

# Why Semitic Controversies Was Created

By Karl Radl

July 27, 2008

<http://semiticcontroversies.blogspot.com/2008/07/why-semitic-controversies-was-created.html>

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

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

This is not to say that some anti-jewish critiques and writings that have appeared over the years have not been without merit and that there have even been some trenchant ones. That have realistically and precisely defined the jewish foe in the light of the knowledge and literature available at that time. However: what has happened since the end of the Second World War is that discourse about the jews has ceased to evolve for all practical purposes and has not changed to suit the times that it is in or changed state of the intellectual landscape that it now has to contend with. In essence: it has stagnated and the assertions it makes about jews have ready-made powerful answers. Jews can, for example, rightly charge that the quotes from the Talmud used by many are either made-up, altered or taken out of context<sup>[1]</sup>.

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

You might argue that it doesn't matter as to meaning, especially when a quote is so lurid as to

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

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

Dilling thus provides us an excellent example of where an argument can seem on the surface to be quite correct but because it is not given any context nor is the reason for a given rabbinical ruling considered it in fact is heavily misconstrued and thus is easy for a Rabbi or anybody who has a knowledge of the rabbinical literature in the context of Jewish history to answer quite conclusively and thus make the person asserting the more outrageous argument (for example the assertion that the Kol Nidre is in essence a blank check for the Jews to do what they will to the Gentiles) look like a sinister liar or a fool who did not check the literature himself before hand. Thus the pro-Jewish literature can then declare the person making the argument to be 'irrational' and 'uneducated'. Using this as back up to their common assertion that 'anti-Jewish prejudice' and 'anti-Semitism' are in fact the products of not knowing enough about Jews and Judaism (as well as based on 'bigoted superstition'). Thus the anti-Jewish argument becomes fodder to the pro-Jewish one, because the anti-Jewish argument has not been checked for factual accuracy and nor has it been subject to considered criticism from other anti-Jewish persons and authors. We

can therefore say that, because of this dynamic of jews using bad anti-jewish arguments to bolster their own argumentation as well as their propaganda depicting the anti-jewish person as some kind of inbred, illiterate moron. That when one makes a bad anti-jewish argument and uses one or more standard anti-jewish canards without checking them then one is actually helping the jewish cause far more than that same person would had they have written a good pro-jewish argument.

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

If you take for example the anti-Zionist arguments: they have been developed rather differently from anti-jewish arguments. They were created using a historical basis and linking in aspects of jewish power around the world and what the Israeli state (and its jewish citizens) have been doing in Palestine and to a lesser extent elsewhere. It grounds its argument in facts, statistics and appropriate testimony, which allows it to then take an intellectually credible position.

Anti-jewish argument must do the same thing, and the only way to do this in our opinion here at Semitic Controversies is to take a surgical knife to anti-jewish arguments and examine what lurks underneath. In doing so we believe we will find, and indeed have found, many anti-jewish arguments based on rotten premises, but we have also discovered some good arguments, often neglected and unused, which deserve intellectual attention.

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

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

Now think about what the pro-jewish authors can do if you put a different spin on these facts and incorporate other facts from across the pro-jewish literature to make the situation not nearly as rosy and wonderful as the pro-jewish authors try to make it. Now what can pro-jewish authors actually do to rebutt, debunk and/or explode your arguments? The answer is simply: not much. All they can do is suggest that your argument is not cogent on interpretative rather than factual grounds. This means that their opportunity for decisive critique is limited and they are forced to

concede to you the status of a valid intellectual position *ipso facto* regardless of whether they openly announce it or not. If you take the arguments that jews have been using to justify their own interpretations for years and offer a different interpretation they cannot do much to you intellectually, or even legally, since all you have done is offer a differing interpretation of the facts that they themselves accept as true.

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

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

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

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

[3] The full text is available at the following address:

<http://www.come-and-hear.com/dilling/dcontents.html>

[4] Dilling's exact argument is available at the following address:

[http://www.come-and-hear.com/dilling/chapt04.html#Kol\\_Nidre](http://www.come-and-hear.com/dilling/chapt04.html#Kol_Nidre)

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

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