of Perlmann by the HGSS proved; once again, to be a bone of contention with the US: the quarrel this time; which described once again only superficially by Grose, was over the wages allotted to Perlmann. The HGSS demanded that the US (who actually paid his wages) pay Perlmann £4 per week rather than the original £3. The justification offered by the HGSS for this demand for an increase in Perlmann's was that Perlmann was then to '*reside in the neighbourhood*' (which he already did) and '*attend services regularly*' (which he also already did). (65)

We are therefore left in something of a puzzle over the reason for the demanded increase in Perlmann's wages, which we can only resolve by reasonably speculating as to what the underlying motive of the HGSS was for seeking to further antagonise the US and start yet another confrontation. This mist partially clears if we look to the past history of the HGSS/US confrontations as well as the response that the US gave at this particular time to the HGSS.

The confrontations; as we have documented and discussed above, were largely (at least overtly) regarding the subject of money and funding. This also figures in the US response to the HGSS on this point where they state as follows: that '*until there is a very distinct improvement in the finances of the HGS Synagogue it is impossible to consider an increase.*' (66) This relates directly back to the US' concerns in 1939 about the financial viability of the HGSS and its habit of reckless expansion based on demanding US loans, while contributing proportionately little to its upkeep. (67) If we also recall the fact that the HGSS had; in its recent history, been on the defensive against the US in the ongoing power struggle between the two organisations: the mists begin to clear somewhat. What this reveals is that the HGSS had resolved to use the population chaos necessarily brought about by the coming of war to launch an egoistic counteroffensive against the US by demanding a higher salary for its chazzan. It should be recalled that in the war environment and economy: money and resources were becoming tight and if the HGSS could extract even if this small amount from the US it would; disproportionate as it might seem, be a significant victory for them in these times of general deprivation and want (even for jews).

The HGSS counteroffensive was; perhaps predictably, not successful and saw a still further cooling of relations between the HGSS and the US. The immediate object; Perlmann, soon; like his predecessors, suddenly felt an urge to up-sticks and head to less turbulent waters in early 1941 (once again little less than a year after coming to the HGSS as a member of the religious staff). This time the destination was the Great Synagogue in Manchester where Perlmann had managed to acquire another; perhaps more congenial, appointment as first chazzan. (68)

References

- (56) Elliot Horowitz, 2007, *Reckless Rites: Purim and the Legacy of Jewish Violence*, 1st Edition, Princeton University Press: Princeton, pp. 81-106
- (57) Grose, Op. Cit., p. 16
- (58) Some examples of the kind of literature, which may well have been read by the HGSS membership of this time (and on which Jewish speakers would have also based some of their arguments) are Robert Brady, 1937, *The Spirit and Structure of German Fascism*, 1st Edition, Victor Gollancz: London; Basil Matthews, 1934, *The Jew and the World Ferment*, 1st Edition, Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge: London; E. O. Lorimer, 1939, *What Hitler Wants*, 1st Edition, Penguin: London and Edgar Mowrer, 1937, *Germany puts the Clock Back*, 2nd Edition, Penguin: London.
- (59) We may note that Captain L. L. Franks was very likely not a frontline soldier, but rather a 'behind-the-lines' officer who rather than fight for Great Britain decided it would be much more opportune to hide away and do desk duty where he wouldn't have to break a proverbial fingernail and could instead lord it over London society as a 'hero'.
- (60) Grose, Op. Cit., p. 16
- (61) Ibid, pp. 16-17
- (62) Ibid, p. 17
- (63) M. A. Doherty, 2000, *Nazi Wireless Propaganda: Lord Haw-Haw and British Public Opinion in the Second World War*, 1st Edition, Edinburgh University Press: Edinburgh, pp. 87-121. Doherty's analysis largely puts popular anti-Semitic attitudes and ideas that were common in Britain at the time; contrary to common belief, down to 'prejudice', 'rumour-mongering' and 'Nazi propaganda' assuming that anti-Semitism is irrational and not based on actual observations (at least in part). However Doherty's analysis of public opinion and the resonance it found in German official and covert propaganda broadcasts offers the suggestive; and in my opinion more probable, conclusion that these opinions were informed by actual observation of Jewish behaviour. Doherty's analysis is complemented by Denis Hill, 1977, *People's War or Elitist Conspiracy?* (Unpublished Masters thesis: University of Sussex). Similar attitudes among ordinary Britons are discussed in varying amounts of detail; in relation to inter-war Britain, in Richard Griffiths, 1998, *Patriotism Perverted: Captain Ramsay, the Right Club and British Anti-Semitism 1939-1940*, 1st Edition, Constable: London, pp. 11-65 and Gisela Lebzelter, 1978, *Political Anti-Semitism in England 1918-1939*, 1st Edition, MacMillan: London, pp. 13-109.
- (64) Grose, Op. Cit., p. 17
- (65) Ibid.
- (66) Ibid.
- (67) Ibid, pp. 15-16
- (68) Ibid, p. 17

Hampstead Garden Suburb Synagogue: A Case Study in Egocentrism (Part IV)

Wednesday, 21 July 2010

After the third chazzan; M. Perlmann, had left: the HGSS swiftly moved to appoint a rather

illustrious successor in the form of one: N. Wilkomirski. Who had formerly been a noted chazzan in the German city of Leipzig. (69) Grose claims that the HGSS had wanted to appoint Wilkomirski earlier, but does not disclose on what evidence he bases this assertion. We may however suggest that this may well have been true as to gain a noted chazzan would lend further credibility to the still young HGSS community and give it a certain propagandistic; as well as egoistic, advantage in its conflict with the US. Wilkomirski's appointment; again perhaps predictably, proved to be the ostensible reason for a new round of intra-communal verbal and legal warfare between the HGSS and the US.

The first shot in the simmering conflict was fired this time by the US who objected to the appointed of Wilkomirski on the grounds that they '*could not view the appointment of an elderly man with satisfaction.*' (70) This promptly caused the HGSS' officers to dig their heels in deeper being '*determined*'; as Grose says, to have Wilkomirski as their new chazzan.

The central turning point of the argument on both sides was; once again, the question of money. The HGSS demanded that the US pay Wilkomirski the increased sum of £5, while the US refused to budge from its new somewhat compromised position; on account of Wilkomirski's reputation, of £4. Discussions between the HGSS officers; the members of the delegation are unnamed by Grose, and Sir Robert Waley-Cohen of the US in the early months of 1941 generated a compromise from the HGSS. That compromise was for the US to pay Wilkomirski their preferred salary of £4 while the HGSS would add a further £1 out of its own funds, but on the condition inserted by the US that this £1 was not generated from the offerings of the synagogue congregation. (71)

This compromise position between the HGSS and the US did not; predictably, last very long and soon both sides were at each others throats again. The event that broke the short-lived peace between the HGSS and the US occurred in June 1941 with Wilkomirski's former employer; the Hendon Adath synagogue, offering him an £8 salary to return to them as their chazzan once more. This predictably caused the question of the salary to be offered to Wilkomirski; in order to retain his services as a chazzan, to become an issue of importance to both the HGSS and the US. The HGSS promptly demanded that the US provide Wilkomirski with an increased salary (double what the US was then paying) of £8. (72)

The US; represented by Waley-Cohen, would not budge on this subject as they did not see; we may reasonably infer although Grose offers no comment, the value to be gained for them by having Wilkomirski as the HGSS' chazzan. While the HGSS saw the gaining and retaining of Wilkomirski as their chazzan to be of vital importance as a way to keep up their growth and thus their prestige in the eyes of their jewish congregation. (73)

Underlying all this is; of course, the egoistic motivations of the jews involved, in so far as the issue of whether the US would pay Wilkomirski's high wage bill was really one of power politics in that if the US conceded to pay the wages demanded by the HGSS for Wilkomirski then they would lose egoistic face and power over the HGSS. In that by successfully demanding and getting Wilkomirski as its chazzan against the wishes and machinations of the US at the increased salary then the HGSS would have demonstrated their ability to dictate terms to the US, which would then open up the possibility once again of the HGSS trying to force its virtual

independence of the US, while taking the money of the US. In essence one can say the conflict between the HGSS and the US; particularly instanced in the conflict over Wilkomirski, can be seen as a conflict between two organised groups of con-men: each seeking to dupe the other and establish (and maintain) themselves on the best terms possible (and also those which most disadvantaged the other group). (74)

This was a risky strategy on behalf of the HGSS as they were in a financially weak position and were not receiving much in the way of fees due to jewish population largely having left the area due to reasons that have already been discussed. (75) Thus we cannot but conclude that the HGSS were taking this risky strategy in a desperate attempt to win a more defensible position to resist the inevitable US counterassaults that this worsening of the HGSS financial position would inevitably bring. While the HGSS had some semblance of the necessary resources to mount such a strategy given that with the deteriorating financial position of the HGSS: it would not long be able to keep up the fight in the; then, foreseeable future. The risky stratagem failed the HGSS once again and they were forced; by their injured collective and individual egos, to try and make the best out a bad situation by '*volunteering*' to pay Wilkomirski another £2 in addition to the £5 that he was already being paid. So if we total this up from June 1941 the US was paying Wilkomirski £4 in salary, while the HGSS was paying £3 to Wilkomirski itself in order to keep him at the HGSS and to make up the salary differential: thus making Wilkomirski's salary £7.

Wilkomirski decided on this basis that his best personal interests lay with the HGSS as opposed to his old synagogue: Hendon Adath. Grose does not explain what other considerations motivated Wilkomirski to take a pay cut of £1, but we may surmise from what Grose does say that much of the reason that Wilkomirski stayed at the HGSS had to do with many promises and concessions being offered by the HGSS to him as well as his living closer to the HGSS than the Hendon Adath synagogue. (76)

We should not however imagine that Wilkomirski was a silent actor in this drama of jewish intra and inter-communal conflict. Grose does not elaborate on Wilkomirski's role in these events; perhaps because there is little physical record of them, but we may reasonably surmise that Wilkomirski played a central role; as the '*commodity*' under discussion, in the negotiations and the conflict: all the time seeking to improve his own personal position by creating an informal and/or formal bidding war between the HGSS, US and the Hendon Adath synagogue.

Thus we must envision a multi-faceted struggle between jewish collective and individual egos all battling each other; without an inch of mercy or compassion being granted, for supremacy and/or the best possible position at the proverbial food trough. This is the scene that greets us with the history of the HGSS and it indicates to us that jews must not be understood as a '*collective mind*' or a '*hive*', but rather a mass of individual egos battling each other in a never-ending struggle for supremacy, but also allying with each other when and where they deem it in their individual egoistic best interests to do so (but also breaking and/or re-forming those alliances just as easily without even a blink of compassion, attachment and/or remorse).

Once again we return to our narrative: in late 1941 the rabbi of the HGSS; Harry Bronstein, began to tire of the inter and intra-communal struggles and sought a new appointment. That new appointment was as a chaplain to His Majesty's Armed Forces. (77) Bronstein was to

presumably perform two roles in connection with the British Armed Forces:

1) To offer '*spiritual council*' to jews '*serving*' in the British Armed Forces (presumably behind-the-lines) and further instruct them in their status as the Chosen of Yahweh/Hashem. (78)

2) To '*educate*' non-jews; particularly Christians, how their religion required them to fight on behalf of jews as Bronstein; like many jews past and present, would likely have argued that; contrary to the required beliefs of Judaism, Christianity was a form of Judaism (which we should point out to an observant jew is dissembling of the highest order). (79)

In his hurried desire to get away from the HGSS Bronstein found and manipulated the Board of Management into accepting a temporary rabbi; one Dr. Weinstock, who lived nearby and who had been a teacher at the '*Principal Jewish High School*' in Vienna before he had unceremoniously abandoned his post (as well as his jewish pupils) and run away to Britain at the first whiff of egoistic disadvantage in 1938. (80)

Grose spends a paragraph detailed the educational accomplishments of Dr. Weinstock; who apparently had a '*brilliant mind*' and had attained a doctorate in Oriental Languages and Philosophy. (81) We should note that Grose also lionizes Harry Bronstein detailing his accomplishments as an alumnus of the University of Cambridge among others. (82) Grose's motivation behind this; otherwise unwarranted, inclusion of the educational achievements of these two rabbis is to indicate to his HGSS jewish community; as of 1984, reader the '*impressive*' intellectual calibre of these two rabbis. Who are; after all, central figures in the latter part of Grose's narrative. This helps to egoistically reinforce Grose's position by cultivating a positive mythos for the modern HGSS jewish community and garnering him praise and laurels for reinforcing the communal attitudes (i.e. creating a situation where Grose's history is accepted as unabashed historical fact and better Grose's position by elevating him to the position of the HGSS' community's official historian).

References

(69) Ibid.

(70) Ibid, p. 18

(71) Ibid.

(72) Ibid.

(73) Ibid.

(74) A similar example of this intra and inter-communal synagogue warfare can be found in Lewis Olsover, 1980, '*The Jewish Communities of North-East England*', 1st Edition, Ashley Mark: Gateshead: where Olsover recounts in considerable detail the trials and tribulations of synagogue communities in between (and including) Newcastle, Darlington and Middlesbrough. A secular example of this intra and inter-communal warfare can be found in Larry Wayne, 2009, '*Union Bread: Bagels, Platzels and Chollah: The Story of the London Jewish Bakers' Union*', SHS Occasional Paper No. 26, 1st Edition, Jewish Socialists' Group/Socialist History Society: London. Also of interest to the student interested in these conflicts within Anglo-jewry would be V. D. Lipman, 1967, '*The Jews of Medieval Norwich*', 1st Edition, The Jewish Historical Society of England: London; David Cesarani (Ed.), 2002, '*Port Jews: Jewish Communities in*

Cosmopolitan Maritime Trading Centres, 1550-1950, 1st Edition, Frank Cass: Portland; Louis Hyman, 1972, *The Jews of Ireland: From Earliest Times to the Year 1910*, 1st Edition, Israel Universities Press: Jerusalem and Judith Samuel, 1997, *Jews in Bristol: The History of the Jewish Community in Bristol from the Middle Ages to the Present Day*, 1st Edition, Redcliffe: Bristol.

(75) Grose, Op. Cit., p. 18

(76) Ibid.

(77) Ibid.

(78) For an example of this kind of instruction please see Elie Wiesel, Neal Kozodoy (Trans.), 1987, *The Jews of Silence: A Personal Report on Soviet Jewry*, 3rd Edition, Schocken: New York, pp. 33-42.

(79) Two prominent contemporary; to Bronstein, works come to mind when one thinks of the 'jewish origin' argument in regard to Christianity. These are Gerald Friedlander, 1911, *The Jewish Sources of the Sermon on the Mount*, 1st Edition, Routledge: London and W. Oesterley, 1936, *The Gospel Parables in the Light of their Jewish Background*, 1st Edition, Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge: London. A more contemporary scholarly restatement of this thesis can be found in John Meier, 1991, *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus*, 2 Vols., Doubleday: New York.

(80) Grose, Op. Cit., pp. 18-19

(81) We may reasonably presume from this that Dr. Weinstock completed his doctoral thesis on a jewish philosopher/thinker who had originally written his work in either Hebrew, Aramaic, Yiddish and/or Arabic. Grose gives us little information on this point: hence we can only make an educated guess regarding this.

(82) Grose, Op. Cit., p. 14

In Brief: The Meaning of 'Righteous among the Nations'

Thursday, 22 July 2010

With the Associated Press running a news story regarding yet another fanciful tale of 'holocaust survivor' love: I thought it apt to briefly remark on an aspect of the story that might have passed many by. (1) That aspect; to be precise, is the idea of the 'Righteous among the Nations'. This idea; of course, stems from the fundamental assumptions of Judaism, but we can quickly show that it is not quite as innocent as it might at first seem.

When one sees the term; 'Righteous among the Nations', one assumes that it is a fairly quirky and innocuous label, but the logic of the term is what is suggestive to us. By awarding people this title the awarders; in this case broadly the jews as a people and Yad Vashem in particular, are stating by implication that the nations (i.e. non-Israel/gentiles and therefore non-jews) are not as a rule 'righteous'. Therefore gentiles are inherently unrighteous and by that logic: 'evil' or prone to 'evil deeds'.

This is implicitly directly contrasted with Israel (meaning the biological community of the jews in this case: as it does in Judaism) who are; by implication, inherently righteous and therefore 'good' or prone to 'good deeds'.

This is; of course, rather less complementary than it at first seemed. As the award of being '*Righteous among the Nations*' merely means you are no longer assumed to be inherently '*evil*', but rather have some semblance of '*good*' in you. What Yad Vashem; and the jews in general, are saying is in effect: you have aided the jews therefore you are good, because we; as the people of G-d say you are. However if you merely aided other gentiles then you would still be inherently '*evil*' or prone to '*evil deeds*', because you didn't aid the Chosen of Yahweh/Hashem (who alone can award this status and will do for their own benefit not because of a humanitarian or humanist ideology).

If we follow this line of thought for a second we can see that it becomes even more ominous in its implications in so far as by awarding the status of being '*righteous*' to one assumed to be '*evil*' or prone to '*evil deeds*'. Yad Vashem; and the jews in general, are assuming the mantle explicitly given to them in Judaism whereby they become the priests of the world and world's intermediaries with Yahweh/Hashem. Thereby they; as a biological group of Messiahs, and only they can deign to lift a non-jew out of their status of being inherently evil or prone to '*evil deeds*' and inform Yahweh/Hashem that this non-jew is really a '*good servant*' of the jews and thus is to be rewarded.

Is this not assuming the mantle of Godhood falls upon the jews? After all who is determining what is '*evil*' and what is '*good*' in this case? The jews of course and the basis for this arbitrary determination is rooted in the jewish self-proclaimed status as the '*Chosen People*' of Yahweh/Hashem. This seems silly and absurd to us, but that is what the individual jew and the sum of jews think they are: G-d or rather the divine representative(s) of G-d (and therefore gifted in knowing G-d's mind). So the question we must logically answer is: whether you are interested in appeasing Yahweh/Hashem as your God? If not then why must you appease and kneel before the jews?

Ask yourself that and follow that thought-experiment to its ultimate conclusion and you will realise that where reason takes you is into the realm of rational opposition to the jews as a people or as we should call it: anti-Semitism.

References

(1) Monika Scislowska, '*Former inmate recalls daring escape from Auschwitz*', 20th of July 2010, Associated Press. This is available at the following address:
http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/20100720/ap_on_re_eu/eu_poland_escape_from_auschwitz_1

Elie's Awesome Adventure (Part I)

Monday, 26 July 2010

Elie Wiesel; professional jew, '*holocaust*' survivor, outspoken Zionist, author of '*Night*' and winner of the 1986 Nobel Peace Prize, is probably one of the best known jewish individuals in the United States and Western Europe today. Wiesel's fame is largely based on two seminal

events in his life: his supposedly being imprisoned by the Germans and their subsequent; and generally inexplicable, failure to gas Wiesel despite ordering him to the gas chamber numerous times. (1) The second is the publication of his book; *'Night'*, which despite many claims and how it is taught to school children is; in fact, now acknowledged to be a complete fiction. (2) Both these events are rather open to criticism as Carlo Mattogno has recently pointed out: Wiesel might well be lying about just about everything he has ever claimed in regard to his experiences in the *'Death Camps'*. (3)

After Wiesel attained international fame as a professional *'holocaust'* survivor: he began to use his ill-gotten gains to put forward his views on jews in general and critics of jews specifically. Wiesel was one of the key propagandists of the state of Israel who has argued that any criticism of Israel is by nature anti-Semitic as it is criticism/opposition to a jewish state. This is; of course, utterly illogical and is easily sliced six-ways-to-Sunday by pointing out that any criticism of Britain for example would therefore be anti-Christian because Britain is officially a Christian country (much as Israel is officially a jewish country as opposed to being the jewish nation [which actually refers to jews as a whole both in Israeli law (a-la the *'Law of Return'* having biological criteria) and in halakhah]). This is obviously an absurd position and therefore Wiesel's *'logic'* is shown to be utterly inconstant not to mention vapid in that he applies a double-standard for what is true for the jews is not true of anyone else, because the jews are *'special'* in Wiesel's view.

Like many jews; particularly those of the Zionist persuasion, (4) following Stalin's 1949-1953 attack on *'rootless cosmopolitans'*, which; although often claimed to be anti-Semitic because it disproportionately targeted jews, cannot be reasonably considered so. (5) Wiesel began to turn his attentions; as a self-proclaimed Zionist, to the *'plight'* of Soviet jewry and in particular the so-called *'refuseniks'*. (6) Wiesel; of course, already being something of a celebrity in the jewish community decided to visit the Soviet Union personally to *'ascertain'*; well more correctly to lend credibility to his already held Zionist views on this subject, the *'condition'* of Soviet jewry. This trip and his *'exploits'* were subsequently turned into his best-selling 1966 book; *'The Jews of Silence'*, which had gone through three new editions by 1987 and further to which Wiesel had travelled back to the Soviet Union twice more claiming to; one again, be *'studying the conditions'* that Soviet jewry existed in.

'The Jews of Silence' is a book which should be of great interest to anti-Semites as it provides us with a highly-respected jewish source for some rather useful claims which he makes during the course of the pages. One in particular; regarding the *'holocaust'* *'mass execution site'* of Babi Yar (in the Ukraine), is famous within revisionist circles as it is beyond merely comical and actually suggests that Wiesel is either mentally-ill or knowingly writing fiction (both solutions are equally plausible in my view). This claim is as follows:

'Eyewitnesses say that for months after the killings the ground continued to spurt geysers of blood. One was always treading on corpses. Only recently someone dug up a new mass grave, and it is generally held that this was not the last. So it is impossible to rely on figures; the dead themselves ensure the need for occasional revisions of former estimates.' (7)

This is; of course, utterly absurd in so far as dead bodies; especially those that have been dead

for a few days and have thoroughly begun the decomposition process, cannot spurt '*geysers of blood*' and certainly purpose-built mass graves would not be so shallow as to enable people to be constantly '*treading on corpses*' in the sense that Wiesel means (i.e. literally and not as some might try to argue metaphorically [this is clear from the context of Wiesel's remark]). Another obvious problem with Wiesel's statement is that; as far as I am aware, the actual site of the supposed Babi Yar massacre has not been located and no mass grave has been positively identified to contain Babi Yar's thousands of alleged jewish victims. (8)

Wiesel doesn't stop there however and actually narrates another obviously fraudulent '*holocaust*' '*survivor*' fairy tale when he relates as follows:

'Indeed, those who are prepared to speak the whole truth about Babi Yar can find no one to listen. I was told, for instance, about a woman who rose from her grave in that ravine of death. She had only been wounded. At night she managed to extricate herself from the tangle of bodies that had fallen on top of her and fled, naked. She was given shelter by a Ukrainian. The next day he turned her over to the Germans. Once again she was forced into the long lines, stripped of her clothes, and shot. Once again, she was saved, and this time managed to escape. But her mind had snapped. Now she rants aloud, remembering forgotten things, and people say, "Poor woman, she lives in another world."'' (9)

This is once again obviously preposterous as the story makes out that; the conveniently unnamed jewess, managed to defy medical science: survive being shot twice and not lose consciousness due to massive loss of blood due to lack of medical treatment over at least two (and presumably a considerably higher amount of) days (if we also factor in the fact that she was almost certainly vigorously exercising then we can see how further improbable Wiesel's tall tale is).

This also leaves out the fact that the jewess somehow acquired new clothes (presumably from the Ukrainian) and promptly ran away naked through the countryside twice without being noticed or once again turned in by the undoubtedly bemused locals. Who; if we follow Wiesel's reasoning and all the other many '*holocaust*' '*survivor*' claims that have been published, must have regularly seen individual; and groups of, naked jews running through the Soviet countryside after having '*survived*' the; apparently, not very efficient Germans attempts to kill them. Not a few of them would have also; like our unnamed jewess, been sporting open bullet wounds that in Wiesel's logic were '*spouting geysers of blood*' and managing to defy medical science: these jews promptly survived or performed numerous other miracles. After all why shouldn't the jews perform miracles? They are the self-ascribed '*Chosen*' of Yahweh/Hashem: are they not? Apparently nothing; even things that defy the laws of nature, is impossible for the jews.

We should also note a further impossibility in how on earth Wiesel came to know such a story; let alone check its authenticity (he implies it is authentic by using it as his '*best example*' in his chapter entitled '*Babi Yar*': he predictably doesn't tell us how he knew that it was), when he explicitly tells us that the old jewish biddy had lost her proverbial marbles after the event with said event being the direct cause of her general nonsensical gibbering. Does Wiesel simply believe insane people if they say things he happens to like? Apparently so: no doubt Wiesel would '*believe*' anything that helped him gain differentiation for his product (i.e. himself) and establish himself further again the many would-be jewish '*holocaust survivor*' messiahs. (10)

So why is Wiesel making such outrageous; and in three cases utterly nonsensical, claims?

The simple fact is that he thinks; per his heavily bloated personal ego/messiah complex, that as the '*prophet*' of Western jewry: he can divine exactly what is truth and fiction. This becomes rather hilariously obvious to us when we read the following absurd claim from Wiesel in his introduction to the first; 1966, edition of '*The Jews of Silence*'. This is as follows:

'Having never been involved in political action, I hope that what I have written here will neither exacerbate the cold war nor be used for political purposes. I have never engaged in propaganda, and have no intention of beginning now.' (11)

This is; once again, obviously both absurd and utterly egoistic in nature. We can note the almost mind-numbing lunacy of Wiesel's claim to '*not be a propagandist*' because he has never been involved in '*political action*', which also happens to be an outright lie on Wiesel's part as he had been involved in pro-Zionist and pro-holocaust political activity from his '*liberation*' in 1945 onwards and especially beginning with his fame as the author of '*Night*'. Aside from the false nature of Wiesel's statement we can note that propaganda/propagandistic activity does not exclusively cover political behaviour but rather any activity where-in one knowing purports one's specific views on a given subject: especially where one is attacking another's views or addressing persons of different views on a given subject. (12)

It is also clear from the work itself that Wiesel's obvious intent was for it to be used for '*political purposes*'; which is actually implied by Martin Gilbert (who also wrote an afterword to the 3rd edition of '*The Jews of Silence*') in his complements to Wiesel, (13) as why else did Wiesel seek to publish a book regarding his experiences if not to propagandise his particular observations and claims. If Wiesel's aim was not to propagandise surely he would have just kept his observations to himself, but he didn't and therefore we cannot but reasonably conclude that Wiesel's purpose in writing '*The Jews of Silence*' was propagandistic in nature.

Also within Wiesel's statement: we also find an extremely oversized ego. This is evident in Wiesel's claim that he hopes that what he writes will not '*exacerbate the cold war*', which directly implies that Wiesel is on the same level as any major political figure in NATO or the Warsaw Pact. This is; of course, absurd, but it does demonstrate the fact that Wiesel's motivation and thought process is essentially egoistic and not based on any real concern for his fellow jews. Rather Wiesel is far more interested in how the supposed '*plight*' of Soviet jewry can be used to his own personal advantage in order to further his own career and profile thus satisfying his considerable ego, which requires constant sustenance in order to maintain. This sustenance in Wiesel's case must most obviously be derived from the increase in his fame, laurels, monetary gain as well as the simple increase in attention that is paid to him by '*championing*' a jewish cause.

One suspects that Wiesel doesn't really care for his fellow jews, but rather opines to care: on the basis that throughout '*The Jews of Silence*' Wiesel often speaks of; what he claims is, the Soviet jewish reaction to him (as well as his Israeli-born son) (14) while not saying very much about the condition of Soviet jewry in general. What Wiesel does say about Soviet jewry is often meagre,

extremely general, sometimes likely contrived/made-up and usually in some way relates directly back to Wiesel himself (according to himself all kinds of implied complements [which the reader is meant; we can opine, to pick up and repeat as if they were his or her own]). (15)

Wiesel's egoism is perhaps most evident in his assertions that his Jewish audience in the Great Synagogue in Moscow was enraptured by him and kept telling him just how wonderful he was. He also asserts that 'crowds' of Jews 'crushed each other' to get at him to ask him questions. (16) Wiesel also claims how wonderful his Jewish audience was (17) and that; by implication, this was because they 'loved'/'worshipped' him (and as such temporarily satisfied Wiesel's need for ego gratification). (18)

This can only demonstrate to us that Wiesel doesn't really care for the Jewish cause that he is championing, but rather is only interested in the supposed 'plight' of Soviet Jewry in so far as the propagandising of that 'plight' can benefit him as an individual Jew. In essence Elie Wiesel; like the rest of his Semitic kin, is an absolutely selfish and mercenary character who doesn't care what happens to anyone but himself.

References

- (1) Robert Faurisson, 1988, 'A Prominent False Witness: Elie Wiesel'. This is available at the following address: <http://www.ihr.org/leaflets/wiesel.shtml>.
- (2) The edition of 'Night' that is currently sold is actually a massively revised and edited version of Wiesel's first edition of the work. This has been apologetically covered in Naomi Seidman, 1996, 'Elie Wiesel and the Scandal of Jewish Rage'. This is available at the following address: <http://www.vho.org/aaargh/fran/tiroirs/tiroirEW/WieselMauriac.html>. I have not had time to look up the original article, but having read the AAARGH transcription: it seems to be quite credible.
- (3) Carlo Mattogno, 2010, 'The Riddle of Lazar-Lázár-Eliezer-Elie Wiesel'. This is available at the following address: <http://www.revblog.codoh.com/2010/05/the-riddle-of-lazar-lazar-eliezer-elie-wiesel/>; Carlo Mattogno, 2010, 'Elie Wiesel: "The Most Authoritative Living Witness" of The Shoah?'. This is available at the following address: <http://www.revblog.codoh.com/2010/02/elie-wiesel-the-most-authoritative-living-witness-of-the-shoah/>; Carlo Mattogno, 2010, 'Elie Wiesel: New Documents'. This is available at the following address: <http://www.revblog.codoh.com/2010/03/elie-wiesel-new-documents/>.
- (4) It must be remembered that the two competing theories in terms of favour within the Jewish community from the turn of the twentieth century until the present day have been socialism/marxism and Zionism. For example see Harriet Pass Freidenreich, 1991, 'Jewish Politics in Vienna. 1918-1938', 1st Edition, Indiana University Press: Indianapolis, especially pp. 48-114.
- (5) The two best recent presentations of this particular theory can be found in Benjamin Pinkus, 1984, 'The Soviet Government and the Jews 1948-1967', 1st Edition, Cambridge University Press: New York and Gennadi Kostrychenko, 1995, 'Out of the Red Shadows: Anti-Semitism in Stalin's Russia', 1st Edition, Prometheus: New York. Both are well evidenced and reasonably well thought out, but none-the-less: ignore several fundamental considerations that undermine their theory of Soviet 'anti-Semitism'. We will be covering this particular claim of Soviet 'anti-Semitism' in detail at a later date on Semitic Controversies.
- (6) Those Jews who had applied to Soviet authorities for permission to emigrate to Israel as Jews.
- (7) Elie Wiesel, 1987, 'The Jews of Silence: A Personal Report on Soviet Jewry', 3rd Edition,

Schocken: New York, p. 26

(8) Herbert Tiedemann, 1994, *'Babi Yar: Critical Questions and Comments'* in Gernar Rudolf (Ed.), Victor Diodon (Trans.), 2003, *'Dissecting the Holocaust: The Growing Critique of 'Truth' and 'Memory''*, 2nd Edition, Theses & Dissertations Press: Chicago, pp. 501-528

(9) Wiesel, Op. Cit., p. 27

(10) Of all of these we can perhaps name the fortunately deceased Simon Wiesenthal as being Wiesel's only notable rival. Wiesenthal is most famous for publishing numerous works on *'Nazi hunting'* and renting his name to Rabbi Marvin Hier so that the latter could create the Simon Wiesenthal Center (which Wiesenthal himself had little to do with) using Wiesenthal's fame to give the organisation a false appearance of authority and impartiality to its activities, which are essentially based on *'holocaust'* advocacy, pro-Israeli activism and subverting the United States as part of the so-called *'Israel Lobby'*. Wiesenthal is also best known as the most prominent proponent of the *'ODESSA'* conspiracy theory, which asserts that the SS escaped intact after the fall of the Third Reich and created a massive conspiratorial organisation to create a Fourth Reich.

(11) Wiesel, Op. Cit., p. xi

(12) For a recent summary; with which I agree in general although not on the specifics of the definition of propaganda, see Nicholas Jackson O'Shaughnessy, 2004, *'Politics and Propaganda: Weapons of Mass Seduction'*, 1st Edition, Manchester University Press: Manchester, especially pp. 1-109.

(13) Martin Gilbert, 1985, *'The Jews of Hope: The Plight of Soviet Jewry Today'*, 1st Edition, Penguin: London, pp. v-vi

(14) Wiesel, Op. Cit., p. ix; p. 37

(15) For example Ibid, pp. 85-89. Where Wiesel claims by implication that the Jewish youth in the Soviet Union were specially opening up to him as a Jew from the West. Also see pp. 7-9 for example where Wiesel claims that Jews instantly recognised him as a Jew and started following him around covertly trying to tell him all about their *'experiences'*. Of course Wiesel doesn't name the Jews in question; even to give them pseudonyms, but rather creates a vivid picture of what is in essence a Russia-wide Jewish conspiracy; à la the Protocols of the Elders of Zion, without realising the implication of his statements.

(16) Ibid, pp. 16-17

(17) Ibid, pp. viii-ix

(18) Ibid, p. ix. Wiesel directly implies here that he was/is Yahweh/Hashem when he says he in effect that he forgot G-d and by implication of his words became G-d to that Jewish congregation. It is worth comparing Wiesel's reaction to that of Moshe/Moses in the Books of Genesis and Exodus in the Torah/Old Testament.

Elie's Awesome Adventure (Part II)

Saturday, 31 July 2010

Another aspect of himself that Wiesel brings forth in *'The Jews of Silence'* is his positive attitude towards the Marxist-Leninist worldview when he tells us in no uncertain terms that it is a *'pure and humane ideology'*, (19) but realising how this might sound he adds an *'apparently'* before that remark to imply that he admires Marxist-Leninist thought; perhaps even believing in its validity himself, but at the same time trying to distance himself from too close association with it

as to not hamstring or disadvantage his own career as a celebrity jew by publicly associating himself with the Soviet Union and/or Marxist-Leninist thought in its totality.

The reason for this unnecessary inclusion in *'The Jews of Silence'* is made obvious to us by Wiesel's constant referencing of all the events and situations he finds himself in to his own person. In essence making *'The Jews of Silence'* far more about Wiesel himself than Soviet jewry: in spite of its ostensible subject. This constant self-referencing suggests that Wiesel is; as we have said, looking at the alleged *'plight'* of Soviet jewry as an opportunity for himself; without caring or even acknowledging the importance of others be they jew or gentile.

This leads us to the conclusion that Wiesel's pro-Marxist-Leninist statement is in fact an unconscious/conscious ploy that Wiesel is using to attempt to place himself in the middle of the situation between NATO and the Warsaw Pact where he believes he can serve as a mediator/negotiator between these two warring power blocs. This is; as we can see, manifested in Wiesel's claim that his book (and by logical extension: himself) is so important as to potentially cause an *'exacerbation of the cold war'*. (20) This then must lead to the conclusion that we have stated above in so far as Wiesel is seeking; with his book (which he implicitly believes; in his utterly egoistic frame of reference, will have a major impact on the world) to achieve an enormous egoistic boost by becoming a *'power broker'* himself and thus assuring himself perhaps the ultimate status that a jew hopes to achieve: Messianic immortality and the only form of material *'godhood'* to which any individual may aspire. This would provide Wiesel with the means to be remembered forever and thus in essence potentially equal Moshe/Moses in his own mind to whom jews habitually look as a role model (but not in the way that non-jews sometimes do). (21)

With this then we conclude our analysis of Wiesel as an individual egocentric jew in his *'The Jews of Silence'*, but there is still one more general matter that Wiesel often brings up that should be put before the anti-Semitic reader.

This is perhaps one of the hardest points for some to understand about Judaism: in that it is a religion based on very simple biological principles. In so far as when we speak of Judaism we do not speak of just another religion that looks for converts, proselytises and holds that it is the only true beacon of light in the darkness of the world. There have been a great many of those: some current and many more that have ceased to be. What marks Judaism out is that it is a religion that cannot but be practised by jews born as jews and by nobody else. This is inherent; although not often explicit today, in much of Judaic thought (some jews even go as far as to lie outright or lie by omission on this point) (22) and is widely acknowledged in both jewish cultural custom and the rabbinical literature. (23)

Wiesel clearly understands that this is the case as he repeatedly informs us; throughout *'The Jews of Silence'*, that the jews are special/*'Chosen'* and that jews stay jews regardless of what religious or irreligious creed they espouse. A clear example of this can be found when Wiesel talks of his experiences in a synagogue in Kiev where he observes that the Kohanim *'blessed the people of Israel'*. (24) This; to a reader without an understanding of Judaism, might seem all rather innocuous, but the small footnote at the bottom of the page inserted by the translator shows us a smidgen of the much more disturbing reality of what Judaism is when it; correctly,

defines the Kohanim as:

'Members of priestly class, as distinct from "Levites" and "Israelites." Traditionally, descendents of Aaron the High Priest.' (25)

The implications of this idea of the Kohanim being present at the service and of; importantly, a distinct biological order (in terms of hereditary) within Judaism are obvious, but if we take a moment to think about what Wiesel said and his translator's explanatory note. We realise that what Wiesel is saying here is that in Judaism you have a distinct '*class above*' ordinary jews in those jews who are biological (and not spiritual as some Christians might be inclined to argue on the basis of Saul aka Paul of Tarsus) descendents of the last high priests/priests of the Temple of Solomon in Jerusalem. This then begins to clarify the importance of biological; i.e. inherited, status in Judaism, which obviously; as the translator's note points out, classifies jews into orders of worthiness. We can also point out; to complete the impression, that in halakhah; jewish religious law, the transmission of ones status as a jew (and not as a lower order of part jew of unsure ancestry such as a '*mamzer*' (i.e. bastard) or '*foundling*') is dependent on the mother's being of pure jewish ancestry (the father's ancestry is held to be less important), but in the case of the Kohanim the father's pure jewish ancestry is that which is required (the mother's jewish ancestry or lack of it being unimportant). (26)

The reasons for this have long been conjectured upon and argued about by both jewish and non-jewish scholars. However the most obvious rationale for this little bit of '*pure blood*' legislation can be found in the relations between jews and non-jewish servants and slaves. (27) This legislation's origin can be reasonably traced back to the Torah and most famously the story of Hagar: who was of course used as concubine by the jewish patriarch Abraham who promptly sent her away when Sarah; his wife, got antsy about being upstaged by a non-jew (and was probably complaining about her looks going as jewesses; especially today, are prone to do). (28)

This leads us to the suggestive; although speculative, conclusion that this hereditary practice on the part of the jews actually derived from the jewish; rather Freudian, predilection for seeking to bed gentile women and avoiding marrying jewesses. We can note with interest that this seems to indicate why these laws came into effect in so far as the jewish authorities wanted jews to marry jewesses and to make sure that any concubines; which were undoubtedly kept by any jew who could afford a serving girl or a slave, who bore partially jewish children could not demand that these children be recognised as legitimate by the father because of their jewish heritage. This in essence prevented the dilution of jews and gave rise to the '*mamzer*' (i.e. bastard) biological class in Judaism.

As for why Judaism demands the Kohanim be a paternal line: that too has an obvious solution in this context. In so far as the high priests and priests of the Kohanim; like their fellow jews often kept concubines who doubled as slaves and serving girls, and whom would produce many children for them and in order to keep their power within their families the Kohanim; as the ruling religious authority with jurisdiction over the halakhah (such as it existed at that point), ruled that their children with non-jewish wives would be considered jews and more importantly Kohanim so that they could push out other families from their duties leaving only the families of the Kohanim as the ultimate intermediaries between the '*chosen people*' and Yahweh/Hashem.

We can thus see the origin of the split inside Judaism relating to biology and how there are different biological castes; if you will, inside of mainstream Judaism: both today and historically.

This is in essence an egoistic explanation of the origin of this particular custom within Judaism, but as we can see: it makes sense of what is something that is otherwise difficult to understand and explain from a philo-Semitic or anti-Semitic point of view.

Wiesel relates this biological status in numerous ways some of which I will quote by way of example below:

'Soviet Jewish youth has remained Jewish to a degree beyond anything we could possibly have expected.' (29)

"Who are we?"

"Jews!"

"What are we?"

"Jews!"

"What shall we remain?"

"Jews"" (30)

'Their isolation is so total and so absolute that they will do anything to break out, even for a minute. If they fall upon you, begging for a prayer book, a Jewish calendar, a talith, it is not simply because they are religious; they want something to link them to the rest of their people, something to remind them that somewhere in Jewish history continues to be written. Frequently I was approached by young people who wanted anything I could give them, anything at all, so long as it was Jewish.' (31)

'On that night of Simchat Torah I happened to be in the company of a Jew from abroad who prided himself on his antireligious and antinationalist convictions, a cold, dry, unsentimental liberated Jew. The youngsters were singing, "Come let us go together, and greet the Jewish people." Unable to contain himself, he burst into tears. The next day he appeared at the synagogue. "Don't think I've become religious," he said to me. "It's not that. But they have made me a better Jew."' (32)

I have quoted these four examples of Wiesel's constant and consistent implication of the Jewishness as being biological as opposed to religious in origin. Wiesel informs us repeatedly by these implications that those who claim; usually in books written explicitly for gentiles, that Judaism welcomes converts and is a religion like any other are not being honest. However this is a lie by omission in that what it doesn't state is that gentile converts to Judaism are accepted (it is however difficult to be accepted as one has to prove one is a Jewish soul born in a non-Jewish body [note the quasi-biological distinction the Jews make here]) but that they are assigned to the

lowest biological class (i.e. with 'mamzers' and 'foundlings') and are only allowed to marry within that biological class. (33) Can it be any clearer that Judaism is not just any religion, but is in fact a religion that requires and ensures the; supposed, absolute biological, emotional and spiritual superiority of the jew over the non-jew.

Thus we cannot but conclude that Wiesel himself also believes all that I have outlined to be true as I have pointed out by quoting him to the general effect of my thesis that Judaism is such a faith, but; of course, Wiesel does not state this directly but rather he uses his own version of Leshon Hakmah; the secret language of the jews, to translate his actual meaning to jews while leaving it somewhat hidden to gentiles.

We can thus conclude with the notion that Elie Wiesel is a nasty little jew who has made his wealth and mark on the world on the basis of non-jewish suffering, while claiming to have suffered as a jew at the hands of jews. Of course Wiesel also professes to believe; per Judaism, that the jews are a superior; 'chosen', people while the gentiles must be lead by the proverbial nose ring to do the 'good' which it is apparently not inherent in their nature to do.

That is the real Elie Wiesel.

References

(19) Ibid, p. 21

(20) Ibid, p. xi

(21) The correct nature of this analysis can be seen through study of specific jews and their relation to the jewish and non-jewish worlds that they inhabit. Fundamentally however in order to understand that this is a jewish motivation we have to understand that jews fundamentally do not see the world the say way that gentiles (or more specifically non-Semites) do and do not; per se, see dishonesty, cheating or gaining something by guile/stealth/deception as being in anyway dishonourable (this is considered a positive in jewish/Semitic thought and there are even positive terms for it in popular jewish culture such as 'schmoozing' and 'chutzpah'). The only time a jew (or rather more generally: a Semite) claims that something is negative is when they perceive it to be to their personal advantage to do so and/or when it effects them personally in a negative way. Otherwise jews tend to shrug their shoulders and recite some formulaic response equivalent to 'who cares?' For the different assumptions that underlie jewish thought in general (although you will need to look at the implication of what is said as well as it is obviously assumed) then see Gerald Abrahams, 1961, *The Jewish Mind*, 1st Edition, Constable: London and Raphael Patai, 1996, [1977], *The Jewish Mind*, 1st Edition, Wayne State University Press: Detroit. For an anti-Semitic analysis of the jewish mind that is extremely perceptive as well as well-written see F. Roderich-Stoltheim [Theodor Fritsch], 1923, *Das Raetsel des juedischen Erfolges*, 6th Edition, Hammer Verlag: Leipzig.

(22) For example Morris Kertzer, Lawrence Hoffman, 1996, *What is a Jew?*, 5th Edition, Simon & Schuster: New York, pp. 280-281.

(23) Modern testimonials to this behaviour can be found in; for example, Sarah Cohen, 2008, *Costly Roots*, 1st Edition, Crossbridge Books: Martley; Arthur Katz, 2000, *Ben Israel: Odyssey of a Modern Jew*, 1st Edition, Burning Bush Publications: Laporte; Reva Mann, 2008, *The Rabbi's Daughter: A True Story of Sex, Drugs and Orthodoxy*, 1st Edition, Hodder &

Stoughton: London; David Daiches, 1971, *Two Worlds: An Edinburgh Jewish Childhood*, 2nd Edition, Sussex University Press: London and for a slightly older testimonial to the same effect see Isaac Levinsohn, 1878, *The Russo-Polish Jew*, 1st Edition, Robert Banks: London. For a general introduction as the biological tradition in Judaism (although one has to 'read between the lines' and think about the actual implications of what is said a little bit) please see Charlotte Elisheva Fonrobert, Martin Jaffee (Eds.), 2007, *The Cambridge Companion to the Talmud and Rabbinic Literature*, 1st Edition, Cambridge University Press: New York.

(24) Wiesel, Op. Cit., p. 30

(25) Ibid.

(26) For example see Phillip Birnbaum, 1964, *A Book of Jewish Concepts*, 1st Edition, Hebrew Publishing: New York, pp. 84-85; 113, 283-284; 425-426; 466; 499, which gives an excellent introduction to jewish ritual and the importance of the Kohanim within Judaism (as well as their biological status and how it is derived).

(27) A very apologetic account of jewish slavery laws in halakhah; as well as the ludicrous extended claim that jews have always been the best masters and have never mistreated their non-jewish slaves, can be found in Mordecai Katz, 1966, [1925], *Protection of the Weak in the Talmud*, 1st Edition, AMS Press: New York. Also see Ex. 21:1-11.

(28) Gen. 16:1-15; 21: 1-21

(29) Wiesel, Op. Cit., p. 43

(30) Ibid, p. 45

(31) Ibid, p. 55

(32) Ibid, p. 73

(33) This is discussed in apologetic detail in Maurice Lamm, 1991, *Becoming a Jew*, 1st Edition, Jonathan David: New York.

In Brief: A Little More Gefilte in the Socialist History Society

Monday, 2 August 2010

I have previously written an *'In Brief'* about jews and the Socialist History Society, but as I received an update of sorts on this matter today. I thought I would update the record with the new information. According to the *'Socialist History Society Public Meeting'* email bulletin of the 2nd of August 2010: the SHS are sponsoring talks from a jewess named Anne Showstack Sassoon; who is Professor Emeritus of Political Science at Kingston University and a senior visiting fellow at Birkbeck College of the University of London, she is going to be warbling to a small crowd of die-hard marxists at the Bishopsgate Institute in London on the 19th of August 2010 about the ludicrous theories of that most famous of Italian marxists: Antonio Gramsci.

No doubt Miss Sassoon will also be looking for gratuitous donations (since the lecture is free but it is stipulated that *'retiring donations'* would be welcome) to prop up her flagging ego due to the burgeoning realisation that her *'revolution'* will probably never happen (and certainly not in her depleted lifetime). That won't stop Miss Sassoon though: I am sure she will be huffing and puffing about Gramsci's alleged import to the *'working class'* and how *'true democracy'* can *'only be achieved'* through her personal impressions and interpretations of Gramsci. Of course Miss Sassoon probably hasn't done a days hard work in her life and would regard it as a great

strain should be break a finger nail while pounding the pulpit fantasizing that she was in those supposed halcyon days of the 'revolution' in Russia. Hardly the 'worker's advocate' she makes herself out to be now is she?

Also of note is that one Ted Crawford; no doubt a bit of an aging gentile fuddy-duddy who is wheeled out by some enterprising hook-nosed members of the SHS depending on the need to 'prop up the flagging spirit of the troops', who will be giving a talk on one Dora Montefiore on the 2nd of November 2010 (once again at the Bishopsgate Institute). Dore Montefiore; despite her surname, wasn't actually jewish (she was born Dora Fuller), but her husband was. Both were members of the Communist Party of Great Britain (better known as the CPGB) and life-long socialists. Mrs Montefiore; deluded by her childish fantasies (what she would no doubt have been pleased to call her 'ideals'), married an enterprising jew who; we may suspect, emotionally and even physically abused her for the remainder of her life. This would; of course, be the norm among 'inter-faith' (or rather inter-racial) marriages between jews and gentiles and seems to be particularly common in marxist interracial marriages with the founder of Marxism; Karl Marx, abusing his gentile wife: Jenny von Westphalen for nearly all her life. Poor old Dora: she thought so well of him until he beat her with a candelabra for being a disobedient goy...

In concluding our brief notes on this matter: we may point to the recently founded SHS-aligned academic journal; 'Twentieth Century Communism: A Journal of International History' (published by the old CPGB and far left publisher Lawrence & Wishart in London), which includes an article by Gidon Cohen who for some reason that I cannot fathom has weaselled his way into being appointed senior lecturer in Political Science at the University of Durham. (1) In his article; 'Political Religion and British Communism' (2), Cohen merrily tries to prove that Communism really doesn't have any religious qualifications and that by virtue of its 'rationality': it is a wonderful ideology to hold. Of course Cohen views himself as something akin to the next Karl Marx and has spent the last few decades of his unfortunate existence trying to prove just that. However Cohen will; of course, not be successful, but don't tell him that. He might get upset and demand in shrill tones that Yahweh/Hashem cause an 'uprising' of the 'people' against you so that he can sit there smirking in egoistic radiance, while warbling about 'human rights', 'democracy', 'fascism', 'dictatorship of the proletariat' etc ad infinitum. Not that these mean anything of course, but then I am sure Cohen; as the cynical jew that he is, is all too well aware of this.

Oh well... c'est la vie.

References

- (1) Anon., 2010, 'Notes on Contributors', 'Twentieth Century Communism: A Journal of International History', Vol. I, No. 2, p. 255
- (2) Gidon Cohen, 2010, 'Political Religion and British Communism', 'Twentieth Century Communism: A Journal of International History', Vol. I, No. 2, pp. 197-211

Jared and the Jews

Tuesday, 3 August 2010

Author's Note

I reproduce here possibly the first article I ever wrote on the Jewish question some three years ago and although my thought has since moved on considerably I thought it would be of value to reproduce this particular essay as it deals with a subject; i.e. Jared Taylor and '*American Renaissance*', that is still important and timely today. I do regret some of the sources and expressions I used; particularly David Duke's '*My Awakening*', but as I believe we are defined as much by our mistakes as well as successes I have decided to leave this essay unchanged and unedited. I hope that my readers will find it of some use and possibly even thought provoking. In due course I will be writing another more detailed essay on philo-Semitic racialists and this reproduction from 2007 will help to give the reader a flavour of my thought then (and to an extent now) on this important issue.

Jared and the Jews

In the last few years: there has been an increasing trend in certain segments of the racist movement towards the minimization of the Jewish question. This segment of the racist movement has been spearheaded by the '*darling*' of the '*modernizing school*': Jared Taylor. While Taylor does not go so far as to '*ban*' those who speak out about the Jewish question from his organisation, or conferences. He has been under some intense pressure to do so from his '*White*' Jewish '*friends*' and readers, notably the Jews Lawrence Auster [1] and Michael Hart [2]. It is interesting to note that after Taylor's article in his monthly '*American Renaissance*' magazine, when he called Jews '*irrelevant*' [3], that there are increasing numbers of references in said magazine to Jews as an '*extremely ethnocentric White group*' [4]. As well as published letters from subscribers identifying themselves as '*White Jews*' [5] congratulating Mr. Taylor on his magazine, and its content.

'American Renaissance', and perhaps what we should call the '*Taylor school*' of Racist thought seem, on the face of things, to present a water tight case. Why associate Racism with the Jewish Question: I mean after all... the Jews are just '*like us White people*': right?

The interesting thing about the '*Taylor school's*' stance on the Jewish question is: how at odds it is with their own trumpeted methodology for understanding the world. The '*Taylor school*' love to talk about how they have both a '*populist*' [6] and '*fact-based*' [7] approach to the various issues that Racist thought centres around.

Perhaps, their approach can be indeed be described as '*populist*' i.e. in this specific case: distilling Racist thought to such an extent where-by it supposedly becomes palatable to those individuals who don't like '*loonies*' [read: anyone who talks about socially taboo facts], and such other ways of describing the truth as the facts of the matter present it. However, '*populism*' is certainly a double-edged sword, since when one compromises on certain parts of your belief system [as the '*Taylor school*' invariably does] it allows an open door for a '*few changes here*' and '*a few changes there*'. Since after all: you've made one '*modernising*' change so why not a few, and if you've made a few... why don't you make a few more?

The essential point being made here is not the logical fallacy of the '*slippery slope*' [which is only a fallacy when it is metaphysical in nature], but in fact it is stating that Mr. Taylor has openly '*modernised*' his position, and hence his '*American Renaissance*' magazine has slipped into the bowels of essentially being hypocrites of their own method. This, my dear readers, is where the '*slippery slope*' device, becomes fact rather than logical fallacy.

This hypocrisy is not inherent within the '*populist*' approach to Racialist politics: far from it in fact, but it is inherent to the '*Taylor school*' in its publications, and its outlook. By this the author means the '*fact-based approach*' of the '*Taylor school*' is in fact nothing of the sort, but is largely a '*selectively stated fact-based approach*'.

In order to evidence this to the reader, and indeed provide the necessary evidence that the present authors

'*slippery slope*' device is indeed correct in its usage, rather than as a metaphysical logical fallacy. It is necessary to critically review the pages of '*American Renaissance*' to show how Mr. Taylor and the writers who write for American Renaissance like to leave out inconvenient facts about Jews, which do not support the '*White Jews*' assertion.

Martin Luther King and the NAACP

One of the favourite targets for the '*Taylor school's*' ire is the infamous '*Saint*' '*Dr.*' Martin Luther King, and Mr. Taylor [as well as his nom de plume and alter-ego Thomas Jackson [8]]. '*American Renaissance*' offers the reader a seemingly detailed review from the literature around Martin Luther King, and how he was cheat, general malcontent, and plagiarist. This information is based as you might expect on solid facts that the specialist literature has uncovered, but remain outside the purview of many.

However, Mr. Taylor and his writers conveniently don't actually ask what is a fundamental question: how was Martin Luther King able to do what he did?

After all Mr. Taylor and his writers also have tendency to talk generally in terms of IQ when discussing racial differences, and highlighting that the mean average for Negro IQ in the United States is 85: one standard deviation below the mean average for Whites at 100 [9]. This is interesting, because '*American Renaissance*' and the '*Taylor school*' in general, expend, as we have stated, a significant amount of time and space to developing the IQ and civilisation argument [10] that has generally been pioneered in the modern era by Richard Lynn, Hans Eysenck [11] and Arthur Jensen [12]. Although, they would argue, and this author would not object that these figures are not averages, and that outliers [exceptions to the rule] will be present.

However, this puts the '*Taylor school*' and '*American Renaissance*' in a bit of a logical bind, since it is clear from the literature, and well demonstrated in the manner of the plagiarism of Martin Luther King [13] that he wasn't the brightest Negro in the world. So how did Martin Luther King do what he did: if he wasn't the brightest chap in the world?

The logical, and in this case factually correct, answer would be that he had help.

The next logical question would have to be: who helped, and what was the nature of that help?

Mr. Taylor, *'American Renaissance'*, and the *'Taylor school'* in general make little to no mention of the Jewish support for Martin Luther King, or that he was introduced to Communism and extensively helped by the Communist Jew Stanley Levinson [14].

Some of the specialist literature, as well as many of the authors of Racist commentary on it, even makes the assertion that Levinson actually wrote some of King's speeches for him. Duke asserts that Levinson may have in fact written the *'I have a dream'* speech [15], which we now know to have been plagiarised from another preacher [16]. It is still quite possible that this is true, but considering King's habit of plagiarising others work, which he had started at an early age [prior to his meeting Levinson]: this seems rather unlikely. It is however possible to speculate that King's meeting with Levinson led to an internalisation of this plagiarism based on the increase in King's plagiarism as Levinson and King got closer.

Proponents of the *'Taylor school'* however might seek to debunk this notion of Jewish power over Martin Luther King, by asserting, in line with previous assertions made by members of this school of thought, that his two personal aide's (chronologically): Bayard Rustin, and Jack O'Dell weren't Jews. Thus somehow *'debunking'* the fact that the Jewish Communist Levinson was the most powerful man behind the scenes with King. Of course, what proponents of the *'Taylor school'* would either mention in passing, or *'forget'* to mention at all is the fact that both Rustin and O'Dell were known Communists [17]. Communism of course is a philosophy largely created by Jews for the benefit of Jews [18], and it can be argued that it had its basis in some of the earlier practices of Jewry [19]. Thus, we can establish that although Rustin and O'Dell were not Jews biologically: they were ideologically and in spirit.

Further to this we can evidence that Levinson was the more important influence in creating, and maintaining Martin Luther King by the simple expedient of pointing out that he was both Martin Luther King's accountant, (incidentally Levinson was a major accounting presence in the Communist Party USA [according to Duke he was a funnel for funding from the Soviet Union] [20]) and main fund-raiser. [21]

So thus far we have shown that one of the *'Taylor school's'* preferred hobby-horses has far more to it than they that school, and Mr. Taylor would have you believe. This author has already pointed out the fundamental contradiction between *'American Renaissance's'*, Mr. Taylor's and the *'Taylor School's'* general obsession [which is perhaps somewhat justifiable] with IQ, and their lack of any non-hypocritical explanation for how Martin Luther King was able to do what he did.

Perhaps, it is also necessary to further re-enforce the point being made in so far as Negroes lacking the will, and the ability, as the *'Taylor school'* tells us to organise themselves in such manner. However, from its formation to the 1970's the NAACP [National Association for the Advancement of Colored People] was characterised by good organisation, and the unusual ability to use the given tools of the day to the NAACP's advantage [22]. Since that time the NAACP has become a by-word for egoistic Negro self-interest, corruption and the support of

general lunacy among the Negro community. [23]

This is not something mentioned by the *'Taylor school'* very often [if at all], but it should be obvious if one compares the account given of the Rosa Parks incident [24], and the accounts given of current events in Mr. Taylor's writings [25] that there is an obvious disparity between the organisation now, and then. In so far as if you read an article by Mr. Taylor about the historic NAACP, and then one about the modern NAACP you would almost think you were dealing with two different organisations.

This again begs the logical question: what has changed?

Well *'American Renaissance'* magazine answered that on their own in a manner of speaking, when they reviewed a book on the relationship between Blacks and Jews in the *'Civil Rights Era'* [26]. This was perhaps a surprise to readers of *'American Renaissance'*, because the Jewish angle of events is not usually touched upon in the pages of said magazine [27]. However, the article had an interesting slant in it for our purposes here. When it argued that Jews in fact supported Blacks because they were afraid of a White majority [for reasons of *'anti-Semitism'* and the *'Holocaust'*], and hence thought a *'racially integrated'* America was better for Jews [28].

Yes, the early NAACP had Jewish Presidents [29], the clear majority of its founding members were Jews [30] [interestingly *'American Renaissance'* writes of Du Bois the one of only two Black founding members of the NAACP as if he were the sole founder: again glossing over Jewish involvement [31]] and was largely funded and organised by Jews [32]. *'American Renaissance'* stops short of saying this in their review of that book, and instead generalises it as a *'general alliance'* [33] rather than mentioning specifics, which might show how they and/or Mr. Taylor had glossed over the Jewish role in earlier articles.

However, how can this revelation about the Jewish role with *'American Renaissance's'*, and the *'Taylor school's'* concept that the Jews *'don't matter'*? [34]

The *'Taylor school'* contradicts this assertion by arguing that Jewish interests were against the interests of the White race in the past [35]. However that now *'the Jewish people'* are now beginning to come round to a similar point of view about the current situation, and find that their interests are similar to those espoused by this *'Taylor school'* [36]. The assumption behind this is actually remarkably similar to the beliefs espoused by this author, and others who are termed *'Nazis'* and/or *'anti-Semites'* by *'mainstream'* political thought. In so far as it assumes that *'the Jewish people'* are an extremely significant force within the modern political climate of the United States, and hence to a large extent: the world. The *'Taylor school's'* idea seems to be that courting *'the Jewish people'* by falsely declaring them *'White'* [more on that later], and distancing themselves from *'anti-Semitism'* that the Jews will actively assist White people in their demographic plight [37].

Sounds like a nice and quite logical idea doesn't it?

Well yet again the *'Taylor school's'* logic is utterly superficial as one can easily demonstrate by asking who will hold the power after this *'saving of the White Race'*?

To answer that you just have to look to the same powerful '*Jewish people*' who say have just '*saved*' the White race from extinction.

So the '*Taylor school's*' logic leads them to leave the power within the United States, Europe and the European Diaspora generally with very people who they refuse to admit were behind '*Saint*' Martin Luther King, the organised and powerful NAACP [ergo Rosa Parks], and behind the '*anti-racist science*' that '*American Renaissance*', Mr. Taylor and the '*Taylor school*' consistently attack with a significant chunk of their ire. These same Jews by admission of the '*Taylor school's*' own logic and statements are highly ethnocentric, which means that they see themselves as Jews first, and anything else second.

This means that they will always act in Jewish interests first, and White interests second [at best], so we come to a situation where the '*Taylor school*' is giving power to a supposedly '*White*' group that does not identify as '*White*' first.

Perhaps the '*Taylor school*' might try and debunk this by claiming that it is the same as any 'religion', but as we will discuss later the appellation '*jews*' refers to a biological group [traditionally in White nations and Israel], rather than an actual religion in all but the case of non-Jewish converts of Judaism [which are few indeed]. One only need look at American Renaissance associate, the Jew Lawrence Auster who is a practicing Christian to see a direct contradiction to this argument.

However, would any Protestant for example, seek to act in accordance with the wish of another state? Would they show the absolute loyalty of '*the Jewish people*' to the Jewish state: Israel if there were only one Protestant state? I doubt it.

For White people generally: Race comes before religion, and the same applies to Jews. If one doubts that one can easily look up the Israeli marriage laws, and how the '*Law of Return*' works in Israel to see how the concept of Jew is defined biologically by the only Jewish state in the world.

Not quite so nice, and logical now: is it?

In fact: it is downright illogical, and absurd to suggest that this might be a '*good idea*' if one assumes as the '*Taylor school*' does that '*the Jewish people*' in the United States, and in Europe are a highly significant political entity.

The '*Taylor school*' might now wish to use Mr. Taylor's argument about '*White Jews*' [38] to back up their crumbling logic, but as we shall relatively briefly discuss later in this article this assertion is firstly disingenuous, and secondly hypocritical to the stated methodological approach of the Taylor school, which as this author has earlier asserted is supposedly '*facts-based*'.

Will the 'White Jews' please stand up?

In his article 'The Genetics of Race' published in '*American Renaissance*' Harold Stowe spends a significant amount of time talking about the population genetics dimension of racialism, and

pointing out at length why assertions, from Jewish Marxist academics such as Richard Lewontin [who he doesn't mention was a Jew], about absolute racial equality are in fact erroneous [39]. Within this body of work, there is a section sub-titled '*Unique Variants*' where it is pointed out that Ashkenazi Jews have certain exclusive genetic diseases, and significantly different rates as a biological group for others. This is not expanded upon by Stowe, but it is telling that Stowe appears to suddenly group Ashkenazi Jews in with the Han Chinese among others about having unique genetic polymorphisms. [40]

The fact it was not expanded upon is quite probably due to Mr. Taylor's earlier article '*Jews and American Renaissance*' where he asserted that '*American Renaissance*' was to take no explicit policy as regards the Jewish question [41], but then later asserted when asked about his position on Jews that they '*look White*' [42].

It is hence obvious that Mr. Taylor does indeed take a specific stance on Jews, which has been further evidenced by his publishing of letters and articles in '*American Renaissance*', which have explicitly stated that Jews are indeed '*White*' [43]. Even the irrationally paranoid Jewish hate group, the Anti-Defamation League, decided to point out to its audience that Taylor '*avoids anti-Semitism*' [44] and the Southern Poverty Law Center [often referred to as the SPLC] ran an article in its monthly 'Intelligence Report' about the rise of what this author has labelled the '*Taylor school*' of Racist thought noting that there was '*a new crop of racist intellectuals with no interest in the Jews*'. [45]

This perhaps might seem strange, since the Taylor school has made few bones about the fact that among the various racial differences that they cite are unique genetic diseases, or higher incidences of certain diseases among different racial populations [46]. This already indicates to us that as before we are not getting the whole story from '*American Renaissance*', Mr. Taylor and the '*Taylor school*'. Since if they explore one part of the facts as they present themselves, but leave out other facts then they are not abiding by their own stated methodology of putting the facts first. It also would indicate as this author earlier asserted that Mr. Taylor, and the '*Taylor school*' rely on a selective interpretation of the facts to present the idea of '*White Jews*'.

However, the assertion that there are such a thing as '*White Jews*' is problematic, because it is very by its very nature so subjective. The only possible case that Mr. Taylor or the '*Taylor school*' could make would be that '*White Jews*' should apply to biologically-White converts to Judaism. However, this would be hypocritical since Judaism is a Semitic religion [hence not European or of White origin], and the '*Taylor school*' routinely warns of the Islamic threat to the West [Islam being a wholly Semitic religion], and attacks Islam and its followers [47].

Perhaps the reader is wondering what evidence the authors has to assert that the Jews are not a '*White people*' as some of the contributors to '*American Renaissance*' have asserted in the past. In order to provide evidence for this a very brief review of the academic literature as regarding the population genetics of Jewry is required.

Oppenheim et al (2001) [48] asserted that in terms of genetic clusters most Jewish populations cluster close to Iraqis and Kurds, rather than Europeans. However, Oppenheim et al (2001) also pointed out that Ashkenazi Jews differ from two other common varieties of Jewish stock in so far

as they appear related in some way to the Turkic tribe: the Khazars who converted to Judaism in the 9th century.

Of course, findings and assertions such as those made by Oppenheim et al (2001)'s are often countered by authors such as Thomas (2002). Who suggest that generally the haplotypes for the two main varieties of Jews: the Ashkenazi and the Sephardic are in fact Semitic in origin.

The debate over the origin of world Jewry, and especially the Ashkenazi Jews is not of concern to us here, and it is enough to say that whichever side is eventually proven right, or if in fact it is a unspecified mix of the two, that both sides are not White with the Khazars being related to modern day Turks, who *'American Renaissance'* and the *'Taylor school'* rightly do not consider members of the White race. With the other side of the debate contending that the Jews are related to the modern day Palestinians, and their Arabic neighbours. *'American Renaissance'* and the *'Taylor school'* rightly do not consider Palestinians or Arabs as *'White'*. This must lead us to the general conclusion that Jews are not White.

However, the academic literature suggests that most of the maternal line of Jewry is in fact drawn from the local Diaspora [50]. In the context of this discussion this would indicate that Jews are generally the result of inter-racial breeding between Semitic/Turkic peoples and local women. In the case of White people: this would suggest that White women had been breeding with Jews, and had combined to produce modern Jewry. This would mean that Jews are in essence a racially mixed group, which has continued to breed in the vast majority of cases within itself: much like the Creole in the United States [51].

Since *'American Renaissance'* and the *'Taylor school'* do not support racially-mixed populations either breeding with White populations, or being created by the breeding of two racial groupings then we must conclude that they on their own logic should not class Jews as *'White'*.

It might be argued by some of the *'Taylor school'* that some Jews *'look White, so they are White'* [52]: other than being a ridiculous misrepresentation of Race on the par of the Jewish anthropologist Ashley Montagu [53] or the proven liar Ruth Benedict [54]. It is also essentially fallacious and illogical assertion. In so far as on that criterion of looking White then one would be forced to accept any number of upper caste Indians, Syrians, Iranians, Iraqis who can be classed as *'looking White'* and thus in that logic being White [55]. Since both *'American Renaissance'* and the *'Taylor school'* do not consider these people White then we must accept that this argument is illogical [otherwise it would be a purely selective interpretation]. Since physical morphology (or appearance) does not always indicate racial heritage [governed by genetics] [56]: it is equally a fallacious thing to suggest.

So thus we can conclude from this that Jews must be non-White by *'American Renaissance's'* and the *'Taylor school's'* own approach to the literature and to the concept of Race, and that the continued presence of Jews writing for, and being involved in the *'Taylor school'* or *'American Renaissance'* is in fact hypocritical, and comparable to letting Arabs, Turks or Islamic converts write, argue and speak for the White Race.

Concluding Thoughts

As we have asserted, and proven in the above article we must conclude that Mr. Taylor, 'American Renaissance's' and the 'Taylor school's' tolerance of Jews is in fact hypocritical to their own methodological standards. We can also state that by not investigating the Jewish connection to such matters, and establishing whether or not it is present: they are in fact deliberately mis-informing their readers, and contradicting their own related positions on such topics as I.Q.

If Mr. Taylor or the 'Taylor school' wished to be serious, rather than populist, about Racialism then they would address the Jewish angle of matters from a serious, and educated viewpoint. As this author has argued the fact of the matter remains that by entrusting the future of the White race to Jews, and their power, which Mr. Taylor does as we have stated, recognise. Then it allows those who were responsible for the situation in the first place to cling on to power, and do it again should they feel threatened.

There is always hope that Mr. Taylor, and the school of thought that this author has postulated is associated with him, will recognise the fundamental truth of the need to replace the current Jewish power structure with a White power structure. And that this change cannot be effected by pandering to this same existing Jewish power structure.

Only time will tell...

References

- [1] <http://www.amnation.com/vfr/archives/005523.html> [Accessed 17/04/2007]
- [2] <http://www.splcenter.org/intel/intelreport/article.jsp?pid=1096> [Accessed 17/04/2007]
- [3] Taylor, J, 2006, 'Jews and American Renaissance', American Renaissance, Vol. 17, No. 5, p. 11
- [4] For example Letter 1 and 3, 2006, 'Letters from Readers', American Renaissance, Vol. 17, No. 6, p. 2
- [5] For example: Letter 1, 2006, 'Letters from Readers', American Renaissance, Vol. 17, No. 6, p. 2
- [6] For example Letter 1, 2007, 'Letters from Readers', American Renaissance, Vol. 18, No. 4, p. 2; Legrand, F, 2007, 'The National Front: Going Soft or Getting Wise?', American Renaissance, Vol. 18, No. 3, p. 1 & 3-5.
- [7] Taylor, J, 2007, 'Banned in Halifax', American Renaissance, Vol. 18, No. 2, pp. 1 & 3-8; Taylor, J, 2007, 'Return to Halifax', American Renaissance, Vol. 18, No. 4, pp. 12-14; <http://www.amren.com/siteinfo/information.htm> [Accessed 17/04/2007]
- [8] This is an assumption on this author's part based on writing style, and type of contribution made.
- [9] Herrnstein, R, Murray, C, 1996, 'The Bell Curve: Intelligence and Class Structure in American Life', 2nd Edition, Simon & Schuster: New York
- [10] Taylor, J, 'Northwest Passage', American Renaissance, Vol. 17, No. 6, pp. 7-12
- [11] Hans Eysenck isn't actually Jewish as some have argued, but in fact had a Jewish stepfather. Despite having left Germany after Hitler came to power Eysenck was often later branded as a 'Nazi' according to his introduction to Pearson, R, 1994, 'Race, Intelligence and Bias in Academe', 1st Edition, Scott-Townsend: Washington D.C.

- [12] Arthur Jensen's mother was a Polish Jew, which would make him in Jewish law: a full Jew, but in racial science that would make him a half-Jew. He has however often been smeared as an 'anti-Semite' by Jewish organisations, and Zionists [e.g. the ADL].
- [13] Pappas, T, 1998, *'Plagiarism and The Culture War: The Writings of Martin Luther King, Jr, and Other Prominent Americans'*, 1st Edition, Hallberg: Tampa
- [14] Dyson, M, 2001, *'I May Not Get There with You: The True Martin Luther King, Jr'*, 2nd Edition, Simon & Schuster: New York
- [15] Duke, D, 1998, *'My Awakening: A Path to Racial Understanding'*, 1st Edition, Free Speech Books: Mandeville
- [16] Pappas, T, 1998, *'Plagiarism and The Culture War: The Writings of Martin Luther King, Jr, and Other Prominent Americans'*, 1st Edition, Hallberg: Tampa
- [17] Helms, J, 1983, *'Remarks of Senator Jesse Helms'*, [October 3rd], Congressional Quarterly, Vol. 129, No. 130, S13452-S13461; Garrow, D, 1981, *'The FBI and Martin Luther King, Jr'*, 1st Edition, Norton: New York
- [18] For example: MacDonald, K, 2002, *'The Culture of Critique: An Evolutionary Analysis of Jewish Involvement in Twentieth-Century Intellectual and Political Movements'*, 2nd Edition, 1st Books Library: Bloomington
- [19] Ibid.; Ford, H, *'Is the Jewish "Kahal" the Modern "Soviet"?'*, The Dearborn Independent, 28th August, 1920; Anon., 1976, *'Let My People Go'*, 1st Edition, Empirical: Belfast
- [20] Duke, D, 1998, *'My Awakening: A Path to Racial Understanding'*, 1st Edition, Free Speech Books: Mandeville
- [21] Helms, J, 1983, *'Remarks of Senator Jesse Helms'*, [October 3rd], Congressional Quarterly, Vol. 129, No. 130, S13452-S13461
- [22] Taylor, J, 2005, *'The Rosa Parks Madness'*, American Renaissance, Vol. 16, No. 11, http://www.amren.com/mtnews/archives/2005/11/the_rosa_parks_madness.php, [Accessed: 17/04/2007]
- [23] For example: Mosk, M, Thompson, C, *'Mfume Accused of Favoritism at NAACP: Ex-President Denies Rewarding Women'*, Washington Post, April 28 2005, p. A01, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2005/04/27/AR2005042701979.html>, [Accessed: 17/04/2007]
- [24] Taylor, J, 2005, *'The Rosa Parks Madness'*, American Renaissance, Vol. 16, No. 11, http://www.amren.com/mtnews/archives/2005/11/the_rosa_parks_madness.php, [Accessed: 17/04/2007]
- [25] For example, *'Rose Parks [Copyright]' & 'Shameless'*, 2007, *'O Tempora, O Mores!'*, American Renaissance, Vol. 18, No. 4, pp. 15-16
- [26] Jackson, T, 2006, *'The Black-Jewish Alliance'*, American Renaissance, Vol. 17, No. 8, pp. 8-11
- [27] Taylor, J, 2006, *'Jews and American Renaissance'*, American Renaissance, Vol. 17, No. 5, p. 11
- [28] Jackson, T, 2006, *'The Black-Jewish Alliance'*, American Renaissance, Vol. 17, No. 8, pp. 8-11
- [29] Duke, D, 1998, *'My Awakening: A Path to Racial Understanding'*, 1st Edition, Free Speech Books: Mandeville
- [30] <http://www.naACP.org/about/history/howbegan/> [Accessed: 17/04/2007]; Miller, S, 1971, *'The Socialist Party and the Negro, 1901-20'*, The Journal of Negro History, Vol. 56, No. 3, pp. 220-229; Miller, S, 2003, *'For White Men Only: The Socialist Party of America and Issues of*

- Gender, Ethnicity and Race*', Journal of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era, Vol. 2, No. 3, pp. 283-302
- [31] Duke, D, 1998, *'My Awakening: A Path to Racial Understanding'*, 1st Edition, Free Speech Books: Mandeville
- [32] Jackson, T, 2006, *'The Black-Jewish Alliance'*, American Renaissance, Vol. 17, No. 8, pp. 8-11
- [33] Ibid.
- [34] Taylor, J, 2006, *'Jews and American Renaissance'*, American Renaissance, Vol. 17, No. 5, p. 11
- [35] Jackson, T, 2006, *'The Black-Jewish Alliance'*, American Renaissance, Vol. 17, No. 8, pp. 8-11
- [36] Ibid.; Letter 1, 2006, *'Letters from Readers'*, American Renaissance, Vol. 17, No. 6, p. 2
- [37] Auster, L, *'Why Jews Welcome Muslims'*, Frontpage Magazine, June 22 2004, <http://www.frontpagemag.com/Articles/ReadArticle.asp?ID=13894>, [Accessed 17/04/2007]
- [38] <http://www.amnation.com/vfr/archives/005449.html> [Accessed 17/04/2007]
- [39] Stowe, H, 2006, *'The Genetics of Race'*, American Renaissance, Vol. 17, No. 7, pp. 1 & 3-7
- [40] Ibid., p. 4
- [41] Taylor, J, 2006, *'Jews and American Renaissance'*, American Renaissance, Vol. 17, No. 5, p. 11
- [42] <http://www.canada.com/components/print.aspx?id=62926c33-df00-4608-b817-7a46d55d7da4> [Accessed 17/04/2007]; <http://www.splcenter.org/intel/intelreport/article.jsp?pid=215> [Accessed 17/04/2007]
- [43] For example: Letter 1, 2006, *'Letters from Readers'*, American Renaissance, Vol. 17, No. 6, p. 2
- [44] http://www.adl.org/learn/ext_us/amren.asp?xpicked=5&item=amren [Accessed 16/04/2007]
- [45] <http://www.splcenter.org/intel/intelreport/article.jsp?pid=1096> [Accessed 16/04/2007]
- [46] For example: Lutton, W, 1998, *'Immigration, Sovereignty, and the Future of the West'* in Taylor, J, (Ed.), 1998, *'The Real American Dilemma: Race, Immigration and the Future of America'*, 1st Edition, New Century Books: Oakton
- [47] For example: *'Cartoon Jihad' & 'BNP Wins Round One'*, 2006, *'O Tempora, O Mores!'*, American Renaissance, Vol. 17, No. 3, pp. 12-13
- [48] Oppenheim, A, Faerman, M, Majumber, P, Brinkmann, B, Filon, D, Nebel, A, 2001, *'The Y Chromosome Pool of Jews as part of the Genetic Landscape of the Middle East'*, The American Journal of Human Genetics, Vol. 69, No. 5, pp. 1095-1112
- [49] Thomas, M, Weale, M, Jones, A, Richards, M, Smith, A, Redhead, N, Torroni, A, Scozzari, R, Gratix, F, Tarekegn, A, Wilson, J, Capelli, C, Bradman, N, Goldstein, D, 2002, *'Founding Mothers of Jewish Communities: Geographically Separated Jewish Groups were independently founded by very few female ancestors'*, The American Journal of Human Genetics, Vol. 70, No. 6, pp. 1411-1420
- [50] Ibid.; Siegel-Itzkovich, J, *'Dad was out and about, while Mom stayed home.'*, Jerusalem Post, June 16 2000, p. F1
- [51] For example: <http://www.frenchcreoles.com/CreolesWeAre.html> [Accessed 17/04/2007]
- [52] <http://www.canada.com/components/print.aspx?id=62926c33-df00-4608-b817-7a46d55d7da4> [Accessed 17/04/2007]; <http://www.splcenter.org/intel/intelreport/article.jsp?pid=215> [Accessed 17/04/2007]
- [53] Montagu, A, 1975, [Originally published 1942], *'Man's Most Dangerous Myth: The Fallacy*

of Race', 5th Edition, Oxford University Press: Oxford

[54] Pearson, R, 1994, *'Race, Intelligence and Bias in Academe'*, 1st Edition, Scott-Townsend: Washington D.C.

[55] Baker, R, 1974, *'Race'*, 1st Edition, Oxford University Press: Oxford; Chiarelli, B, 1995, *'Man Between Past and Future'*, 1st Edition, Institute for the Study of Man: Washington D.C.

[56] Ibid.; Fishberg, M, 2006, [Originally published 1911], *'Jews, Race & Environment'*, 1st Edition, Transaction: New York; Hooton, E, 1939, *'Twilight of Man'*, 1st Edition, G. P. Putnam & Sons: New York; Sarich, V, Miele, F, 2004, *'Race: The Reality of Human Differences'*, 1st Edition, Westview: Boulder

In Brief: Kim Philby and the Jews

Wednesday, 4 August 2010

Kim Philby is a name well-known in the world of espionage and spy thrillers as the best known member of the *'Cambridge Spies'*; who were five Soviet spies who worked their way into the British intelligence, diplomatic and royal establishment, and who is/are the subject of a considerable body of literature. (1)

What is less well-known and commented on is Philby's relationship with the jews. Unfortunately there is a dearth of material in this area, (2) but from what we do know: we get a tantalizing suggestion that this would be an area that would benefit from careful research and intellectual exploration.

Philby's relationship with the jews seems to have begun while he was at Cambridge when he began to actively self-identify first as a socialist and then as a communist. Philby probably began to sympathise with jews as a result of pro-jewish communist propaganda of this time and the assertion; oft made in communist literature up till the present day, that the jews are simply *'scapegoats'* for *'economic problems'*. (3) Contributing to this was Philby's deep emotional antipathy towards National Socialism; which he maligned as *'fascism'*, (4) and with the jew being perceived as the chief *'victim'* and *'scapegoat'* of *'fascism'*; regarded as they and are by leftists as *'evil pseudo-capitalists'*. It is thus understandable; if somewhat intellectually abhorrent, that Philby became something of a philo-Semite: to the extent of breaking off contact with the NKVD when the Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact of 1939 was announced. (5)

When Philby left England in 1934 to perform some communist underground work in Austria: he; according to Phillip Knightley, *'helped smuggle Jews and Communists out of Vienna'*. (6) We should note in passing that Knightley rightly implies; although he probably did mean to do so, that many jews in Austria; notably in Vienna, were communists. (7) In the course of this smuggling out of communists and their jewish allies and co-conspirators: Philby met a jewess by the name of Litzi Friedmann (nee Alice Kohlmann) with whom he fell in love and promptly married. It is notable that both Philby and Friedmann were; by then, working directly for Soviet intelligence. Perhaps predictably their unnatural union did not last too long and the two split up in the mid to late 1930s: no source seems to have a precise idea of exactly when or why the couple split.

Having experienced the bitter taste of jewish skirt Philby decided that it perhaps really wasn't for him; well at least not in the bedroom department and having to put up with a jewess as your wife, and proceeded to seduce and marry two non-jewish women: both of whom were blissfully unaware that their husband was a communist and an agent of the NKVD. It is interesting to note that the NKVD agent who probably recruited both Philby and Friedmann to work for Soviet intelligence was Edith Suschitzky: who was incidentally also a jewish communist.

Philby's early flirtation with jewish skirt however may have caused his eventual downfall as a jewess; Flora Solomon, who Philby had felt the urge in 1934 to try to seduce (whether he was successful has not been ascertained) and then try to recruit as a Soviet intelligence agent in Western Europe. Solomon promptly informed MI5 in 1962; when it was most advantageous to do so, that Philby had tried to do this and this new information served as the immediate cause of the events that lead to Philby's flight from Turkey to Moscow in 1963. (8)

Philby's lack of recognition that jews were and are a problem; even in dialectical materialism, can be found in the fact that it has been reasonably conjectured that Philby was instrumental in getting several communist jews; such as Morris and Lona Cohen who has been spying on the United States for the Soviet Union, out before they were unmasked and brought to book for their crimes. (9)

We can summarise from this brief account of Philby's relations with the jews that he was rather clueless about them and naively believed that they were '*misunderstood*', '*just like everyone else*' and the '*scapegoats*' of horrid anti-Semitic capitalists. What Philby doesn't seem to have figured out; even on his death bed, was that he had been used and abused by jews his whole life and that the great unhappiness he experienced as a result of his 1963 flight to Moscow and his subsequent cold treatment by the NKVD was significantly caused by the jewish skirt that he chased; as well as the secular halakhah of Karl Marx that he had so ardently espoused, in his particularly deluded youth.

References

(1) An excellent literature review of the many works published on Kim Philby and the '*Cambridge Spies*' can be found in Mikhail Lyubimov, Hayden Peake and Rufina Philby, 2003, '*The Private Life of Kim Philby: The Moscow Years*', 2nd Edition, St. Ermin's Press: London, pp. 297-363

(2) Perhaps the only works to discuss this at any length are Mark Aarons, John Loftus, 1991, '*Ratlines: How the Vatican's Nazi Networks Betrayed Western Intelligence to the Soviets*', 1st Edition, Heinemann: London and Mark Aarons, John Loftus, 1994, '*The Secret War against the Jews: How Western Intelligence Betrayed the Jewish People*', 1st Edition, St. Martin's Press: New York. Both these theses on this point are rebutted in summary by Lyubimov, Peake and Philby, Op. Cit., pp. 365-366. It is worth noting that John Loftus has been caught lying on television several times and even managed to cause a hate campaign against a family by telling the world at large that they were Islamic terrorists (when they weren't even Muslims): his work in general makes spicy; and even salacious, reading, but is utterly improbable and absurd in its various theses usually relating to '*Catholic-Nazi-Muslim conspiracies*'.

(3) On this point see the jewish communist Daniel de Leon's, 1921, '*Anti-Semitism: Its Cause*

and Cure', 1st Edition, Socialist Labor Party: New York. This is available online at the following address: <http://www.marxists.org/archive/deleon/pdf/subject/antisem.pdf>. De Leon's little booklet is still considered to be the premier marxist statement on anti-Semitism and 'de Leonist' analyses of the jewish question (predictably blaming everyone and everything, but the jews) as such are common.

(4) For an example of the; then as now, idiotic contemporary comparisons of this kind see Robert Brady, 1937, *The Spirit and Structure of German Fascism*, 1st Edition, Victor Gollancz: London.

(5) S. J. Hamrick, 2004, *Deceiving the Deceivers: Kim Philby, Donald Maclean and Guy Burgess*, 1st Edition, Yale University Press: New Haven, pp. 19-21

(6) Kim Philby, 2002, [1968], *My Silent War: The Autobiography of a Spy*, 1st Edition, Random House: New York, p. x

(7) For two accounts of this please see Harriet Pass Freidenreich, 1991, *Jewish Politics in Vienna, 1918-1938*, 1st Edition, Indiana University Press: Indianapolis, pp. 84-114 and Jerry Muller, 2010, *Capitalism and the Jews*, 1st Edition, Princeton University Press: Princeton, pp. 144-172. For the causes and extent of this relationship please see Lionel Kochan (Ed.), 1970, *The Jews in Soviet Russia since 1917*, 1st Edition, Oxford University Press: New York; Gisela Lebzelter, 1978, *Political Anti-Semitism in England 1918-1939*, 1st Edition, MacMillan: London, pp. 155-169; Erich Haberer, 2004, *Jews and Revolution in Nineteenth-Century Russia*, 2nd Edition, Cambridge University Press: New York and Benjamin Pinkus, 1988, *The Jews of the Soviet Union: The History of a National Minority*, 1st Edition, Cambridge University Press: New York.

(8) Hamrick, Op. Cit., p. 7

(9) Ibid, p. 22

Moratorium till November

Friday, 6 August 2010

Dear Reader,

Unfortunately an unseen work commitment is going to require me to be absent from my normal routine of posting for a few months as I will be in countries where anti-Semitism is not only frowned upon: it is a crime. Hence I will be stopping my posts here till I return from my work trip in early November this year (2010).

I will continue writing while I am on my trip so that when I return I will have plenty of high quality articles to post on my return. Please do not worry: Semitic Controversies hasn't died a death, but due to unforeseeable circumstances the material will not be able to be posted until November as I have said.

I will still be able to pick up my email so if anybody has anything they would like to ask me about or any articles they wish to post then please feel free to drop me a line at the usual address.

I will see you in November!

Karl,

Semitic Controversies Returns...

Monday, 13 September 2010

Dear Reader,

Due to an earlier than planned return: I am delighted to announce that Semitic Controversies is back up and running as of today. In my time away I have had the opportunity to do a lot of research into various aspects of the jewish question and I return somewhat refreshed and revived from my break in posting. I hope that the articles that have been in the gestation in my absence will more than make up for it.

Enjoy!

The Editor,

Another Kosher Communist Obituary

Monday, 13 September 2010

On Semitic Controversies I frequently comment on the latest rigmaroles, whines and general denunciations of the London-based Socialist History Society as well as their monthly journal articles, contributions and miscellany. As I have now had time to fully read the latest newsletter; that of August 2010, I would like to add another notch in this supposedly egalitarian group's strange obsession with the self-chosen ones.

Now on p. 5 of the Socialist History Society's Newsletter for August 2010 we find a laudatory obituary by the presumably gentile David Morgan for a certain Marian Slingova-Fagan who was herself; despite her unfortunate double-barrelled surname, a gentile as well. Having been born Marian Wilbraham in New Zealand in 1913: the budding wind-bag won a place at Oxford University and became involved in left-wing anti-fascist politics having been; as Morgan implies, deluded enough by Marx's secular halakhah to join the Communist Party of Great Britain (better known to students of Marxism by its acronym: the CPGB) where she evidently met many a hooked nose at the CPGB's infamous King Street headquarters.

While she was part of the kosher crusade to save humanity; specifically the Czech portion of the world, from general sanity Miss Wilbraham acquired a taste for the circumcised Bolsheviks that she met in the '*underground*' and as Morgan records she married one; Otto Sling, at an unspecified time either just before or during the Second World War. Morgan records that Miss Wilbraham was specifically engaged in helping Czech refugees; specifically communist and/or jewish ones (after all some members of the '*working class*' are more equal than others... right?), and one of these refugees was; of course, Otto Sling.

Now after aiding in the brutal attempted near extermination of the German nation and its 'working class' Mrs Marian Sling; as she was now known, decided that she and her lecherous husband would go to the now Communist Czechoslovakia. Of course the new Bolshevik masters; complete with their secular Talmud '*Das Kapital*', welcomed their fellow member of the tribe and his gullible shiksa appointing Sling as Communist Party Secretary of the important Brno region. Morgan; of course, does not speak of the massacres and general oppression orchestrated by Sling and his gullible wife who no doubt was enjoying the joys of ostensibly being a part of the Communist elite.

However all this came to an abrupt end when the all too obviously jewish elite of the Czechoslovakian Communist Party were removed; partly by popular acclaim that the jews be removed and partly because the obviously overly jewish establishment was felt rightly or wrongly to be more loyal to their fellow jews than to the Marxist-Leninist cause, and Sling; like his more prominent fellow member of the tribe Rudolf Slansky, was executed in 1952. Morgan predictably makes a big fuss about this '*injustice*' but doesn't bother to say one word about Slansky or Sling's non-jewish victims but rather Morgan just sees it as a problem if jewish communists are executed. I mean who cares about the insignificant goyim when the Chosen of Hashem/Yahweh are being brought to book? Oy vey!

Mrs Sling was; of course, also promptly taken from her bourgeoisie lifestyle and cares and thrown in prison for various crimes; that Morgan claims were '*trumped up*', against the Czech people. She stayed in this condition for two years before being released after this short sentence: probably because she was a foreign national. (1)

When Mrs Sling returned to the United Kingdom she continued her pro-Communist campaign in spite of her experiences; after all a leopard doesn't change its spots, and was involved in various subversive organisations from the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament to the Women's Peace Camp on Greenham Common. Mrs Sling however had not in this time lost her taste for the circumcised and married yet another jewish Bolshevik; one Hymie Fagan, in 1977. Mrs Slingova-Fagan ended her unfortunately long, diseased and miserable existence in July 2010 at the age of 97.

An appreciation was predictably published by her jewish son; Karel Schling, in the Guardian on the 19th of July and an obituary also appeared in the Independent. But we should end on a positive note: at least the devils in hell get a new favourite plaything.

References

(1) This is indirectly suggested by a fellow British communist who also lived in Czechoslovakia in the period that Mrs Sling was released in Denis Hill, 1989, '*Seeing Red, Being Green: The Life and Times of a Southern Rebel*', 1st Edition, Iconoclast: Brighton, pp. 283-297.

Tacitus and the Jews (Part I)

Tuesday, 14 September 2010

Publius Cornelius Tacitus is one of the most famous of all Roman historians (and certainly one of the most read) and indeed possibly one of the greatest historians in the classical world. Tacitus however in addition to his work on the history of Imperial Rome; which forms the basis for his '*Histories*' and '*Annals*', gives us an interesting and indeed brutally honest portrait of the jews as a people.

Tacitus' remarks on this score have long been cited by educated anti-Semites (1) as they make for excellent confirmation that the charges of anti-Semitism; often supposed to be lacking a factual basis, have largely stayed constant throughout the ages and that jewish behaviour has consequently stayed the same throughout this time period. (2) Thus directly suggesting a link between jewish behaviour and outbreaks of anti-Semitic feeling/violence that cannot be reasonably dismissed out-of-hand by even the most dedicated philo-Semite.

Tacitus' comments on the jews have come in for considerable academic discussion and are usually dismissed as being repetition of unfounded anti-jewish myths; of generally Greek origin, that one can also see repeated in Josephus' '*Against Apion*'. What has not been pointed out in modern literature is that Tacitus' description and analysis of the jews is actually; like most of his work, rather more correct than it has been conceded by the generally philo-Semitic academic establishment.

What we shall do in this essay is to bring to the fore Tacitus' comments on the jews (regardless of their origin in either experience or the literature of the time); which form a short segment of fifth book of his '*Histories*', and examine them to see how reasonable they are and whether they can be dismissed as easily as various philo-Semitic and jewish scholars have claimed. We shall also; where appropriate, comment on how Tacitus' description of the jews should be understood in the light of modern anti-Semitic research.

Tacitus begins his account of the jews by informing us of the arguments; without explicitly endorsing any one theory in particular, surrounding the origin of the jews at the time that he wrote. (3) He tells us that one theory is based on the notion that the jews come from Crete which is adduced from the similarity of the names: '*Idaei*' (the inhabitants of Mount Ida in Crete) and '*Judaei*' (the inhabitants of Judea or the jews). He then proceeds to inform us that the jews were said to have emigrated to Libya and that an; implied, rival tradition disputes this and claims that the jews are in fact superfluous population from Egypt who were lead out of Egypt by two men called '*Hierosolymus*' and '*Juda*'. Tacitus also informs us that another tradition has the jews originating from Ethiopia to the south of Egypt. Another theory has it that the jews are Assyrian refugees and occupied a piece of Egyptian territory turning it into their own state. While another; more fanciful, theory claims that the jews were the descendents of the Solymi; from south-west Turkey, who were then famous due to Homer's positive mention of them in the Iliad. (4)

These theories; in spite of claims that Tacitus and/or the Greek accounts of the jews are almost wholly inaccurate, are actually; in all but two instances (those of the Cretan and Solymian origin of the jews), reconcilable with the account of the jewish origins given in the Torah/Pentateuch. We can note that the references to Libya and Egypt closely follow the Biblical narrative with the

jews having come from the Egyptian empire (5) and the reference to Ethiopia can also be argued to simply based on the assumption that the jews originate from Egypt and therefore that the jews originate from Punt (Ethiopia) as the Egyptian mythology claimed they; the Egyptians, did. The reference to Assyria is also; we may reasonably suggest, a direct result of the assertion by B'reshiyth/Genesis that Abraham was held captive in Syria only to return to Canaan later, which Tacitus would have reasonably regarded as Assyrian and Egyptian territory at that point in time. (6)

The reference to '*Hierosolymus*' probably refers to Moses/Moshe as '*Juda*' seems to me to probably be either a corruption of '*Juba*' (7) or '*Judea*'. (8) Where-as with '*Hierosolymus*' it would be normal for Greek sources; especially if they believed the Hellenizing jews who tried to make jewish tradition fit Greek mythology and legend, to assign Moses/Moshe a Greek name (as opposed to the barbarian original): much as they assigned the Greek gods to other pagan peoples; emphasizing a particular god or goddess depending on their knowledge of the religious customs or general culture of the people in question. Tacitus himself implicitly endorses this interpretation when he asserts that '*most authorities agree*' that the jews were lead out of Egypt by a man named Moses/Moshe, which indirectly implies that Tacitus believed one (or both) of the identifications of '*Hierosolymus*' or '*Juda*' as the man who led the jews out Egypt to be Moses/Moshe and that he had correctly identified possibly the most important figure in jewish history. (9)

We could also potentially argue that the claim that the jews were the descendents of the Solymi possibly derives from the assertion that '*Hierosolymus*' lead them out of Egypt in the Exodus and that a Greek or Roman author (or perhaps more maliciously a Hellenizing jew in the vein of Philo Judaeus); who would almost certainly been familiar with Homer, had taken it upon themselves to rationalise the existence of the jews within Homeric epic by associating them with a people described by Homer (i.e. to link them to the Greeks if one were to look at this as a malicious act on the part of a Hellenizing jew). We can see this association in Tacitus' recounting of the theory that the jews originate from Crete based on the like sounds of the given names of the two peoples.

We should however note that this is only intellectual speculation on my part in that I am not a classical philologist and nor do I make any claim to be one. That said I felt it necessary to call to my reader's attention that potentiality it seems possible; even probable, that the origins of the jews that Tacitus relates are in fact not only reconcilable but fairly reasonable for the time period as they; as we have seen, do actually derive from the jewish tradition and unless one regards jewish claims as to their origin in the Torah/Pentateuch uncritically then one has to pay attention to the theories propounded by the unknown authors who Tacitus is citing.

References

- (1) For example see Theodor Fritsch, 1933, '*Handbuch der Judenfrage*', 35th Edition, Hammer Verlag: Leipzig, pp. 418-419
- (2) This thesis; as applied to the Roman Empire, is best exemplified by Franz Altheim's, 1939, '*Die Soldatenkaiser*', 1st Edition, Das Ahnenerbe: Berlin, which uses Tacitus; although not directly, as one of the key evidential bases to argue that there was an internal power struggle between the Aryan and Semitic races within the Roman Empire. Altheim's thesis is

controversial; especially in the present age, but it still represents one of the more complete theories regarding the Roman Empire, which takes into account biology as opposed to the presumption that social, economic and religious differences lie at the heart of the understanding of history (which is in effect a denial of the application and the value of biological science).

(3) Tac. Hist. 5. 2

(4) Hom. Il. 6. 184

(5) On this point see the book of Sh'moth/Exodus in particular.

(6) Gen. 12

(7) The name of a number of rulers of nearby Numidia. It is notable that Juba II was associated; via his second marriage to Glaphyra, to the Kings of Judea as her first husband was Prince Alexander of Judea (a son of the infamous King Herod of Judea) and her lover and third husband was another son of King Herod of Judea: King Herod Archelaus. This further suggests that 'Juda' may well be a corruption of 'Juba' given this close historical association, which would probably have been known to Tacitus in some form as Juba II had been an advisor to Gaius Caesar during his tour of the Eastern Provinces between 2 BC and 2 AD given his description of Gaius Caesar in the '*Annals*'.

(8) The southern jewish kingdom which has historically been more closely associated with the jews of today than the northern jewish kingdom of Samaria.

(9) Tac. Hist. 5. 3. One could also combine the names '*Hierosolymus*' and '*Juda*' to form one individual, which if the reference was to one individual might suggest that Moses/Moshe was indeed the individual referred to by Tacitus and the authors whose opinions/theories he cites.

Tacitus and the Jews (Part II)

Saturday, 18 September 2010

When Tacitus has finished his description of the various theses that had developed in the Roman and Greek literature regarding the origin of the jews: he proceeds to display his; probably second hand, knowledge of the Torah and the traditions of the jews by pointing out that '*most authorities agree*' that Moses/Moshe was central to the founding of the jews as a nation. (10)

Tacitus indeed relates an interesting counter-tradition to the famous exodus of the jews from Egypt described in the Torah in so far he asserts that a great plague of leprosy had occurred in Egypt and that Pharaoh had been tasked by the God Ammon to rid the country of the pestilence and to perform this pious act. The Pharaoh rounded up and expelled all those '*wretches*'; as Tacitus calls them, who had contracted the disease. We should note in passing that in the ancient, classical and medieval worlds leprosy was viewed as an unclean disease and was often attributed to immorality. (11) These individuals were then removed from the country and abandoned out in the desert; which is presumably a reference to Sinai.

Tacitus' assertion; probably made on the basis of ancient Greek works on jews and Judaism, that the jews had their origin among Egyptian lepers can be said to be direct reference to Sh'moth/Exodus. As we find that the ten plagues that were supposedly cast down on the Egyptians by Hashem/Yahweh are similar to Tacitus' account in their fundamental assumptions in regard to the events. Tacitus tells us that the lepers/jews were driven out into the (Sinai)

desert, because a great plague had come upon Egypt and Sh'moth/Exodus claims that the jews desired to leave but Pharaoh had to be forced to let them leave by ten great plagues. (12)

What is particularly interesting to us is that the reference to a plague is probably not literal i.e. it might suggest that the jews residing in Egypt had been the cause of much destruction and harm to the Egyptians and hence were viewed as a great plague hence the reference to them in Tacitus' writing as lepers (i.e. a veiled reference to their spreading a horrific disease by their dissolute habits wherever they go). We find evidence for this interpretation in Sh'moth/Exodus when Hashem/Yahweh supposedly demanded that the jews ask Pharaoh for *'jewellery of silver and gold'* (13) and in Pharaoh's decision to chase the jews with his army. (14)

This decision on the part of Pharaoh makes little sense unless we view it as an allegory for something that the jews had collectively done to anger Pharaoh. So rather than the jews being *'granted'* the *'jewellery of silver and gold'* of Pharaoh by him: we can reasonably suggest that the jews simply stole or cheated Pharaoh out of his riches and fled en masse with them to Sinai. This is also suggested by the implicit claim made by Sh'moth/Exodus that Hashem/Yahweh had decreed that it should be so thus legitimizing this particularly jewish piece of thievery. (15)

We can also see this in an earlier account of the jews in Egypt from B'reshiyth/Genesis, which also implicitly informs us of the jewish financial manipulation of the Egyptian grain market enacted by Joseph. (16) We are then told that after Joseph's success his whole tribe immigrated to Egypt (17) and thereafter attained significant financial, social and political success as a result of Joseph's opening up of the Egyptian markets and power structure to them. (18) We also find reference to the fact that the jews at this point had begun to control Egyptian internal policy and were using it for their personal and collective benefit so as to effectively place themselves in control of the Egyptian citizenry and grain market under the guise of *'helping Pharaoh'*. (19) We can see this when a famine occurred it resulted in the people having to pay homage to the jews to procure enough to eat. (20) The jewish rapaciousness (21) didn't even stop at the powerful Egyptian priestly class and they used their financial might and power over Pharaoh to try to undermine the power of the priestly class and procure for themselves the position as the only power behind the throne. (22)

This informs us that when Tacitus speaks of the jews as *'lepers'* he does not mean that the jews were literally infected with leprosy, but rather that they were like lepers in that they had angered the Gods; specifically Ammon, by their actions in Egypt, which lead to Ammon commanding Pharaoh to be rid of these usurious usurpers, which lead to Pharaoh's somewhat successful attempt to break the back of the jewish power behind the throne. We should note in passing that when Tacitus speaks of the God Ammon he is probably referring to; however wittingly or unwittingly, the priestly class' struggle against the jewish power behind the throne referred to in B'reshiyth/Genesis 47:22-26.

This is implied in the following lines:

'A foul and disfiguring disease once broke out in Egypt, and that King Bocchoris, on approaching the oracle of Ammon and inquiring for a remedy, was told to purge his kingdom and to transport all the victims into another country.' (23)

The '*foul and disfiguring disease*' that broke out in Egypt is likely; as we have seen, an analogy for the jewish seizure of power and of their control of the all important Egyptian grain market, which brought with it the twin evils of domination by a foreign power and mass starvation. The '*victims*' of the disease were of course the jews as they had been infected by this mental leprosy. (24) The priestly class fought back against the jewish subversion of Egypt and when the jews had caused one too many a famine among the Egyptian people and revolt was in the air. The jews fled; i.e. '*were purged and transported*', into Sinai with the '*jewellery of silver and gold*' of Pharaoh (i.e. the wealth of the Egyptian kingdom) and the Egyptians predictably assembled their army and marched after Hashem's holy thieves.

Thus Tacitus is actually describing jewish rapaciousness and its results in Egypt and does not literally mean; as has been argued, that his '*account of Jewish origins is appalling garbled*', (25) but rather that Tacitus' words have to be taken as an analogical representation of jewish origins as opposed to the literalism that is conventionally used to try and discredit Tacitus as a notable source on the ancient jews.

References

- (10) Tac. Hist. 5. 3
- (11) This is shown in Tacitus' remark that the lepers; as the originators of the jews, had '*earned the disfavour of Heaven*'.
- (12) Exod. 7-12
- (13) Exod. 11:2
- (14) Exod. 14:5
- (15) Exod. 11:2
- (16) Gen. 41:46; 47:13-26
- (17) Gen. 48; 47:10-12
- (18) Gen. 47:27
- (19) Gen. 47:20
- (20) Gen. 47:10-15
- (21) According to Gen. 47:21 the jews had by this point made slaves of the Egyptian people.
- (22) Gen. 47:22-26
- (23) Tac. Hist. 5. 3
- (24) One could argue that this mental leprosy is simply an analogy of the jewish mind, which doesn't understand that which it does not conceive to be beneficial to itself.
- (25) Tacitus, W. H. Fyfe (Trans.), D. S. Levene (Ed.), 1997, '*The Histories*', 1st Edition, Oxford University Press: New York, p. xvii

Today's Jews (22nd September 2010)

Wednesday, 22 September 2010

It was reported yesterday; by JWIRE, (1) that one Isabelle Shapiro has been '*elected*' by Woollahra's councillors; not doubt feeling guilty for their positive lack of genuflection before Yahweh's little darlings, for one year. While this would not have been worth mentioning if

Woollahra was a municipal area of little importance: Woollahra just happens to encompass some of the wealthiest and most prestigious neighbourhoods in Australia's most famous city: Sydney.

The JWIRE article is largely reportage of little interest, but the author; Henry Benjamin, does let slip two points of particular interest to us in that he firstly points out that Shapiro does not originate from Australia but is in fact a wandering Jew from South Africa. If we consider this: then two likely historical eventualities occur.

These are as follows:

Firstly that Shapiro; and/or her Jewish parents, left South Africa, because they were associated with the far left; a significant proportion of whose leaders were Jewish in origin, (2) and the Afrikaaner government was so ungrateful as to suggest that justifying or actively participating in terrorist attacks and/or subversive activities was not conducive to the Shapiro family's capability to be productive citizens of South Africa.

Secondly that Shapiro; and/or her Jewish parents, left South Africa, because they felt that their opportunities for sustained ego fulfilment were limited by the brutal and indiscriminate negro violence that the advent of a venomously anti-Boer government; that was created and is still maintained in large part by her fellow members of the tribe, heralded.

Either possibility does not reflect well upon Shapiro and in fact indicates that Shapiro would not be a good mayor to have as she is only out for herself and couldn't care a jot about anyone else: although she will; in time honoured political tradition, pretend to care deeply about everything from Mrs Webster's issues with her neighbour's hedge to Mr Porter's habit of riding the local bus service all day and never getting off.

After all such concerns are put forth by those who are not of Israel and are therefore of no value to Shapiro who; as we are told she is an observant Jewess, believes that the Jews are the Chosen of Yahweh/Hashem and are biologically; not just religiously, entitled and even are specifically destined to rule the world and do what they wilt (and everyone else has to treat it as proverbial manna from heaven).

The second point of interest to us; relating to the biological origin of the Israel/non-Israel distinction in Judaism, is Benjamin's deliberate implication that although the last observant Jew who served as mayor of Woollahra was Leon Snider in 1944: there have been others. As to quote Benjamin:

'The last identifying Jewish mayor in Woollahra was Leon Snider in 1944.'

What Benjamin means here; just to help those who are sceptical, is that the last mayor of Woollahra who practised Judaism was Leon Snider, but that there have been other Jewish mayors of Woollahra who have not practised Judaism and therefore have not identified as such. In essence 'identifying' to Benjamin is Jewish group slang for an observant; as opposed to an apostate or unobservant, Jew. The sceptical can confirm this easily by reading a popular; i.e. written for gentiles, guide to Judaism of which there are a great many.

I would suggest that the residents of Woollahra do something about their new mayor (who lets not forget was not elected by them but their '*councillors*' who supposedly represent them); who necessarily believes herself to be some form of god-like being, before she runs away with her constituent's proverbial savings.

Down with Shapiro!

References

(1) <http://www.jwire.com.au/news/isabelle-shapiro-elected-mayor-of-woollahra/11772>

(Accessed: 22/09/2010)

(2) See the following Semitic Controversies article for a summary:

<http://semiticcontroversies.blogspot.com/2010/06/twelve-prominent-jewish-anti-apartheid.html>

A Change

Sunday, 26 September 2010

Dear Reader,

Since I have once again had increasing demands placed upon me: I have decided to change how I operate Semitic Controversies yet again. I apologise for this and can only explain that it comes from having too little time in a given day to write what I could do if I had the leisure to do so.

What I will do moving forward is to write full articles; as opposed to posting them in parts, and then publish them on Semitic Controversies and in the case of longer bits of work: as downloadable PDFs. The publishing schedule of these articles will be about one a week to give me the time to research and write them properly as opposed to rushing them and potentially detracting from their content and import. To give you a flavour of what I am working on I will list some articles that will be forthcoming:

1) Karl Marx: A Typical Jew

In this article I will assemble the evidence that concerns Marx's life and his thought while placing them in their jewish background giving the reader a picture of Marx as an extremely egoistic jew who based much of his thought on the way that halakhah is presented and argued in the Mishnah and the Talmuds. I also argue that Marx; and his writing, can only be understood on the basis of his jewishness and the peculiar way of understanding the world that that necessarily entails.

2) Tacitus on the Jews

In this article; of which I have already published two parts, I will go through and analyze Tacitus' famous statements about the jews and point to the fact that Tacitus is on the whole a reliable

commentator on the jewish question as what he argues bears a strong correlation to what is said in jewish sources and particularly the Torah.

3) The Beilis Ritual Murder Reviewed

In this article I will take an indepth look at the infamous trial that claimed that Mendel Beilis had committed the long-standing; and highly controversial, crime of jewish ritual murder. In doing this I point to both the inconsistencies in the prosecution's and defense's argument and make the case that neither side should be seen as whiter-than-white in this legal and political debacle of international proportions.

4) Wilhelm Marr: Father of or Traitor to Anti-Semitism?

In this article I investigate a long-standing claim in so far as that Wilhelm Marr; a German author and journalist, 'created' modern anti-Semitism and point out the inconsistencies with this narrative. I also point out that Marr himself was certainly no anti-Semite on the basis of his marriage to three jewesses, his attitudes towards the jewish question as well as his own writings on this most important of subjects.

5) Was Che Guevara an anti-Semite?

In this article I argue at length that the infamous Marxist guerrilla leader; Guevara, openly pointed out that jews were a nation in and of themselves and viewed them as a threat to the 'international working class' and that because he viewed them as such it would not be unreasonable to assert that Guevara himself was an anti-Semite masking it in Marxist intellectual jargon.

6) Of Jews and Jesuits

In this article I point out the role of jews in the founding of the Society of Jesus and also discuss to what extent the infamous 'Black Order' can be called anti-Semitic, which has been a staple charge against it that has gained intellectual currency since the 1920s.

7) Reading Luther's 'On the Jews and their Lies'

In this analysis of one of Luther's most important works for the modern age I point out that in spite of the attacks that have been made upon it: 'On the Jews and their Lies' is a fairly reasonable portrayal of jews from a devoutly Christian standpoint. I also point out that many of its arguments against Judaism and the conduct of jews have stood the test of time and remained cogent up till the present. I also dispel the notion; which is prevalent in anti-anti-Semitic literature, that Luther wanted to 'exterminate' the jews and point out that Luther always maintained that honest jews would become Christians and was ready to accept them as such, which does not compatible with the 'extermination' thesis.

8) The Eternal Jew: Fact or Fiction?

In this article I assemble the claims made by the famous 1940 anti-jewish documentary film; 'Die Ewige Jude', and analyze them in the light of the literature to see if the common assertion that the film is simply 'lies' is correct or whether Die Ewige Jude was in fact more arguable fact than deliberately distorted fiction.

9) The anti-Semitic Thought of Revilo Oliver

In this article I critically analyze the thought regarding the jews of the late, great Professor Oliver. I point out the challenges that Oliver laid down for anti-Semites and also point out that Oliver's identification of the problem is probably incorrect and give the reasons why I believe this to be the case.

10) Understanding the Torah

In this book length treatise I take the first five books of the Old Testament; known to jews in slightly different form as the Torah, and analyse them paying particularly attention to the lessons that one inevitably has from jewish behaviour. I also point out in detail the necessary implications of many statements in the Torah for both gentiles and jews.

In between these larger articles and treatises I will; of course, publish smaller book reviews and articles dealing with other subjects surrounding the jewish question. I hope this will sate my reader's curiosity and appetite for work on the jewish question.

Kindest Regards,

The Editor,

Pliny the Elder, the Jews and the Essenes

Monday, 11 October 2010

Gaius Plinius Secundus; better known to history as Pliny the Elder, is the one of the first of the Roman encyclopaedists whose work; *Naturalis Historia* (or the *Natural History*), has come down to us more or less complete. Pliny's work has not often been referred to by anti-Semites; largely because his comments on the jews are brief and very specific to the Essene sect(s), (1) but it is does have some import for us as anti-Semites because it gives us a very brief but telling look into how jewish groups have historically operated.

Pliny speaks of the Essenes as follows:

'Lying on the west of Asphaltites, and sufficiently distant to escape its noxious exhalations, are the Esseni, a people that live apart from the world, and marvellous beyond all others throughout the whole earth, for they have no women among them; to sexual desire they are strangers; money they have none; the palm-trees are their only companions. Day after day, however, their numbers are fully recruited by multitudes of strangers that resort to them, driven thither to adopt

their usages by the tempests of fortune, and wearied with the miseries of life. Thus it is, that through thousands of ages, incredible to relate, this people eternally prolongs its existence, without a single birth taking place there; so fruitful a source of population to it is that weariness of life which is felt by others.' (2)

The reader will notice that Pliny describes the Essenes in strikingly positive terms in that he sees them as being virtuous because of their self-denial and apparent a-sexuality. (3) This would certainly appeal to the fashionable Stoicism of Pliny's time with its insistence on the denial of pleasure in this world putting a life of service and asceticism in its stead. Pliny himself seems to have been somewhat a-sexual in that he was unmarried and no mention is made of any sexual relations that he had. (4)

We should note; as Geza Vermes has pointed out, that the semi-monasticism and primitive communism of the Essenes only applied to those living in the purely Essene communities such as Qumran and those Essenes who lived in towns did not share this same monastic lifestyle and the documents at Qumran indicate that these Essenes certainly were permitted to marry and beget children. Whether the Essenes in the secluded communities could also marry and beget children is a matter of great debate as what we are told by the scrolls is inconclusive and can be convincingly argued either way. Pliny's suggestion of celibacy being the norm for the Essenes does much to forward the view that the secluded Essene communities were essentially a-sexual, but we should however be guarded in our acceptance of Pliny's suggestion in so far as he may be correct, but we also know that Pliny was using secondary source material wholesale and we have no clue as the veracity of his source. That said however Pliny's notation is suggestive if nothing else of an Essene community that we know took all their Torah-derived Halakhah deadly seriously with stringent punishment; such as death and/or excommunication, for those who disobeyed or questioned the authority of the community's Torah scholars.

Pliny's pagan laurels however would certainly have been an anathema to the Essenes themselves as they would have necessarily regarded him as something less than human in that he was not of the Chosen of Israel and would thus; if he had by some miracle been admitted to an Essene community, have been of the fourth and lowest class: the proselyte. (5) We should call attention here to the fact that the Essene form of Judaism was based on an extremely rigid; and often literal, interpretation of the Torah and its derivative halakhah. (6) It should also be noted that the core of the Essene faith was a belief that the Temple in Jerusalem was occupied by false priests because the then priestly line; the ancestors of the modern Kohanim, was not of Zadokite biological origin. (7) The basis of this belief was justified by the fact that the then priestly lineage of the Temple had been appointed by a non-jewish ruler and thus was; in the Essene view, illegitimate. (8)

In essence then the Essenes represent a third classical Jewish tradition in addition to the well-known Sadducee and Pharisee traditions who in many ways completely rebelled against the authority of these two more powerful factions. This informs us of the continuous strife, factionalism and ego conflict inside Judaism that still occurs up till the present day (9) and which has unfortunately gone largely unnoticed by anti-Semites. (10) It is worth noting that the Essene tradition in fact validates many arguments; anti-Semitic and otherwise, that criticise Judaism and Jews as it represents an 'extreme' tradition in the same sense as the modern Hasidim; with their

vociferous hatred and unqualified rejection of all things '*unclean*' (such as non-Israel/gentiles), as a related Essene document; the Cairo Damascus Rule, clearly states that to steal from or murder a non-jew is acceptable if the community has ordered it (and it may still be acceptable even if the community has not ordered it i.e. as long as the Essene community itself is not endangered), (11) that the jews should not trade certain items (such as wine presses) to non-Israel as they are not to be trusted with them, (12) and that the jews should not inform the gentile authorities of their activities on pain of death (13). It is also interesting that we find one of the first uses of the derogatory term; Kittim, in the scrolls with the Essenes assigning it to the greatest gentile power of the day: originally the Seleucids and then Imperial Rome. Kittim was also adopted into the Pharisee tradition and became part of the standard repertoire of Judaism as pointed out by Jacob Neusner and Geza Vermes. (14)

We may also briefly comment on Pliny's assert that stranger's flocked to the Essenes as this does have some truth to it as we know; for the community's rules, that many newly religious jews did find the Essenes attractive and did somewhat '*flock*' to their banner although seemingly no more or less than other messianic and apocalyptic movements of the time. We should however note that Pliny does not seem to realise that only jews could flock to join the Essenes and that gentile '*converts*'; of which there do not seem to have been many, were treated with contempt and suspicion as we can ascertain from the fact that proselytes; i.e. gentile converts, seem only to have occurred in the town Essene communities and that non-jewish slaves with Essene masters who were '*converts*' were closely questioned and treated as second class citizens by other Essenes. (15)

In summary then we can point that this was hardly a community that Pliny; as a gentile and even worse a '*heathen*', would have felt at home in, but because Pliny relied on secondary sources he did realise the mistake he had made in lauding the customs of this third jewish tradition. That said however the Essenes is an understudied and underrated subject among anti-Semites that demands some lucid attention and we may look forward to a time when a scholarly anti-Semitic work on the subject will appear and indicate the arguments put forward by ancient and classical critics of jews are not without both foundation and intellectual substance.

References

(1) The Essenes are the centre of two considerable academic controversies: firstly whether they were the authors or compilers of the library known colloquially as the Dead Sea Scrolls; notably the sectarian literature that is part of the scrolls and the all important Temple Scroll (which some have suggested is actually a sixth book of the Torah that was rejected by the jewish prophet Ezra [and with which view I generally agree]), and secondly the precise nature of the link between their beliefs and teachings and early Christianity. Some; jewish, academics have recently claimed that the Essenes did not even exist, but we may dismiss their arguments; as have specialist scholars in general, on the grounds that the mention by several different classical sources of a similar era of this sect offer strong evidence for its existence and that this is evidence is supported by the evidence from the Dead Sea Scrolls themselves. I use the plural to describe the sects of Essenes because there may; if we are to believe Philo of Alexandria two different groups within the body of the Essenes and scholarly opinion is divided on this issue. The reason that anti-Semites have rarely called attention to Pliny's comments is probably due to the lack of

information that was available on; and the apparent insignificance of, the Essenes during the glory days of anti-Semitic thought in the early to mid twentieth centuries with the Dead Sea Scrolls; from which the importance of the Essenes has been realised, only being found two years after the surrender of the Third Reich.

(2) Plin. Nat. 5. 15

(3) This pseudo-monasticism has been the subject of much scholarly debate and quite a few popular books proclaiming that the Essenes were the precursor of Christians and while there is much to support a substantial relation between the two groups such as John the Baptist's likely having been raised as an Essene (quite probably in Qumran community itself). We should be cautious in noting that apparent similarities can deceptively hide the differences between these two rather different religious systems.

(4) This does not mean that Pliny was necessarily a-sexual, but rather because we don't know anything on this score and all that we do know is that he didn't ever get married which for a prominent Roman is somewhat unusual.

(5) Four biologically-orientated classes have been derived for the Essene community; similar to the biological class system prevailing in Judaism at the time and since (but far more strict in its interpretation and requirements), which are Kohanim (priests), Levites (aids to the priests), Israelites (biological jews) and Proselytes (non-jews professing Essene beliefs). Later Judaism added further biologically-based classes such as foundlings (jews of uncertain lineage) and mamzers [literally translated as '*bastards*'] (jews born out of wedlock, from incestuous relationships, from adulterous relationships and/or jews born to those of uncertain parentage) to distinguish Israel further and prevent '*clean blood*' mixing with '*unclean blood*' [pun intended]. For an example of this system legislated for in modern Judaism see the Babylonian Talmud, Tractate Yebamoth 78b and Tractate Kiddushin 73.

(6) By halakhah I mean the literal meaning of '*religious laws*' as opposed to the more colloquial usage meaning the religious laws of modern Judaism usually derived from the Mishnah, the Talmuds and the standard commentaries (e.g. Maimonides, Rashi and Caro) .

(7) Geza Vermes, 1987, '*The Dead Sea Scrolls in English*', 3rd Edition, Penguin: London, pp. 1-4 & 16; Frank Moore Cross, 1992, '*The Historical Context of the Scrolls*' in Hershel Shanks (Ed.), 1992, '*Understanding the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Reader from the Biblical Archaeology Review*', 1st Edition, S.P.C.K.: London, p. 25

(8) This is the key dichotomy in Essene thought in that the founder of the Essenes; the '*Teacher of Righteousness*', was the opposite of the '*Wicked Priest*'; probably the Maccabee brothers Jonathan and Simon, who had once been '*righteous*' but whom had then had a falling out with the '*Teacher of Righteousness*' (probably over who got to be the High Priest), which the '*Wicked Priest*' had won, and then the '*Teacher of Righteousness*' lead what remaining of the first Hasidim (i.e. '*the pious*') to Qumran to await Yahweh's; rather tardy, judgement forming the Essene community, which flourished until the first jewish revolt when the advance of the Roman legions forced the Essenes to go into hiding and then disappear from history.

(9) For an amusing and accessible modern example see Israel Shahak, Norton Mezvinsky, 1999, '*Jewish Fundamentalism in Israel*', 1st Edition, Pluto: London, pp. 48-49.

(10) This is probably because anti-Semites necessarily have an interest in promoting the idea of jewish unity as opposed to the extreme disunity of the jewish community in general. The acceptance of the conspiracy and/or ethnocentric solutions to the puzzle of the jews has directly promoted the notion of jewish unity, which has lead to this disregarding of inconvenient facts among anti-Semites leading to such ludicrous ideas as the '*hive*' theory (where jews are thought

to be similar to say ants in their single-minded devotion to jewishness and the cause of the jewish community).

(11) CD XII:4-6; 8

(12) CD XII:11

(13) CD IX:1 & 11Q19:LVII-LIX. Also see James Vanderkam, 1992, *'The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Essenes or Sadducees?'* in Shanks, Op. Cit., pp. 54-55.

(14) Jacob Neusner, 2004, *'Making God's Word Work: A Guide to the Mishnah'*, 1st Edition, Continuum: New York, pp. 64-65 & 74; Vermes, Op. Cit., p. 28

(15) CD XIV:3-6. An amusing counter to this record of the enslavement of gentiles by jews maybe found in Mordecai Katz, 1966, *'Protection of the Weak in the Talmud'*, 1st Edition, AMS Press: New York, but Katz's argument is circumstantial and unconvincing. It does however make for interesting reading for anti-Semites who have some knowledge of rabbinic Judaism.

Christopher Jon Bjerknes: Sliced and Diced

Tuesday, 23 November 2010

Prefatory Note

Apparently Bjerknes believes that myself and Lionaxe are (or rather could be) the same person: that is untrue and should have been evident from the previous responses to him as our writing styles, native languages and specialist areas of study are completely different. Bjerknes claims that I; Karl Radl, seek to *'convert'*; a strange word to use given that it ironically suggests that Bjerknes elevates his beliefs to the status of unquestionable religious dogma, people at VNN and Stormfront to *'pro-jewish positions'*. I find this somewhat ironic for an individual who in an interview with jewish anti-feminist and general conspiratorial loon Henry Makow claimed to have some of that jewish holy ichor flowing through his veins.

I might point out that firstly Bjerknes assumes that anything he believes is an anti-jewish position which is obviously utterly subjective as much as whether one views Karl Marx as a genius or a moron. The problem with his position; as Bjerknes would know if he could manage to muster a proverbial ounce of critical thought, is that it assumes that a subjective position is an objective one and therefore places the person with a supposedly wholly objective position in the realm of deities along with Jupiter, Yahweh and Baal. Bjerknes would do well to remember that unfortunately he is not omniscient and in fact has a habit of lying outright; as the reader can for example ascertain for themselves from the fact that Bjerknes simply refuses to reply en pointe while claiming to do so on the central issues that form the basis for his claims, as well as being apparently unable to perform basic research functions like critical source and document analysis.

Secondly I might point out that Bjerknes; in line with his small coterie of whirling dervishes, imputes a conspiratorial motive by implying that I am some kind of jew or friend of the jews because I disagree with him. Or perhaps Bjerknes wishes to impute that I am an agent of the Illuminati, the shape-changing reptilians and/or the Elders of Zion because I disagree with him? Of course he wishes to do so, because Bjerknes; in his periods of borderline lucidity, well knows

that he has been caught with his trousers down and he; like many a member of the tribe, cannot stand the egoistic loss of admitting he can; or even could, be wrong.

Oh dear have I jabbed a pin into a particularly sensitive boil Christopher? I think I might have.

After all Bjerknes' sole claim to any kind of fame is his 'work'; if one can call it that, on Einstein which has been laughed out of the room by just about everyone with a triple digit IQ. Oh and as for the pseudonyms Christopher my dear child: I am afraid some of us have fairly significant careers and jobs to which we attend and unlike you we aren't so ineffective and insignificant that we would be unnoticed or un-persecuted by those who; like you, have Yahweh's divine ichor in their veins and form the '*power behind the throne*' in the countries in which we live and work.

Karl Radl,
Christopher Jon Bjerknes: Sliced and Diced

This is the third reply; by me, to Christopher Jon Bjerknes on the matters pertaining to Einstein, relativity and the charges of plagiarism related to the formentioned. In the first rebuttal (1) of Bjerknes critique I painstakingly clarified many of his inaccurate descriptions as I went through his central assumptions and claims regarding relativity and Einstein. In the second reply (2) I noted on the absence of an on-point rebuttal by Bjerknes. Now he has issued a post on his blog aimed at my previous retort, called; "*Refuting the Jewish Propagandist "Lionaxe" "Point-by-Point"*". (3)

Naturally, given the title of his latest reply I expected to actually receive a point-by-point critique, however that is not what Bjerknes offered. Let's examine his latest effort nevertheless and see what he felt compelled to answer; or to claim, this time around.

"The Jewish apologist[s] calling itself "Lionaxe" and/or "Karl Radl", which entity haunts the message boards at VNN and Stormfront attempting to convert those opposed to Jewish propaganda to pro-Jewish positions, issued a response to my blog of 6 February 2009. I did not answer it until now, as it is so obviously composed of sophistry and falsehoods that I thought it unnecessary to refute it, given that those who could understand what it said would know that it was based upon sophistry and falsehoods."

As expected Bjerknes starts off with irrelevant and childish polemics excusing himself from having taken his sweet time to reply with the reason being that my previous rebuttals were dense with sophistry and falsehoods. As a curiosa, he appears to have an affinity for the word 'sophistry', as (in my experience) do many of conspiracy theorists and garden variety cranks.

"The opening comments of the blog "Semitic Controversies" attempt to change the subject from Einstein's plagiarism to whether or not Prof. Winterberg has corresponded with "Lionaxe" and whether or not "Lionaxe" could have or should have quoted Winterberg directly, rather than put its, "Lionaxe's", self-contradictory words into the good professor's mouth. Such a diversionary tactic, as well as the "teamwork" it embodies, are typical of disinformation specialists."

This fashion of word salad is typical of Bjerknes' style. He's not really making any sense,

considering that I had simply stated that when asked Winterberg said he didn't not rely on Bjercknes for the accuracy of his work whether or not he had cited him in one instance was noted by me to be a separate issue. I mentioned that Bjercknes only really brought his name into the fold as an appeal for authority, as if it proved him correct where the facts demonstrably did not.

And for the record, Winterberg does not agree with Bjercknes that his work proves Einstein plagiarized or nostrified Hilbert:

"My analysis of Hilbert's mutilated proofs therefore cannot prove that Einstein copied from Hilbert." (4)

Winterberg recognizes the contribution to GR of Grossman, Hilbert and Einstein. Why would he do that if he agreed with Bjercknes that Einstein plagiarised Hilbert?

Bjercknes goes on to state the following:

"The value of my work and my expertise on the subject of Albert Einstein and the history of the development of the theory of relativity has been gratefully acknowledged by the prominent and innovative physicists Prof. Dr. Friedwardt Winterberg of the University of Nevada, Reno, and Prof. Dr. Anatoly Alexeevich Logunov, former Vice President of the Soviet Academy of Sciences. If I had made the mistakes wrongfully attributed to me on the "Stormfront" message boards, these renowned scientists would not have relied upon me and my work. Prof. Logunov has published several books and articles which discredit the views of this "LionAxe" regarding Einstein and Minkowski's plagiarism of Poincaré's theory of relativity and space-time, some of which appear for free on the internet"

Here he's hinting to Logunov in that the latter is in agreement with Bjercknes that Einstein had plagiarised relativity and space-time in general. Whether or not Bjercknes ment SR specifically, I think he should know that his "supporter" obviously doesn't agree with his take on GR:

"The analysis, undertaken in Sections 1 and 2, shows that Einstein and Hilbert independently discovered the gravitational field equations. Their pathways were different but they led exactly to the same result. Nobody "nostrified" the other. So no "belated decision in the Einstein–Hilbert priority dispute", about which [Corry, Renn, and Stachel] wrote, can be taken. Moreover, the very Einstein–Hilbert dispute never took place.

*All is absolutely clear: both authors made everything to immortalize their names in the title of the gravitational field equations. **But general relativity is Einstein's theory.**" (5)*

In the paper that regards Poincaré more specifically, (6) Logunov offers his arguments on behalf of priority for Poincaré regarding SR. Yet Bjercknes didn't simply tell us that Logunov merely argued the priority of SR belonging to Poincaré, but also that he was in agreement that Einstein and Minkowski plagiarised Poincaré which is a completely different claim and one I haven't seen Logunov make. It's another thing that is typical for Bjercknes: he makes the case of priority interchangeable with plagiarism. Furthermore Logunov's understanding of relativity shows a splinter when he tries to explain the Sagnac Effect and the Twin Paradox with the relativistic

mechanics of Poincaré which did not have room or usage of relativistic corrections (without them, the GPS for example, would not function as it does today, i.e correctly!)

In any case, Bjerknes argued that Winterberg and Logunov agreed with his work which showed Einstein to be a plagiarist. Having checked the work and statements of Bjerknes' given authorities: this is an outright lie. Not only do they not agree with Bjerknes on this but Logunov even stated that GR is Einstein's theory.

Bjerknes: when you're in a hole please stop digging.

"Now on to the self aggrandizing and ridiculous commentary of the Jewish propagandist calling itself "Lionaxe". "Lionaxe" again misrepresents my words by asserting that I stated that Poincare was the first person, among all others, to state the Principle of Relativity (PoR); when in fact I stated that Poincare was the first only between Einstein and Poincare, and that countless others had stated it before Poincare. In fact, I demonstrated through direct quotation that many others had stated the PoR before Poincare in my book Albert Einstein: The Incurable Plagiarist and again in my book The Manufacture and Sale of Saint Einstein (see pp. 1950-1958).

"Lionaxe" then proceeds to misrepresent the PoR as if it were in contradiction to, and incompatible with, Poincare's ether theories. "Lionaxe" falsely claims without proof that "Poincare maintained a preferred inertial frame". In the context of the PoR, this would mean that the inertial frame of the ether of Poincare, presumably the quiescent ether of Lorentz, violated the PoR and could therefore be detected by experiments; in that the laws of this one inertial reference frame differed from those of others, or all others."

Again, it is clear that Bjerknes is not really replying to what I clarified for him in my first rebuttal, regarding the differences between Poincaré's and Einstein's work, which followed after Bjerknes had stated the following:

"Logunov and I have already refuted this "LionAxe's" nonsense. Poincare's PoR is the same as Einstein's plagiarized version."

I explained at some length the very well known and obvious differences between Einstein's and Poincaré's work on relativity. To mention a couple of aspects, Poincaré's paper *"Sur la Dynamique de l'Électron"* (1906), on the Lorentz contraction, deals through dynamic explanations.

However due to Einstein it was established that it is inherently kinematical. Poincaré also implies that the speed of light is isotropic exclusively in a unique frame, as is easily deduced from Lorentz's 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). (7) But yes, Poincaré 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. Poincaré 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. He had pegged down physical importance, meaning to the first effect while clearly negating the second one as a mathematical artifice.

However, while I do not wish to simply repeat all that I wrote in my first retort (which Bjerknes still ignored at equal length in his following replies), I will comment (and probably repeat myself) further on this matter.

Bjerknes denies that Poincaré worked by the premise of a privileged/preferred frame of reference:

"'Lionaxe' quotes Poincare's 1902 critique of Lorentz as if in support of its contentions regarding the PoR. In fact, Poincare was there dismissing aspects of Lorentz' theory, in particular the notion that the ether represents a preferred frame of reference at rest in absolute space. Poincare's theory instead refers to the fixed stars, and/or the ether at rest relative to itself, as inertial reference frames, and Poincare refers to bodies 'fixed' to these frames of reference, resting with respect to them, but Poincare expressly excludes the concepts of absolute space and a preferred reference frame with respect to the laws of mechanics and electrodynamics. The reference frame at rest with respect to the fixed stars is no more or less 'superfluous' to such a Metaphysical PoR than is the ether, and yet it is observed and does not violate it."

Poincaré did indeed continue to believe in the existence of a privileged frame; i.e the immobile aether, and that it was a crucial part as he based his predictions on it. I quoted Poincaré himself as proof of this, which Bjerknes simply ignores. It is clearly documented by what he said in the talk at the 1904 St. Louis Congress of Arts and Science:

"The principle of relativity, according to which the laws of physical phenomena should be the same, whether for an observer fixed, or for an observer carried along in a uniform movement of translation; so that we have not and could not have any means of discerning whether or not we are carried along in such a motion . . .

The most remarkable example of this new mathematical physics is, beyond contradiction, Maxwell's electro-magnetic theory of light. We know nothing of the ether, how its molecules are disposed, whether they attract or repel each other; but we know that this medium transmits at the same time the optical perturbations; we know that this transmission should be made conformably to the general principles of mechanics, and that suffices us for the establishment of the equations of the electromagnetic field . . .

Perhaps, likewise, we should construct a whole new mechanics, of which we only succeed in catching a glimpse, where inertia increasing with the velocity, the velocity of light would become an impassable limit. The ordinary mechanics, more simple, would remain a first approximation, since it would be true for velocities not too great, so that we should still find the old dynamics under the new." (8)

Still stuck on the ether of classical mechanics Poincaré said:

"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." (9)

This paper of Poincaré's; which got published in June 1905, (10) predominantly deals with Lorentz's paper of 1904 both welcoming it and providing corrections. It mused onward about constant external forces applied to deformable electrons in a manner consistent with the obsolete heading of the given aether. And one of Poincaré's hypotheses at the *"La Mécanique Nouvelle"* Göttingen lecture was that a body which is in translatory motion experiences a change of deformation in the direction of motion. So still; after about four years post Einstein's initial paper on this matter, he clearly didn't understand or accept that length contraction was a consequence of Einstein's two postulates. If there was anyone partly lost in his own metaphysical philosophy of science: it was Poincaré.

On the one hand he very often critiqued the stationary ether of classical mechanics, but at the same time was unable to do away with it himself. He continuously brought such a premise into his work and left what ever doubts he had about his own work and others in his philosophical lectures on the metaphysical possibilities, which is where he at times hinted that an ether might one day not be necessary at all. Yet he was never able to remove it himself. His confusion is perhaps best observed in his lecture from 1900: (11) where he stated the need for a stationary ether to; among other things, properly explain aberration. Shortly thereafter he stated that only *"some"* kind of ether was needed. In his paper in 1902: (12) he included the necessity of an ether to do away with absolute rotations.

Einstein completely discarded the aether as he predicted and theorized that the expressions of the laws of physics should be same/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 same footing. This while Poincaré still purported somehow (it wasn't an absolutist belief in ether/aether, but nevertheless his assumptions tells us there was a base premise of it) in an aether. Poincaré didn't manage to physically exclude the aether from his actual work, as he viewed it as the privileged reference-frame wherein *"true"* space and time were defined. Hence the consequence of his work was that the speed of light wasn't the same in all inertial frames regardless of his metaphysical rhetoric elsewhere.

In the first page of his paper *"Sur la dynamique de l'électron"*, he expresses the relativity principle as follows, noted by Levy in 1996 :

"It appears that the impossibility of observing the absolute motion of the Earth is a general law of nature. We are naturally led to assume this law which we will refer to as the Relativity postulate." (13)

At the end of the 7th chapter; speaking of the Fitzgerald-Lorentz contraction (real and not reciprocal), he affirms:

"Therefore, the hypothesis of Lorentz (contraction) is the only one which is compatible with the impossibility of bringing the absolute inertial frame to the fore."

So it is clear that for Poincaré absolute motion existed. Besides the Lorentz contraction implies this absolute motion. Indeed; if a rod really contracts when it passes from one inertial frame to another, it is because there is a hierarchy between the different inertial frames (and not an equivalence). And therefore, the theory of Poincaré tries to reconcile two incompatible notions: the relativity principle on the one hand and the existence of a preferred inertial frame on the other hand.

Poincaré did not manage to derive aberration constant from PoR and certainly not prior to 1906. Einstein did in his first relativity-paper however. So Bjerknes is thoroughly confused about the origins and contemporary signification of relativity and spacetime physics as well as between local and real time. As Lorentz (who incidentally was one of those most familiar with Poincaré's work and close friend of his) stated:

"I introduced the conception of local time . . . but I never thought that this had anything to do with real time. This real time for me was still represented by the older classical notion of absolute time . . . There existed for me only one true time. I considered my time transformation only as a heuristic working hypothesis. So, the theory of relativity is really solely Einstein's work." (14)

The difference between the relativity theories of Poincaré and Einstein is an objective one in a historical sense, although it also springs from epistemological considerations.

As a relevant note of curiosa: it was Poincaré (and Marie Curie) who sent a letter of recommendation on behalf of Einstein in late 1911 when Einstein applied for a position at his old university (ETH) in Zurich. In the letter written by Poincaré he had the following to say about Einstein:

"Einstein is one of the most original minds that I have known; despite his youth he has already achieved a very honorable rank among the foremost scholars of our time. What we can, above all, admire in him in particular is the facility with which he adapts himself to new concepts and draws all the consequences from them. He does not remain attached to classical principles, and, when presented with a problem in physics, is prompt to envision all the possibilities. This translates itself immediately in his mind by the prediction of new phenomena, which can be verified by experiments.

...

The role of mathematical physics is to ask questions; it is only experience that can answer them. The future will show, more and more, the worth of Einstein, and the university which is able to capture this young master is certain to gain much honor from this operation." (15)

One of the more fundamental differences between Poincaré's theory and Einstein's concerns the form of a light-pulse for observers at rest and observers in motion. For Poincaré a light-pulse that

is spherical for an observer at rest with respect to the ether is actually an elongated ellipsoid for all other observers in inertial motion. For Einstein; on the other hand, a spherical light-pulse actually has a spherical form for all inertial observers. And from that you get quite notable differences of definitions with the predictions.

Another difference; concerning the years that went on as Poincaré and Einstein continued their work on relativity, was the choice of space-time. Now one of the consequences of using the convention of either Minkowski or Galilei space-time comes from the fact that the geometry of phenomenal space is set by this choice and the spatial geometry in both of the given space-times is that of Euclid. Poincaré knew of this problem, but he didn't understand that his roots in pre-relativist physics guided him erroneously. He began with the choice of the wrong space-time for his work.

Poincaré did not feel his own approach, which involves the adoption of Galilei space-time, to be less promising in 1912 than the Einstein-Minkowski alternative, which involves the adoption of Minkowski spacetime. Since Einstein's general relativity (1915) is incompatible with Galilei space-time and compatible with Minkowski spacetime (as the tangent space, valid for any infinitesimal patch of curved spacetime): Poincaré (in retrospect) chose his spacetime unwisely.

He tried to preserve too much of the old and therefore he did not manage to formulate a complete theory; or even successfully show the physical revelation, behind doing away with the ether, not even when his own work showed that it was unobservable. This is why he; in his Palermo paper, talked about spherical electrons without explicitly mentioning time dilation.

As Darrigol wrote on Poincaré's actual work (not metaphysical pondering of all possibilities):

"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 etherbound Frame." (16)

Let's continue with Bjerknes comments:

"Since we wish to discuss the science, the Physics, as opposed to the Metaphysics of Poincaré and Einstein, then we must state that inertial reference frames do not exist in nature. In order to arrive at a physical theory, rather than a Metaphysical definition, Poincaré was obliged to define that which constitutes a frame of reference. As was customary, and as Einstein has repeatedly done, Poincaré referred to the fixed stars and to the ether. Both Einstein and his

friends, including Pauli, referred to Lorentz' ether as the basis of Special Relativity, as I have long ago proven (see The Manufacture and Sale of Saint Einstein, pp.1958-1967). "

Inertial reference frames do not exist in nature?!

The only sense I can make of this confused word salad is that reference frames (inertial or not) are obviously concepts not physical things. Why Bjerknes felt compelled to point it out in a debate on theoretical physics is beyond me though. Furthermore, even if we confine ourselves to just inertial reference frames, then you still don't need to refer to the stars (or the ether: even if it existed) to handle Newtonian mechanics: since a frame is inertial if Newton's 2nd law applies. The only insufficiency comes from trying to reconcile Newtonian mechanics and Galilean relativity with Maxwell's equations. The problem is that Maxwell's equations appear to require a unique reference frame, but that still wouldn't make otherwise inertial frames non-inertial. It is the search for a unique reference frame, not an inertial one, which notably occupied the minds of those searching for a classical ether.

"Einstein's 1905 paper, plagiarized from Poincare, is based not upon absolute Minkowski Space-Time (a physically contradicted delusion), nor upon Einstein's 1920 statement that a state of rest, a given specific set of coordinates of space representing the vacuum, cannot be assigned to the ether, but is instead premised upon Lorentz' quiescent ether; and Einstein's 1905 paper specifically refers to "rest" and "resting coordinates" as opposed to "motion" and "moving systems" of coordinates, just as did Poincare's and Lorentz' and Larmor's prior works."

Most of the above babbling has been addressed thoroughly in my previous replies to Bjerknes, which he has yet again failed to counter on-point. Not surprisingly Bjerknes is wrong yet again to imply that Einstein was essentially referring to an ether when he mentions *"resting coordinates"*, because Einstein made it clear he was not talking about an ether. Resting coordinates are simply an arbitrary choice of resting frame for a given observer with no implication of an ether whatsoever. Einstein was perhaps the first to at least demonstrate (i.e show through the use of the scientific method) that the ether; if it exists, is essentially physically undetectable at least in the context of the flat space of SR (rather than simply suspecting possibilities of it being undetectable thorough philosophical musings).

"Here again it is shown that Einstein's theory is a subset of Poincare's in that Poincare renders the PoR a scientific as well as a Metaphysical principle, and Einstein merely parrots the Metaphysical content of the principle. Though there were different methods of defining an inertial frame of reference, for example Ludwig Lange's, the method most likely to be understood at the time was to make reference to either a quiescent ether or the fixed stars."

And yet more nonsense. Once again: this defines a unique reference frame not simply an inertial reference frame. The whole point about inertial reference frames is that they are not unique, but that the laws of physics are nonetheless still the same.

"Space-Time" is a Metaphysical concept, one Einstein initially opposed. As Prof. Winterberg has correctly stated, "Space-Time" has never been measured in a laboratory, is physically contradicted, and all laboratories are three dimensional."

And yet... *"Pair of Aluminum Atomic Clocks Reveal Einstein's Relativity at a Personal Scale".*
(17)

Bjerknes is now shifting to an attempt to debunk space-time in general. One can object all one wants to about the words used to describe general relativity. But what ultimately matters is the mathematics, because the mathematics is what makes the predictions and the mathematics works. It makes predictions which experiments verify and no competing theory has been able to duplicate all those verified predictions. Furthermore: no experiments have produced results which contradict the predictions of general relativity either.

"Einstein's ether of 1920 is a Metaphysical and numerological delusion, not a scientific theory, on that point I will agree with the necessary conclusions to be drawn from the sophistry of the Jewish propagandist "Lionaxe.""

The expected; but sad, thing is that Bjerknes, while putting much effort into writing sensationalistic material on relativity doesn't have a basic understanding of it. On this one I'm going to quote myself from the second rebuttal I made to Bjerknes:

"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.

And concerning the "necessity of the Ether" argument above, Bjerknes sidesteps the entire problematic features of preferred inertial frames during the Poincaré/Lorentz era (and all of the given arguments demonstrating Bjerknes claims to be incorrect) with something completely different and having an equally different domain of application when Einstein later used the word "ether". It was indeed around 1920, presumably in response to his personal friendship and admiration for Lorentz, where Einstein began to use the word "ether" in his writings. But it referred to the metric field of general relativity."

It was not in any sense a privileged frame of reference, it was simply a referral to the metric field of GR.

"So there you have it, the Jewish propagandist "Lionaxe" is proven wrong on each and every point related to Einstein's plagiarism."

Ironically: this is stated by Bjerknes after he has ignored nearly all the corrections to his assumptions and assertions that I offered in my previous rebuttals and after he had only revisited a precious few (albeit misrepresented what I had effectively clarified in the process). His own sources do not agree with him, his grasp of science is all but non-existent and he has once again failed not only to refute my previous replies point-by-point (he ignored pretty much all of them) but to even refute even a single given point.

References

- (1) <http://semiticcontroversies.blogspot.com/2009/01/christopher-jon-bjerknes-debacle.html>
- (2) <http://semiticcontroversies.blogspot.com/2009/02/christopher-jon-bjerkens-debacle-part-2.html>
- (3) <http://www.jewishracism.blogspot.com/> (date on the article is Friday, October 29, 2010)
- (4) http://www.theregister.co.uk/2004/11/15/einstein_relativity/
- (5) "How were the Hilbert-Einstein equations discovered?" - Phys.Usp. 47 (2004) 607-621; Usp.Fiz.Nauk 174 (2004) 663-678 (<http://arxiv.org/abs/physics/0405075>)
- (6) "Henri Poincare and Relativity Theory" - A.A Logunov. M.: Nauka, 2005. (Translated by G. Pontecorvo and V.O. Soloviev. Edited by V.A. Petrov) (<http://arxiv.org/abs/physics/0408077>)
- (7) Russell McCormach, 1970, "H. A. Lorentz and the Electromagnetic View of Nature", Isis, Vol. 61, No. 4
- (8) H. Poincaré, "The Principles of Mathematical Physics", St. Louis Congress, 1904, Ref. ["Physics for a New Century". Papers presented at the 1904 St. Louis Congress, a compilation selected by Katherine R. Sopka, Tomash Publishers, American Institute of Physics, 1986.] p. 281.
- (9) H. Poincaré, 1968, "La science et l'hypothèse", chapter 10 of the french edition, "Les théories de la physique moderne", Champs, Flammarion.
- (10) H. Poincaré, "Sur la dynamique de l'électron", Compt. Rend. Acad. Sci. 140, 1904 (1915).
- (11) Poincaré, H. (1900a) "Sur les relations entre la physique expérimentale et la physique mathématique," Revue générale des sciences pures et appliquées, 21, pp 1163.
- (12) Poincaré, H. (1902) "La science et l'hypothèse" (Paris: Flammarion); revised edition 1968. Based on the one edited by Gustave Le Bon, 1917.
- (13) J. Levy, "Basic concepts for a fundamental aether theory", in "Ether space-time and cosmology", Vol. 1, Michael Duffy and Joseph Levy, Editors and ArXiv Physics/0604207.
- (14) Quoted in: J. Mehra, "The Historical Origin of the Special Theory of Relativity" in "The Golden Age of Theoretical Physics", Vol. 1, World Scientific, Singapore 2001, p. 226.
- (15) Carl Seelig, 1956, "Albert Einstein : A Documentary Biography", Staples Press: London
- (16) Oliver Darrigol, 2004, "The Mystery of the Einstein-Poincaré Connection", <http://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/pdf/10.1086/430652>
- (17) http://www.nist.gov/public_affairs/releases/aluminum-atomic-clock_092310.cfm

The Socialist History Society does Auschwitz

Wednesday, 24 November 2010

I have written several articles pointing out firstly the significant over-representation of jews in the Socialist History Society and secondly the fact that jews regularly get a mention (and a sob story or two) in the 'Socialist History Society Newsletter'. In the issue for October 2010 we find yet another mention in the article on pages 8 to 10 entitled 'Searching for Albert!' by the jew David Horsley. Horsley reveals himself to be a member of the bandit tribe by boldly declaring on page 8 that his mother; Judith Salinger, was jewish. Horsley does not mention whether his father also happened to be blessed with Yahweh's holy ichor, but in halakhah Horsley would be indisputably considered to be a full member of Israel (i.e. biologically jewish and therefore an

Israelite) irrespective of his father's origins.

This is of interest to us in that it confirms previous suggestions I have made that the tribe is also heavily overrepresented in the membership of the SHS as well as in its officers if we are to judge by the last several issues of the Socialist History Society Newsletter, which have revealed at least one different Jew (and often more) to be a prominent member; or supporter, of the SHS per issue.

The article itself is largely a personal narrative of Horsley's search for his grandfather's; one Albert Salinger, grave and the '*truth*' about how Albert spent his last years in the Third Reich (he died on the 8th of December 1941 in Berlin and was buried in the Jewish cemetery there [and no the gravestones weren't made into a road a-la '*Schindler's List*'). Horsley is rather puzzled when he comes across something of a contradiction to the established account in that he does not understand why a Jew should have been allowed to have been buried in a Jewish graveyard without harassment and that graveyard to have survived the alleged attempt by the Third Reich; with the SS as the supposed executors, to wipe out Jewry.

Horsley also notes an interesting fact that he discovered in his research on page 9 in so far as: '*the Nazis kept that cemetery and a Jewish hospital open all through the war years*'. This seems to have caused some discomfort to Horsley who had previously believed that the Jews had just been hauled off en-masse to Auschwitz and gassed without much ceremony. After all why on earth would you keep two such institutions going; which would inevitably consume large amounts of precious scarce resources, in the war years if there weren't substantial numbers of Jews in Berlin to use the facilities?

Horsley solves this intellectual mid-life crisis by simply pretending it doesn't exist and implies that it was all a conspiracy on the part of the nasty Nazis to deceive the Jews so they could gas them and goes on to compare the policies of the Third Reich to that more common Marxist *bête-noire*: Apartheid. In an attempt to nod to the established orthodox rigmarole of '*survivor accounts*' Horsley declares that his mother; Judith, didn't want to talk about the '*holocaust*' because her mother; who remains nameless throughout, was '*gassed*' at Auschwitz. How Horsley knows this is uncertain, but we may assume it is just assumption based on popular perceptions of the '*holocaust*'. However this nod to orthodoxy doesn't stop Horsley's underlying surprise and apparent doubts at having been effectively lied to about the fate of Berlin Jewry by his teachers coming across to the reader.

We cannot help but left wondering if Horsley is going to say the Kaddish *ahar Hakk'vura* (the mourning/burial prayer) over his grandfather's grave or whether he is going to declare that Alfred was an example of Kiddush Hashem (a Jewish martyr)...

Pliny the Younger, the Christians and the Jews

Sunday, 5 December 2010

Gaius Plinius Caecilius Secundus; better known to history as Pliny the Younger, is one of the most controversial of the voices of classical antiquity that have come down to us through the

mists of time. Like his uncle; Pliny the Elder, Pliny the Younger has largely been neglected by anti-Semites because his references to jews are small in number and are only oblique in so far as Pliny never refers to jews directly but rather refers to Christians who must necessarily have included a great number of jews at this time in Rome. (1) This might upset those who believe that Christianity is a pure Aryan religion, but we must understand and accept that the evidence is against such a fanciful interpretation of early Christian ethnology. (2)

If we understand and accept this; as opposed to resorting to verbal gesticulation to try to drive the evidence back into a dark cave because it contradicts a favourite myth, then we have to conclude that Pliny's comments on the Christians are largely directed against Christianity as a jewish sect and not as a separate religion per se (as then there was little real distinction between the two groups other than one thought the Messiah had turned up while the others argued he hadn't). Thus to Pliny the Christians would have been a sub-sect of Judaism and like the humorous attacks on Christianity by other pagan writers; such as Celsus, the prevailing view of jews that Pliny must have held would have been one of a dangerous and subversive cult that held laughable religious sentiments in which light Celsus also regarded them. (3)

There is some controversy over Pliny's statements concerning the Christians in that they maybe later Christian interpolations as has been argued by for and against by different scholars. However we shall lay this aside as inconclusive as both cases are reasonable and although this author believes that the statements of Pliny are likely later Christian interpolations: we will assume for the sack of argument that they are completely genuine.

Pliny's only references to the jews through the medium of commenting on the Christians may be found in the tenth book of his letters (sometimes called the '*Letters to Trajan*'). Pliny begins by noting that he himself had not; at that point, been present at; i.e. participated in, trials of Christians and hence is unsure of the exact details of the crimes committed by the Christians. However Pliny's description of the issue does indicate that Christianity was regarded as a political offence as he states:

'And I have been not a little hesitant as to whether there should be any distinction on account of age or no difference between the very young and the more mature; whether pardon is to be granted for repentance, or, if a man has once been a Christian, it does him no good to have ceased to be one; whether the name itself, even without offences, or only the offences associated with the name are to be punished.' (4)

This indicates to us that Christianity; and by association the jews, was regarded by Pliny as a subversive group who stood at odds with what it meant to be Roman and who were actively engaged in undermining the Roman state in much the same way as a criminal who breaks the law seeks; implicitly or explicitly, to undermine the state by undermining the rule of law. In Rome; of course, to undermine the Imperial cult by not sacrificing to the Emperor's image; which Pliny later makes explicit reference to, was tantamount to disputing the power of the Emperor himself: this seems to be much of the substance behind the political crimes of Christians. Although it may be conjectured that the belief that '*every man was created equal before the sight of God*'; which formed part of Christian belief then as now, was regarded as an explicit attempt to topple those in power in much the same way as Marxism later attempted to rally the '*international working*

class’ to create a new state not unlike that explicitly formulated by many later Christian thinkers such as Sir Thomas More in his *‘Utopia’*.

In essence then Pliny is informing us that the Christians; and by extension the jews, were a politically subversive group who the Roman authorities; rightly or wrong, viewed as engaging in an active conspiracy to destroy Rome itself by their vulgar and absurd claims. We can easily see how such a viewpoint could be formed in so far as if one believes that an omnipotent single deity created the world and rules the universe and more importantly that this deity demands that you actively oppose any and all other Gods and Goddesses then it can only be the case that the followers of this deity will; at any given time, seek to subvert a situation unfavourable to their objectives derived from their beliefs.

It is a testament to how subversive and potentially dangerous Christianity; and the jews, were thought of by Pliny that he asserts that if someone professes to be a Christian and will not recant then the death penalty is called for (which Trajan then endorses). (5) As to leave such subversive individuals alive is to invite the potential downfall of the state and Pliny; as the representative of the Emperor Trajan, could not reasonably allow this without either neglecting his duty or committing treason himself. We may particularly note Pliny’s implicit urging of Trajan to take action *‘for the contagion of this superstition has spread not only to the cities but also to the villages and farms. But it seems possible to check and cure it.’* (6)

What is also noteworthy is that Pliny implies that the Christians took many; or certainly a significant proportion, of their converts from amongst slaves and the lower classes of society i.e. those with a vested interest in believing themselves to be superior to the existing order and/or with little else to lose. When we add into this the manifest; and logical, Roman fear of slave revolts within Rome itself, which the memory of Spartacus must have done much to heighten, then it is not hard to see why jews; professing Christianity, to the lower strata of Roman society must have seemed so potentially dangerous and subversive. Pliny; we may however credit, with some scepticism regarding the validity of a jewish-organised Christian conspiracy against the Roman empire as he seems; after torturing two slave girls who were Christian Deaconesses, to have been convinced that the only thing Christians were generally guilty of was an inherent gullibility that was; and is now, generally credited by those in power to the ‘other half’ of the population often referred to as the *‘masses’*.

That said Pliny regards it was quite possible; and even probable, that the *‘masses’* will be cured of their belief in Christianity and that a spiritual revival in Roman religion will take place. He also optimistically asserts that the people are already coming back to the temples and making their sacrifices. Pliny was; of course, incorrect in his assessment, but we cannot ignore the fact that Pliny regarded the jews of antiquity; through the medium of their preaching Christianity to the nadir of Roman society, as political and religious subversives and proposed harsh measures for dealing with them.

We can only sound a note of regret that Pliny’s implicit advice to Trajan was not more widely heeded and even completely discarded in time.

References

(1) For example see Harry Leon, 1960, *'The Jews of Ancient Rome'*, 1st Edition, The Jewish Publication Society of America: Philadelphia.

(2) It should be understood that I am not suggesting that Christianity is not the most likely candidate for the official religion of a racist state, but that in its early forms: those who believed in, defended and propagated it were largely jews and their Semitic kin. In this we can point to the fact that Stoicism had a similar lineage in that it first originated and was propagated by Semites and then taken over (and appropriately modified) to become a religion of the West.

(3) Celsus, Trans: R. Joseph Hoffmann, 1987, *'On the True Doctrine: A Discourse against the Christians'*, 1st Edition, Oxford University Press: New York

(4) Plin. (Y) Tra. 96

(5) Plin. (Y) Tra. 97

(6) Plin. (Y) Tra. 96