

Semitic Controversies

2009 Issue

Edited by Karl Radl

<http://semiticcontroversies.blogspot.com>

Contents

Book Review: Vicomte Léon de Poncins, Undated, [1929], 'Freemasonry and Judaism: Secret Powers behind the Revolution', A & B Books: New York

Responsum to Marc Samberg

A Christopher Jon Bjerknes Debacle: Responsum concerning Albert Einstein

In Brief: The Abuse of Adolf Hitler's Words to Dismiss/Ignore Arguments

Opinion on World Events: The Gaza UN School Incident

Zionism: Friend or Foe? (Part I)

In Brief: The 'Truth' and 'Bias' Assertions

Was Josef Stalin Jewish?

Jews and 9/11: A Response to John Martinson Jr.

A Christopher Jon Bjerknes Debacle (Part 2)

In Brief: Some Background Notes on Revilo Oliver's Articles

The Kosher Food Tax: Fact or Fiction?

Zionism: Friend or Foe? (Part II)

A Change to the Posting and Format of Semitic Controversies

Semitic Controversies (Volume 1, Number 1 [Part I])

Editor's Foreword

News Headlines: Former AIG Chairman Maurice ‘Hank’ Greenberg sues the American Taxpayer

Obama Administration gives 1 billion dollars to Jewish Charities

National News: Bernard Madoff’s Accountant on Fraud Charge

Head of American Jewish Committee libels the United States

Anti-Defamation League attacks Sheriff who is accused of anti-Immigrant Bias

Political News: The Lobby Falts by John Mearsheimer

Business News: Madoff’s Former Clients to get IRS Assistance

Ex-KB Home CEO on Fraud Charge

Agriprocessors owners maintain they are the victims of ‘anti-Semitic conspiracy’

Mortgage Broker in 216 Million Dollar Fraud

Crime in the News: Hasid in New York Rape and Child Pornography case given Lenient Sentence

News from Israel: The Israeli Elections

Moshe Katsav and the Rape of Tel Aviv

American Peace Activist Critical after being Shot by Israeli Troops

The Modesty Police: in Iran? No: in Israel.

Head of International Women Trafficking Ring sought in Tel Aviv

A Senior Rabbi demands the Pope removes his Crucifix at the Western Wall

A Little Humour: The NJDC’s Latest Advert of the 19th of March 2009

Entertainment News: Bob Dylan’s Objectionable Odour

Lindsey Lohan and the Results of Homosexuality

Amy Winehouse on yet another Assault Charge

Notes

Semitic Controversies (Volume 1, Number 1 [Part II])

Our First Issue

A Critical Look at Jewish Law: Legal Inequality between Jews and Gentiles

The Mind of Reva Mann: An Analysis of a Jewish Mind

Denying Historical Debate

Book Reviews: Alan Steinweis Debunks Himself

Notes

Book Review: Vicomte Léon de Poncins, Undated, [1929], ‘Freemasonry and Judaism: Secret Powers behind the Revolution’, A & B Books: New York

Monday, 5 January 2009

Vicomte Léon de Poncins is a name well known in Catholic, anti-Freemasonic and anti-Semitic circles for his numerous, and often quite courageous, works on what he saw as the secret forces that were seeking to subvert society in his day and historically. His work is often cited as a reference by contemporary would-be anti-Semites, as well as serial conspiracy theorists, such as David Duke and Jeff Rense when they make assertions concerning Jews in history and in contemporary times. Four of de Poncins' many books have been translated into English and are often sold in English language nationalist and/or anti-Semitic bookshops. These are: *‘Judaism and the Vatican’*[1], *‘Freemasonry and the Vatican’*[2], *‘State Secrets’*[3] and *‘Freemasonry and Judaism’*. It is important to review the two most of important of these[4], of which the book of primary importance is *‘Freemasonry and Judaism’* since this is the one most cited by these would-be anti-Semites.

‘Freemasonry and Judaism: The Secret Powers behind the Revolution’[5] is an English language edition[6] of de Poncins' 1928 book, *‘Les Forces secrètes de la Révolution’*[7], and the publishing house ‘A & B Books’ is aligned with negro nationalism. Also indicating the steady popularity of de Poncins work over racial boundaries and between the various different racial nationalist movements that exist at present and the very real necessity to review de Poncins' work in the light of what is known today rather than what de Poncins would have known at the time of *‘Freemasonry and Judaism’s’* original writing. That said it would be out of the scope of this review to carefully analyze each and every assertion de Poncins' makes and the evidence on which he bases these assertions. Hence we will discuss the general thesis, the component parts and some of the more important specific arguments of *‘Freemasonry and Judaism’*.

The thrust of *‘Freemasonry and Judaism’* is quite a simple one in that Poncins as he himself states in his foreword as follows:

‘The aim of this work is not to produce new unpublished evidence but to set out and summarize the whole question for a reader who is supposed to be ignorant of this subject.’[8]

Therefore it should become apparent to the reader that de Poncins' is writing for those without expertise in the intricate questions that he is addressing: the influence, or lack, of Freemasonry and/or Judaism in world affairs and more precisely how these factor into the revolutionary climate and activities that were prevalent both at the time that de Poncins was writing and for the decades up to and including that of his death in the 1970s. Thus if we see individuals citing de Poncins as an authority for some fact or another then we must tread carefully with this assertion for as de Poncins tells us in the above passage. He is not writing a precise work, but rather generalising and writing for the interest of the lay reader rather than a researcher on the subject. If a researcher on the subject was to cite *‘Freemasonry and Judaism’* as an authority for some fact or another then they we must suggest that they are to be found wanting[9].

This isn't to say that *‘Freemasonry and Judaism’* is without value, but rather that it is not meant

as a work for citation for the researcher (i.e. acting as proof as itself), but rather as a general introduction to the subject. For a more in depth conception of what de Poncins' argues it is necessary to read his many books in the original French since although he wrote many general introductions he also researched and wrote several works based on original research that included far more extensive, and sometimes original, documentation and in-depth discussion than he produced in his general books. For de Poncins, as I suspect he would himself readily admit, was a populariser of political and literary concepts in the best journalistic tradition. This is demonstrated very quickly in *'Freemasonry and Judaism'* since de Poncins uses only a few sources (and cites them frequently), but these sources are in-depth discussions of the subject and as de Poncins himself correctly notes: they do disagree with each other on many specific points as well as the general theory. So, in a commendable show of relative objectivity, de Poncins offers the reader the logic of the differing schools of thought, citing the authors on either side, and suggests that the reader decide for themselves what they think is the case (which we will discuss below).

De Poncins cites a variety of now relatively rare learned French and German language works[10], usually by members of the Catholic clergy and often also members of monastic orders, concerning the Freemasonic conspiracy against civilisation: whom the literature, and de Poncins in his turn, argues are revolutionary by their very nature and wish to substitute Godly order, as represented by de Poncins in the Catholic Church[11], with an atheistic rationalistic conception of the world, which would be literally revolutionary in terms of the established norms and forms of the world, especially to a ardently Catholic aristocratic conservative like de Poncins. This conception of Freemasonry as being revolutionary and of its centrality to the major revolutions in Europe is not unique to de Poncins, but rather was, as I have said, a common feature of conservative, usually Christian, discourse on history and the forces that opposed conservatism/revolutionary conservatism.

The particular revolution that Freemasonry is most identified with is the French revolution in 1789, in which it is contended, not unreasonably, that the Jacobins and the other radicals were associated with Freemasonic sects, sometimes argued to be the Illuminati of Adam Weishaupt [12] and Count Adolph Knigge[13]. De Poncins, like his conservative contemporaries, takes this argument further and suggests that because Freemasonry wishes to abolish religion, particularly Christianity, and seek a foundation of a new 'rational'[14] and essentially atheistic society. That you can make a direct connexion between the forces that de Poncins argues were behind both the French revolution of 1789 and the forces that were behind the Bolshevik and Marxist revolutions from 1917-1919. In particular de Poncins cites several sources, which allege that Béla Kohn[15], a leading figure in the communist take-over in Hungary[16], and other leading communists and socialists involved in the take-over were members of Freemasonic lodges in Hungary and in fact planned the take-over of Hungary in these lodges.

I cannot find any evidence of this being the case outside of de Poncins' work[17] and the anti-Semitic/anti-communist literature in general, but it is of note that the Hungarian government after the overthrow of the communist coup did outlaw Freemasonry and seize its documents in relation to the communist coup. This means that the Hungarian government, whether it was correct or incorrect in this belief, certainly believed that Freemasonry was involved with the communist party in some way.

However de Poncins does not note that his earlier citations[18] as to the support of the Freemasons lodges for the new communist government may have been in fact the reason for such suppression, rather than the Masonic lodges having been the origin of the communist take-over as it suggested by Jouin who de Poncins quotes. Hence even with this knowledge and the citations de Poncins makes from Jouin's book we cannot substantiate or dispose of this accusation, but rather must we leave it as an avenue for further specialist research.

The citation of Jouin's work in general, and in the case of the Hungarian communist coup of 1919 in particular, is the logical bridge that de Poncins uses to combine his arguments concerning Freemasonry being a revolutionary force with his other fundamental argument, which dominates the second section of '*Freemasonry and Judaism*', that the jews are, like Freemasonry (and in fact dominate, or are allied with, it), a revolutionary force. The particular bridge offered in the case of the Hungarian communist coup is the assertion that 90% of Freemasons in Hungary were jews. Now certainly while the communist coup of 1919 had a significant amount of jews in its higher echelons, and can be argued to be one of the most jewish-dominated of the communist revolutions/coups, there seems to be no actual evidence of the percentage of Hungarian Freemasons who were jews or of partial jewish ancestry[19] and the assertion of 90 percent seems perhaps a little too high: although in the absence of evidence to the contrary we must suspend judgment of his argument until conclusive evidence, which supports, partially supports or disposes of this assertion can be located. Hence we cannot assert that de Poncins is right or not, but it does seem that some of the figures he is citing in his arguments are perhaps a little unrealistic or unbelievable to contemporary scholarship (although they were a common occurrence in political and intellectual discourse at the time both Jouin and de Poncins were writing).

De Poncins then stops to consider an important question of which revolutionary force, given in de Poncins' thesis that they are working together, is the primary issue. His discussions on this point are brief[20] but to the point. De Poncins correctly summarizes that there were, and are, two major different schools of thought[21] in terms of the relationship between Freemasonry and the jews. De Poncins also usefully informs us, which of the major authors he cites advocate which theory. These are put quite simply in de Poncins' own words:

'That the Jews have entirely created masonry in order to corrupt the nations of Christian civilisation and to propagate behind this veil the general revolution which is to bring about the domination of Israel. It is simply a tool and a means in the hands of the Jews.'[22]

And:

'Freemasonry was a good and sound institution in principle, but revolutionary agitators, principally Jews, taking advantage of its organization as a secret society, penetrated it little by little.

They have corrupted it and turned it from its moral and philanthropic aim in order to employ it for revolutionary purposes.'[23]

It is certainly praiseworthy that de Poncins mentions these different theories and doesn't try to direct his reader along one of the two major theories (although he makes it known that he personally favours the second), but rather suggests that the reader make up his or her own mind concerning, which theory best suits the facts of the situation as they are known to them.

In terms of the two theories there is a problem with both of them in that they assume that jewish power is by nature conspiratorial rather than a result of the jewish racial condition[24]. This presumption was a very common one at the time of de Poncins (and the authors he cites) time of writing[25] and again we cannot blame de Poncins, or the authors he cites, for it. However crucially this perspective misses out that jews are not a conspiracy in the traditional Aryan/Slavic conceptions of it, but rather are a series of extremely egoistic individuals with considerable inferiority complexes who identify their fellow jews/jewesses with the relevant parent and hence feel they desperately have to do the best for/protect their kin (asking and answering the question: what is best for jews, as a substitute for the question: what is best for my jewish mother and father).

This is what I argue is the truth of the jewish question and we can see how these two theories fall down in the light of this, because they presume that the jews have consciously manipulated Freemasonry into being revolutionary in character, but yet if what de Poncins argues earlier in '*Freemasonry and Judaism*' is true, i.e. that Freemasonry is by its general character revolutionary, because it is rationalistic and atheistic, then it cannot have been consciously manipulated by jews.

The non-revolutionary character of English freemasonry, as argued by Nesta Webster among others,[26] is hence easily explained by de Poncins' own earlier clarification that Freemasonry, became politicised as the 18th century wore on. Therefore we may argue reasonably that actually continental Freemasonry became politicized and English Freemasonry did not.

There is little reason to suppose jews were actively involved in this politicization either considering that England and later Great Britain was living in a time of great increasing jewish power within its borders[27] and especially among its merchants who would have been drawn to revolutionary rationalistic movements far more than aristocrats who had no bars to their social mobility (which Freemasonry if it became politicised could potentially sweep away).

If the first thesis, that Freemasonry is the creation of the jews, is true then we come on the problem of a lack of evidence for early jewish involvement in Freemasonry and indeed the Masonic constitution of the Grand Lodge, the first Masonic institution, in 1717 seems to have involved very few jews since it was the brainchild of Jean Desaguliers rather than a jewish or pre-dominantly jewish cabal. Although it has been argued that there is a '*Hebrew Manuscript*', of one '*Joseph Levy*', which Desaguliers allegedly stole and then became the '*Father of Modern Masonry*' with[28]. I have not seen any substantial evidence for this accusation although this assertion of Freemasonry's jewish origins remains both unproven and un-refuted until conclusive evidence is brought forth to prove, partially prove or disprove the assertion.

This thesis also encounters the problem that it takes the claims of the Masons themselves, that they were and are descended from the traditions of original Hebrews, at face value, rather than

looking at their claims in context of the need in a secret society to create a mythos for that society to act as the social adhesive between the members of the fraternity. There were of course fairly few mystical traditions to draw on 1717 in comparison with the many different traditions, often created from whole cloth, that are propounded today. It is thus far more rational to presume that the Masonic tradition was created precisely to create this mythos to service as a social adhesive, rather than to assume that the Masons are a predominately jewish organisation created by jews who we should believe are telling their truth about their jewish origins. For why, if it is a jewish secret society, would Freemasonry claim to be descended from the Hebrews of the Bible? Surely if it were a jewish revolutionary organisation it would seek to distance itself from its jewish heritage and select an Aryan tradition, such as the Greek Gods and Goddesses for example, to create its mythos out of.

Although we can't, as in the former case, dismiss this thesis entirely due to a lack of substantial evidence to prove, partially prove or disprove it. We can however suggest that it seems unlikely given what is known about Freemasonry and how jews would likely operate as a conspiracy if they operated as such.

Hence although '*Freemasonry and Judaism*' is a very interesting book and was in its time both factually arguable and timely: it has not aged well due to more information now being available from better sources than de Poncins, and those he cites, had at their disposal. Its focus on the combination of Freemasonry and the jews as the twin arms of a great conspiracy against Christian civilisation is perhaps its downfall in that during the Second World War. Freemasonry, which we should not simply dismiss, as the religiously skeptical do, as a force in world politics, was all, but destroyed as a political force by the Reich Security Main Office, and laudably so, who rounded up the members of the Masonic fraternities and confiscated their possessions and written records. Hence the conception of the Freemasons and jews as the twin arms of a conspiracy that de Poncins argues, while cogent at the time of writing, is not useful in today's world where Freemasonry has been relegated to a decaying club that is desperately trying to regain its former power and glory.

'*Freemasonry and Judaism*' also, unfortunately, as a work tends to take focus off of the jewish question and split it, necessarily, between the two agencies that de Poncins terms '*secret powers behind the Revolution*'. Hence to the reader today it might seem to indicate that they should concern themselves with both Freemasonry and jews: this inevitably leads some otherwise intellectually honest individuals into the highways and byways of the lunatic literature accusing the nebulous and ephemeral '*Illuminati*' of complicity in all, or most of, the wrongs of the world as they perceive them.

The focus on jews must be maintained for although they are certainly not the whole cause of all ills in the world: they are, I would argue, often directly and/or indirectly involved in producing them due to their need, both in terms of secular and religious jews, to '*repair the world*'. If we dissipate research into other power blocs, real or imagined, that are already well-covered then it weakens our research effort to cognitively understand and map the jewish question today as well as historically. This is important for without this research effort modern anti-Semitic propaganda and intellectual work will not come to the fore and anti-Semitism will stay in its comfort zone of 19th and early 20th century anti-Semitic cognitive frameworks and understanding. Therefore

anti-Semitism will remain ineffective and a fringe intellectual movement and no serious anti-Semite can possibly wish this: can they?

[1] Vicomte Léon de Poncins, Trans: Timothy Tindal-Robertson, 1967, '*Judaism and the Vatican: An Attempt at Spiritual Subversion*', 1st Edition, The Britons: London.

[2] Vicomte Léon de Poncins, Trans: Timothy Tindal-Robertson, 1968, '*Freemasonry and the Vatican: A Struggle for Recognition*', 1st Edition, The Britons: London.

[3] Vicomte Léon de Poncins, Trans: Timothy Tindal-Robertson, 1988, '*State Secrets: A Documentation of the Secret Revolutionary Mainspring Governing Anglo-American Politics*', 2nd Edition, The Britons: London.

[4] The two most important for anti-Semites are, of course, '*Freemasonry and Judaism*' and '*Judaism and the Vatican*', but the later is barely known and rarely cited today. While the former is well known and often cited today by anti-Semites.

[5] Léon de Poncins, Trans: Anon., Undated, [1929], '*Freemasonry and Judaism: Secret Powers behind the Revolution*', 1st Edition, A & B Books: New York.

[6] Timothy Tindal-Robertson is the translator of '*State Secrets*', '*Freemasonry and the Vatican*' and '*Judaism and the Vatican*' into English, but the original translation of '*The Secret Powers behind the Revolution*', which became '*Freemasonry and Judaism: The Secret Powers behind the Revolution*' was performed in 1929 rather than in 1968-1975 when Tindal-Robertson translated de Poncins' other works likely at the behest of '*The Britons*' publishing house (who published his translations). Since I have been unable to find an original edition I am unaware of who the original translator was, but it does seem that '*The Britons*' although operating in 1929 and already famous as an anti-Semitic publishing house were not the publishers of this original translation (although it is referred to in their catalogue it is not listed under their imprint).

[7] Vicomte Léon de Poncins, 1928, '*Les Forces secrètes de la Révolution*', 1st Edition, Brossard: Paris.

[8] De Poncins, '*Freemasonry and Judaism*', p. 13

[9] Michael Santomauro writing for '*Ziopedia.org*', which has been reproduced by David Duke on his website (on 11/08/2006), commits this mistake when he cites the translation of de Poncins', '*Freemasonry and Judaism*', in the earlier edition for quotes from Jewish economist Werner Sombart. Santomauro is specifically citing the quotes from de Poncins who is using a French translation of Sombart's German work and then the translation of de Poncins' text has translated the translation. I have not checked the original German work, although I have read the usual English translation of it, but it is careless at best to cite a translation of a translation and expect it to hold evidential water without having checked the original text. This can be found at the following address: http://www.davidduke.com/general/what-about-jews-who-think-the-same-or-worse-as-mel-gibson_850.html [Accessed: 29/12/2008].

[10] These works however would have been readily accessible to the bulk of the French population when de Poncins wrote '*Freemasonry and Judaism*' both in public and private libraries as well as from patriotic and/or Catholic booksellers. Thus the references that seem esoteric and obscure to our time were in fact standard nationalist/Catholic literature in de Poncins' time, which reinforces my earlier point that de Poncins was writing to introduce the subject to the neophyte and not to write a learned treatise on it. Hence quoting de Poncins in this work as an authority is rather like citing a short popular book on Adolf Hitler and then using that as your authority as to why you don't Adolf Hitler i.e. it is nonsensical. For more information about some of authors whom de Poncins cites, as well as the situation which he was writing

about, please see Pierre Birnbaum's, Trans: Jane Marie Todd, 1996, *'The Jews of the Republic: A Political History of State Jews in France from Gambetta to Vichy'*, 1st Edition, Stanford University Press: Stanford.

[11] It is not always the case that it is presumed to be simply the Catholic Church, but rather Christianity as a whole that is under threat. De Poncins focuses on the Catholic Church as he was himself a devout Catholic and because France was and is a traditionally Catholic country. English Protestant clergymen writing at the same time as their French Catholic for example used much the same conception. This was re-enforced in the case of Catholicism by numerous Papal Bulls condemning Freemasonry. A list and discussion of the most important Papal Bulls concerning Freemasonry can be found at the following address:

<http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/09771a.htm#VIII> [Accessed: 29/12/2008].

[12] Adam Weishaupt was himself allegedly of Jewish origin and his surname is certainly arguably a common Jewish one.

[13] Knigge was an aristocratic German freemason who has been argued to have been the real driving force behind the Order of Perfectibilists better known as the Illuminati.

[14] 'Rational' here must be stated to be the 17th/18th century idyll of the 'liberal, rational gentleman' rather it, as Revilo Oliver characterised it in his 1965 speech *'Can Liberals be Educated?'*, is an irrational *'belief in the wonders of science'*. It presumes that the world can be endlessly improved through an increase in what its proponents believe is 'rational' and is worsened through what they believe is 'superstition': i.e. it is an essentially atheistic religious belief that prefigures the religiously sceptical (i.e. sceptics who act in such a manner as to infer that their scepticism is actually their religion and not the result of what they themselves believe to be 'rational cognition') of today.

[15] A Hungarian mixed Jew (i.e. *mischlinge*), whose mother was a gentile and whose father was a Jew of the tribe of the Kohanim (hence in *halakha*/*halacha* [Jewish law] he would be considered a full Jew and also a potential priest for the third temple in Jerusalem). Kohn, or as he styled himself Kun, himself, and also notably the Jewish socialist/communist Joseph Pogany (who later became a leading communist agitator in the United States of America), escaped after the fall of the Soviet Republic in Hungary and took a leading role in the Comintern, specifically being involved in communist agitation in Germany at the behest of his sponsor the Jewish communist Grigory Zinoviev, until he was arrested in Stalin's purges in 1937 and executed in either 1937 or 1939.

[16] Often called the *'133 Days'*: a useful and informative summary, although coloured with the horror earnestly and understandably felt about the atrocities the *'Red Guard'* and the *'Lenin Boys'* had committed, of this can be found at the following address:

http://www.jrbooksonline.com/HTML-docs/Outlaws_Diary_Appendix.htm.

[17] De Poncins, on pp. 72-76 of *'Freemasonry and Judaism'*, cites the summary of *'secret papers'* found in Hungarian Masonic lodges provided by Monsignor Jouin on p. 120 in vol. 3 of his 5 volume, 1919-1927, work, *'Le peril Judeo-maconnique'*, but without either Jouin's original work and/or the *'secret papers'* concerned it is impossible to give a judgement concerning this argument.

[18] De Poncins, *'Freemasonry and Judaism'*, pp. 68-72

[19] It is unclear what precise definition of who is and who is not a Jew. Jouin is using since both racial and religious definitions were common in anti-Semitic religious work at the time: although I suspect Jouin maybe using a combination of both I cannot confirm this.

[20] De Poncins, *'Freemasonry and Judaism'*, pp. 100-107

[21] I have seen it asserted that Freemasons in fact control the Jews, but I have not seen any

literature assert this and it would seem this assertion has more to do with the fanciful idea that the Illuminati are the primary force in terms of 'secret powers' behind the events in the world.

[22] De Poncins, 'Freemasonry and Judaism', p.101

[23] Ibid.

[24] De Poncins gives a lengthy exposition of his jewish conspiracy argument on pp. 183-237, but since this is mostly short snippets on various organisations, which is not complete and misses out a number of major organisations, it would be beyond the purview of this review to detail the flaws in both the list, description and relationships given by de Poncins. Since that in itself would require a separate detailed analysis with numerous qualifications and clarifications on the organisations involved and the nature of jewish power.

[25] Since it is a subjective racial conception of how an Aryan or Slav would have to operate in order to achieve the same results and power gained by the jews. These racial conceptions differ between the two races, but their generality is the same: hence why I am condensing them together for explanatory purposes.

[26] See Nesta Webster's, 1924, 'Secret Societies and Subversive Movements', 1st Edition, Boswell: London, pp. 294-326

[27] For more information on this please see Albert Hyamson's, 1951, 'The Sephardim of England: A History of the Spanish and Portuguese Jewish Community 1492-1951', 1st Edition, Methuen: London.

[28] This has been argued perhaps most extensively in the material that can be found at the following address: <http://www.biblebelievers.org.au/masonry1.htm> [Accessed: 05/01/2009].

Responsum to Marc Samberg

Monday, 5 January 2009

Marc Samberg is a jew, his Hebrew name is Mech-el, who is very active both in posting news and comments across several reasonably sized jewish newsgroups around the internet. In particular he runs a Yahoo group called 'stillnotmusicanyomore', which is a high-volume mailing list with just about everything from adverts to jokes in the very poorest Freudian taste. Marc posted the following comment on the 'EEJH' newsgroup recently and I would like to briefly respond to it as the comment demonstrates the standard, not particularly bright, illogical Zionist jewish take on a variety of issues relating to criticism of the jews. Marc also occasionally attempts to debate various anti-Zionist/anti-Israel newsgroups, whose members appear to be as ignorant as he is on a variety of issues. However let us see if Marc wants to engage in a little debate with Semitic Controversies.

'If the Zionists and Jews truly control the media, then why does it always look so bad for Israel? Cheesh. Wake up and smell the cameldung being hurled at you!!!'

'You can't have it both ways. Either the media is controlled by Jews and Zionists and the news looks good, or else proof that that is a lie in the bad news.'

Marc: this argument is an example of a straw man fallacy where you have projected a view that no anti-Semite that I am aware of holds. In that you have suggested that jews and Zionists are the

same thing. Jews and Zionists maybe the same in your preferred worldview, but they are in reality not the same thing. Jews do not have to be for Israel and nor is the media particularly anti-Israel.

You see Marc jews, like you, don't necessarily support Israel, because as I am sure you are aware there are these jews who are called 'self-hating jews'. Often coupled with the further amusing allegation that these jews are 'anti-Semitic' made, of course, by Zionist jews, such as yourself. Therefore your argument founders, because you by your own logic cannot equate the media being run by Zionists to the media being run by jews. After all since when in being jewish, i.e. born as such, did one have to support Israel and/or Israel's actions?

It is also important to point out that the media is not actually 'anti-Israel'. I know organisations, such as *'Honest Reporting'*, exist to prove such contentions, but you see the mainstream media in Europe and the United States is only opposed to Israel's treatment of its own ethnic/racial minorities not Israel itself. The fact remains that these media outlets don't question the right for jews to live in Palestine/Israel, the right for Israel to exist as a state and nor do they question Israel's right to be a jewish state. What they do question, however, is Israel's right to terrorise and discriminate against a subject population in the light of their own general profession to belief in either a nineteenth or late twentieth century liberalism.

Now morally and ethically as a National Socialist I have no problem with either the Israeli or Arab (i.e. the Palestinians and their racial kin across the Middle East) response, but from a western, liberal point of view Israel's actions are going to be seen as reprehensible. What you, and those like you, would, of course, point out is that Israel receives undue focus in their media and this arguably true: it does. However this isn't as you allege, because the press is biased against Israel and/or is 'anti-Semitic', but rather this is because Israel has over the years drawn attention to itself by its consistent grand-standing and declarations that its creation and the legitimacy of its actions were justified by the so-called 'holocaust'. You see these actions on the part of Israel, as well as by the Arabs own campaigning (highlighted to some extent in the literature of the Soviet Union, which has been labelled by some jewish authors as 'anti-Semitic literature in the language of Marxist-Leninism and anti-Zionism' [see for example the work of 'Sir' Martin Gilbert on the subject in the 1980's]), have drawn attention to Israel's relations with the Palestinian Arabs and its use of force to subdue them.

Simply put: jews have drawn this attention and scrutiny on themselves by their consistent claiming of special, or in the 'holocaust studies' verbiage: 'unique', victim status. Let me use an analogy to explain the world's actions: if you have a social security claimant who makes a lot of, very public, fuss about his or her disability demanding constant, and often increasing payments, to support themselves, because of it. You, as the custodian of that money with a responsibility for how it is spent to the folk at large, receive some disturbing reports that this benefits claimant is not really disabled at all, but has been and is going around disabling others who have been complaining, but this benefits claimant has been threatening them with further violence if they complain. This violence further has been performed in some cases, while it continues to be threatened to all. Then because of this the people the claimant has been disabling now threaten and attempt disorganised violence against the claimant who generally wins, because he is not actually disabled while many of his opponents are.

There are many more disabled claimants out there claiming disability benefits falsely, but this claimant in particular has attracted your attention because of his or her actions, which have actually caused new claimants to arise. As well as that the claimant has particularly drawn attention to themselves by nosily falsely propounding the idea that their disability is some how unique and special. As well as that therefore they should get increasing payments and sympathy from you as the custodian of that benefit money. Would you not investigate and attack such a case of benefit fraud?

If not then you, and Israel as a nation, can hardly be considered morally and ethically superior and therefore you are as anti-Semites, like myself, have described you for centuries (i.e. as immoral vulture-like creatures in human form). If you would investigate then your argument falls flat on its face, because what I have described is what jews have been doing for the last few decades, possibly the last two centuries if you wish to be a little broader, and therefore you admit yourself that Israel has no cause to make about the mainstream media being 'anti-Semitic', or being particularly vindictive towards Israel, for they have valid grounds for criticising Israel considering that they are the source of much of Israel's strength.

Therefore your argument Marc is complete nonsense.

A Christopher Jon Bjercknes Debacle: Responsum concerning Albert Einstein

Sunday, 11 January 2009

Some time ago I made a variety of critical remarks on the claims pertaining to Einstein's alleged plagiarism, including quotes from Bjercknes "Albert Einstein: The Incurable Plagiarist", on the Stormfront message board (also contained in parts in a previous blog-article here).

Recently, on Bjercknes' own blog[\[1\]](#), a response was issued by him and therefore I'd like to respond to Bjercknes and his criticism.

He writes:

"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 Poincare's theory of relativity and space-time, some of which appear for free on the internet"

What we have here is an argument that firstly is an appeal for authority fallacy in that since allegedly the physicists Winterberg and Logunov believes Einstein was a plagiarist. Bjercknes is

therefore making a valid argument and that unless he had no expertise the aforementioned scientists wouldn't have relied upon him and his work. Now I have emailed Professor Winterberg and he didn't agree that he relied on Bjerknes for his views, moreso on his own views and work[2].

Secondly Bjerknes is accusing me of misrepresenting him and that I have somehow denied that the history of relativity hasn't been a collective work contributed to by many scientists. This is false. Not once have I made the claim that science, especially concerning the history of physics, hasn't been portrayed in an oft one-dimensional frame or that there was no history of relativity to speak of prior to Einstein.

He continues:

"It is noteworthy that "LionAxe" quote mines my book Albert Einstein: The Incorrigible Plagiarist (2002) for a remark about Johann Georg von Soldner's work, when I stated in that book that I would address the General Theory of Relativity in another book (AEIP p. 107). That subsequent book Anticipations of Einstein in the General Theory of Relativity appeared in 2003, and in it I republished Soldner's relevant paper and provided a detailed analysis of Einstein's plagiarism of Soldner's, and others, work, and there explained the nature of Soldner's theory. In addition, I have since published a freely available chapter on Soldner's theory in my book The Manufacture and Sale of Saint Einstein (2006) which contains important amplifications of my book Anticipations of Einstein in the General Theory of Relativity. It appears that "LionAxe" is obviously not interested in my arguments, for he does not cite these specific works where my arguments are spelled out in intricate detail, but instead wants to quote mine a book I wrote which was not devoted to addressing this issue, and even under this opaque veil of ignoring my relevant writings, "LionAxe" misrepresent my views and the facts. Those interested in my arguments on this issue of Soldner's work should read chapters 11, 12, and 13, of my book The Manufacture and Sale of Saint Einstein (2006); where you will learn that "LionAxe" is wrong. "LionAxe" is also mistaken in attributing to Einstein and Minkowski what Poincare, Marcolongo and Melchior Palagyi, among many others, created before them. On this subject, refer to my online book The Manufacture and Sale of Saint Einstein and Prof. Logunov's above linked works."

Bjerknes objects to me quoting his initial book since, as he himself basically says, his argument is not qualified enough and berates me for not having further read his elaborations made elsewhere. Well he did make and word those arguments, which he continues to make in his additional work (as I've looked at them). So his complaint is pointless.

Now on the subject of Soldner. Einstein's calculations followed from the idea of gravitational time dilation. As far as the history is concerned: I know of no evidence that Einstein somehow stole the result from Soldner. Bjerknes thinks otherwise. For example he quotes Einstein saying:

"That the idea of bending light rays was bound to emerge in the time of the emission theory is quite natural, as is the fact that the numerical result is exactly the same as that according to the equivalence hypothesis".

Here Einstein is simply noting that it had been addressed without the contextual predictions of any inclusive relativity theory and he's not noting on Soldner's work. Einstein hadn't arrived at finding the doubled figure to be a valid one when the above quote was made. So he wasn't talking about Soldner and the contention that he was simply repeating newtonian emission theory is a moot point. Since Einstein never claimed that newtonian emission theory was his idea. When I do not quote Pythagora when using Pythagora's theorem. I am not stealing anything since the references are inherent in the mathematics and tools used (which Einstein never claimed, as per relativity, to have invented).

This is what Bjerknes often does: he makes the case of priority interchangeable with plagiarism. Which is odd, since then a score of the most known scientists in physics and natural sciences would be plagiarists by the same logic: especially Newton for his usage of Hooke's or Descartés' work.

Descartes' law of inertia: *"Every body, As far as in its power, Always remains in the same state."*[\[3\]](#)

Which Newton renamed to his first law of motion: *"Each thing, As far as it is compelled, Preserves its state."*

Using the same line of accusation as oft applied toward Einstein: one could be equally justified in saying that Newton plagiarized Huygen's law of momentum-conservation and renamed it Newton's Third Law. That Newton stole Kepler's Third Law and re-wrote it as two Newtonian laws: Newton's law of gravity and Newton's second law or Hooke's work. Does it make Newton a plagiarist just because he wasn't the first to assert that gravity might obey an inverse square law and that his could account for the planets moving in ellipses for example? If we follow the Bjerknes' logic this is a given, yet I disagree here as well.

Did Newton plagiarize Leonardo's principles?

"All movement tends to maintenance, or rather all moved bodies continue to move as long as the impression of the force of their motors (original impetus) remains in them."(Principle of Leonardo)[\[4\]](#)

"Every body continues in its state of rest, or of uniform motion in a straight line, unless it is compelled to change that state by forces impressed upon it." (wording of Newton's first law of motion)[\[5\]](#)

Einstein had already thought about the calculation made by his approach to invariance (etc), which was later called the *"special theory of relativity"*. However: he already knew it to be wanting, because of the principle of equivalence acceleration means the bending of light in an accelerated frame implying the bending of light by a massive object. Einstein's whole idea was to generalize the SR, which was about inertial frames, to include the laws of physics as seen from accelerated frames. So, he set about to make such a theory, not even possible in the early 1800's, because the mathematics needed for it was not yet available. It doesn't matter whether light bending is part of Newton's theory or not, because anyone who had studied these matters was

discussing and asking themselves if and why a photon passing by a massive object in its path is bent. That's a forgone conclusion not sign of plagiarism on Einstein's part.

Bjerknes further quotes Einstein saying:

"It may be added that, according to the theory, half of this deflection is produced by the Newtonian field of attraction of the Sun, and the other half by the geometrical modification (curvature) of space caused by the Sun."

Again, Bjerknes is not noting on Soldner's work, but on two things;

- 1: these problems were known and juggled with prior to Einstein.
- 2: They followed naturally by the work on gravitational time dilation.

Bjerknes quotes Einstein further, in an attempt to make it seem as if Einstein knowingly "plagiarized" Soldner:

"I discovered in 1911 that the principle of equivalence demands a deflection of the light rays passing by the Sun with observable magnitude – this without knowing that more than a hundred years ago a similar consequence had been anticipated from Newton's mechanics in a combination with Newton's emission theory of light."

How does the above constitute any lie or concession of plagiarism? He's being correct, he did find that the principle of equivalence demanded the formentioned, without claiming it as his own. Since anyone of his peers would know that ideas concerning the problems of the mechanics physics, or deflection of light, were an issue discussed and addressed prior to Einstein. He knew the arc of bending, per century, had to amount to 43 seconds and Einstein provided the work for how to approach that, which Soldner effectively didn't the same at all.

It all follows perfectly logically and to be expected of course, that if one believes in corpuscular theory of light (as Newton did, which Einstein recognized) then it is obvious such corpuscles would be affected by a gravitational field.

Let me make the obvious point. If one assumes in Newtonian theory that light is a corpuscle with weight and will fall in the gravitational field, then one does get the half deflection reported.

What I wonder is how this works out when one adopts a wave theory like Maxwell's, which would have been the appropriate thing to do in the early 20th century. Had anyone computed what happens in Newtonian or Minkowski spacetime? Would there be any deflection at all? Or does it depend on the coupling one assumed between gravity and electromagnetism?

Einstein himself noted on how the differences between his and Newton's speculations were quite few, a couple were the distortion of the oval orbits of planets around the sun (which when Mercury was confirmed, held consistently not only with this specific prediction but with the entire theory given) and the work on why and how shifting of spectral lines toward the red end of

the spectrum as per light waves emitted from stars of appreciable mass (not a given or clarity given by Soldner, neither did he later declare his work through the electric nature of light).

Also, Born and Hilbert (not sure which of the two wrote the following) commented on Soldner stating:

"The final value of the curvature of light follows naturally out of the general relativity theory. It is a mistake to believe that Soldner had foreseen the relativity theory".[\[6\]](#)

As an additional note of curiosa, here is an excerpt from a paper that in detail investigated Soldner's work on deflection, its editions and comparative discussion on Newton, Lenard, Einstein et al:

"Thus Soldner did nowhere draw false inferences but fell a victim to the printer's devil, and it is indisputable that Soldner obtained the Newtonian value of the deflection of light, which with respects to the constants of his time amounts to 0.84, and not to Einstein's value. Any information to the contrary about Soldner's calculations is erroneous. The preeminent point in Soldner's theory consist in his (vigorously refused by Lenard but, in fact, genial) reference to Epicurus and Lucretius, who postulated the equivalence of inertia and gravity from philosophical reasons. All the same Soldner's theory differs completely from the general relativistic explanation for the deflection of light, as can be seen from the velocity, which in Soldner's and Einstein's approaches take opposite courses."[\[7\]](#)

Double deflection comes from two equal parts. One is a falling of the light in the gravity of sun, which is essentially the Newtonian effect. The other comes from the slight deviation of the geometry of space around the sun from Euclidean geometry. That is a decidedly non-Newtonian effect. Einstein came to see how this wasn't correct. His 1913 "*Entwurf*" theory did not predict a disturbance to the geometry of space around the sun, so it only predicted the Newtonian half deflection, which is what Einstein reported. For a brief time in 1915, Einstein entertained a variant theory in which the trace T of the stress energy tensor vanished. Also that variant theory is equivalent to the final theory in empty space. That is the case dealt with in light deflection by the sun.

To imply plagiarism here is as nonsensical as to invoke the "*Thomson Experiment*" of 1897 as proof of plagiarism. Thomson's work here was not comparable to mass-energy equivalence work done, also, in the experiment, he forced a stream of electrons through opposing fields (magnetic-electrical) and measured the ratio of the electron's, which he is credited to have discovered, charge to its mass. This is not the same as rest energy, which in turn is not to be confused with inertial mass.

As I've stated before, a notable difference between those who get credit for a "good idea" and those who do not is that one is only, generally, credited when turning a "good idea" into a testable and proven theory/thesis, which Einstein did, including it in a frame of work that was well beyond the grasp and understanding of physicists a hundred years prior. So, the fact that there is a trace to ideas and approaches to problems there-of, while not being fervently cited by future scientists, is not a thing or sign of plagiarism. When already known

formulations/theories/tools are used to derive new approaches and frames of work then those derivations for a more unique entity, if not then Newton, Oppenheimer and so forth would be plagiarists along with numerous of others.

Bjerknes continues:

"Logunov and I have already refuted this "LionAxe's" nonsense. Poincare's PoR is the same as Einstein's plagiarized version. In fact Einstein and his wife copied it almost verbatim from Poincare, the minor and insignificant differences in wording being due more to translation than anything else. Poincare's name is not generally associated with the PoR, rather Einstein's is, and to deny that fact is simply absurd. Ask the average man on the street who Henri Poincare was, and he will likely not know. Ask him who first stated the "principle of relativity" and he will likely state "Einstein". Of course, as my books are dedicated to proving, countless experts in the field know that Poincare first iterated the PoR. "LionAxe's" attack is unfounded and disingenuous."

Poincaré's approach and work on relativistic physics were not the same as Einstein's, if they were then Poincaré would have agreed with Einstein's work, which he did not. And Poincaré is, in the well established history of science, associated with PoR, just not as much as Einstein, but that is not Einstein's fault. It is not Newton's fault that his name is generally associated with gravitational physics, planetary motions etc, whereas the average laymen would respond with "say again?" when asked about Robert Hooke or even Kepler. Likewise would you get a clueless response when asking people on what Copernicus derived from Ptolemy's astronomy and so forth.

Here follows a lengthy excerpt from an excellent and thorough paper written by Roger Cerf^[8], discussing and clarifying the erroneous case of the plagiarism charges made by people like Louis de Broglie and especially Jules Leveugle.^[9]

"Although Poincaré cannot be credited for having discovered special relativity, did he recognize the equivalence between inertial mass and energy of a body as Leveugle claims? Leveugle's claim^[10] rests on the fact that in 1900. Poincaré obtained an expression for the quantity of motion of radiant energy^[11] that agrees with the relation $E=mc^2$. VonLaue^[12] paid tribute to Poincaré for this result, from which it follows that a charged particle in motion, for example, an electron, possesses an electromagnetic mass. These findings are far from Einstein's assertion of the general equivalence between inertia and energy.^[13] The philosopher François L'Yvonnet, in a book of dialogs with the futurologist Thierry Gaudin,^[14] has nonetheless followed the example of Leveugle and asserts that Poincaré "had very clearly formulated the relation $E=mc^2$." Both Gaudin and L'Yvonnet discuss why this relation, allegedly due to Poincaré, was attributed to Einstein: the latter's article was written in German Gaudin and "Einstein perhaps had a greater sense of communication" L'Yvonnet^[15]. If Poincaré had conceived $E=mc^2$ in 1900, his colleague Langevin would have known. Langevin had been closely following Poincaré's work, and both men spent a week traveling together in the United States after the St. Louis International Congress of Arts and Sciences in 1904.^[16]

Langevin would not have suddenly come a few years later to tell his co-worker Edmond Bauer

that he was on track to find a relation between the inertial mass and the energy of a body.^[17] He had checked it for an electron for which it followed from Lorentz's and Poincaré's work on radiation and was searching for a general theory. Bauer recounts that he was at the time in charge of abstracts for the journal *Le Radium*, and that he came across an article by someone named Einstein, where he saw the relation $E=mc^2$ that Langevin had been telling him about. He ran immediately to inform Langevin, without even reading the article. We see that Poincaré may have had mathematical hints available to him for a major discovery in physics, that is, $E=mc^2$, without having even a suspicion of their significance. In his 2004 book Leveugle emphasized that in Poincaré's 1900 example, the body emitting the radiant energy E loses the inertia $m=Ec^{-2}$. This addendum by Leveugle to the $E=mc^2$ controversy leaves unchanged our last remark concerning Poincaré's lack of insight into certain aspects of the physics involved. Poincaré's considerations on a body emitting radiant energy clearly show his unawareness of the equivalence between inertial mass and energy. He returned to the example of radiant energy in the lecture he gave at the International Congress in 1904 in St. Louis mentioned earlier and noted that the recoil of the emitting body occurred as if the projectile, that is, the radiant energy, were a "ball." However, as pointed out by Janssen, Poincaré insisted that "our projectile here has no mass, it is not matter, it is energy."^[18]

Also, neither Einstein or Poincaré were the first to state "the principle of relativity". It goes back to at least Galileo and has a long there-of on-going history of transformation.

Stephen Hawking in '*A Brief History of Time: From the Big Bang to Black Holes*' writes:

"Between 1887 and 1905 there were several attempts, most notably by the Dutch physicist Hendrik Lorentz, to explain the result of the Michelson-Morley experiment in terms of objects contracting and clocks slowing down when they moved through the ether. However, in a famous paper in 1905, a hitherto unknown clerk in the Swiss patent office, Albert Einstein, pointed out that the whole idea of an ether was unnecessary, providing one was willing to abandon the idea of absolute time. A similar point was made a few weeks later by a leading French mathematician, Henri Poincare. Einstein's argument were closer to physics than those of Poincare, who regarded this problem as mathematical. Einstein is usually given credit for the new theory, but Poincare is remembered by having his name attached to an important part of it." (pp. 22-23)

Einstein not once claimed that he had invented the mathematical tools for proof, such as the Fitzgerald-Lorentz contraction^[19], tensor-calculus etc. But he had succeeded in unifying several results under the "umbrella" of one theory. Poincaré, for example, was actually nothing less than the most important mathematician of his times. Hence it would be borderline impossible for anyone to steal/plagiarize his work. Since anything he put forth were, and are, well known in the world of physics. Therefore: the thesis purported by Bjerknes that Einstein had just taken it, somehow retracting credit from the creators of the given tools, is glaringly fraudulent.

First of all: Poincaré did maintain aether as crucial, even as late as in his 1909 Lille address in which he included it. Even if Poincaré did equations to explain why the Michelson Morley experiment hadn't yielded proof for aether: he continued to base his predictions and assumptions that there was an aether. This was one of the reasons why he didn't accept Einstein's predictions

or work to be accurate. Had it been a case of plagiarism: why would Poincaré disagree with the material that he himself purported?

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

However, contrary to popular yet erroneous claims made by some, Einstein did mention Lorentz (not to mention Plank, Hertz, Maxwell, Brown, Lenard etc) in more than one of his 1905-1907 papers and also gave reference to Poincaré's work[\[20\]](#) (directly on the action/reaction principle).

One might ask, considering some people claim Einstein plagiarized Poincaré, what differences made Einstein's work his own original venture?

- *Einstein completely discarded the ether, as he predicted and theorized that the expressions of the laws of physics should be the 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 footing.

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

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

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

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

- *Poincaré didn't consider the aspect above therefore.[\[21\]](#)

SR basically established that the relativity principle is fundamental to physics in the sense that the laws of physics; in all inertial frames, must be identical. Since Einstein discarded a privileged frame; this was given, Poincaré didn't discard it and he in fact based his assumptions and predictions on a privileged frame. Poincaré formulated the principle differently: since according to Poincaré's relativity principle. It would be impossible by means of an experiment internal to a given inertial frame to know whether this frame is in motion or at rest with respect to the aether frame. Hence Poincaré's approach to extended space time transformations, unlike Einstein's approach, assumes an aether frame.

The space and time transformations improved by Poincaré from Lorentz were therefore based on a set of "fictitious" transformations: since they had been obtained based on systematic errors during their measurements. Einstein's theories differed greatly. Poincaré simply did not establish,

or reveal, the alterations and changes to the space-time predictions that follow from the theory of relativity. Einstein did however.

The key points of Poincaré's "*Sur la Dynamique de l'Électron*" yielded that, under L-transformation, the equations of Maxwell were invariant. Einstein viewed the radiation paradoxes to be only solved by assuming the inertia of energy. This was in contradiction with Poincaré's views and papers and also Poincaré never addressed this problem again. Einstein brought forth the operational meaning of time dilation whilst Poincaré didn't consider the above. [22] These were just a few points, but it is obvious that Einstein's SR differed substantially from Poincaré's. [23]

Anyone who erroneously awards all the credit to Einstein is wrong, but it isn't Einstein's error. Poincaré's theory on special relativity tried to reconcile two incompatible ideas, which were the existence of a preferred inertial frame and the relativity principle. Einstein discarded the idea of this given and privileged reference frame, which was the correct and revealing move to do at the time of these predictions. The very notion that anything could have been stolen from Henri Poincaré is inherently false in my opinion because, among other things, in 1905 Poincaré was already a superhero, one of the world's most famous scientists and mathematicians. The research and faculty reviewers in the scientific establishment in Europe jumped over anything published by Poincaré. Hence: through a close but educated analysis, what is clearly revealed is that Henri wasn't able to formulate a proper theory of relativity. [24]

Whilst Henri Poincaré effectively and quite philosophically adhered to the PoR: he did believe that this principle might actually be deducible from a revised version of electrodynamics. Subsequently: Poincaré was not ready to take the important step of eliminating the ether concept that had hampered effective and revealing critical insight, whereas Einstein succeeded in eliminating it. This concept was in stark contrast with the essence and simplicity for a correct grasp of the principle of relativity: since it is supposed to treat all frames on an equal footing. Poincaré was also a bit bewildered by the fact that gravitational phenomena seemed to be inconsistent with the PoR.

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

The essence of special relativity lies in the thesis that Newton's account of space and time is incorrect and that all processes unfold against a space and time governed by SR. That thesis was laid out clearly in Einstein's 1905 paper. Poincaré did not build on two kinematical postulates, but worked in terms of the Maxwell equations. He also didn't take the following steps necessary and it is these differences that set Einstein's work sharply apart from his. Poincaré never laid out that central thesis. He did make some suggestive remarks about the speed of light and simultaneity: yes. But most importantly: they were never developed into the simple (nor a

provable and testable) claim that Newton was wrong on space and time.

What Poincaré does say is a great deal muddier with philosophical avenues and open to other interpretations. For example Poincare had clear conventionalist leanings and in his work there seemed to be more than one natural way to distribute time through space using notions of simultaneity.

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

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

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

Other historians have had the opposite bias. Exclusive focus on the formal and empirical content of relativity theory (the Lorentz group and covariance properties) has led some of them to ignore the difference between Poincare’s and Einstein’s concepts of space and time, while nationalism, anti-Semitism, or esprit d’Ecole induced others to read much more into Poincare’s text than is really there. For instance, it has been claimed that Poincare’ 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 Poincare meant here to apply the postulate only in an etherbound Frame.”[\[25\]](#)

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

science.[\[26\]](#)

Most of the mathematical tools used in Special Relativity were created by Lorentz, Hertz, Maxwell and Poincaré etc. This is however not equivalent with having reached the breakthrough of revealing a testable, workable formulation of Special Relativity. Nor is it reasonable there-of to suggest more credit is due unto Poincaré than Einstein in revealing the physics: the beating (and functionally testable) heart of the theory of Special Relativity.

*Poincaré regarded the aether as a medium necessary to propagate the electromagnetic waves.

*Poincaré acknowledged the Lorentz aether, which assumes the existence of a privileged aether frame. He expressed his agreement with Lorentz in the following terms:

“the results I have obtained agree with those of Mr. Lorentz in all important points. I was led to modify and complete them in a few points of detail.”[\[27\]](#)

His agreement implies that the speed of light is isotropic exclusively in the privileged frame, as is easily deduced from Lorentz theory (for that, see his explanation of Michelson's experiment where the speed of light is $c+v$ or $c-v$ in the two opposite directions).[\[28\]](#)

It was Poincaré who seemed a bit confused and bewildered on these issues; thus in a sense he dropped the ball on SR quite obviously. In hindsight: it might be hard to imagine how he wasn't able to establish the breakthrough material needed. If Poincaré declared in other texts that the speed of light is constant then this assertion is at variance with his approach of "*Sur la dynamique de l'électron*".[\[29\]](#) He confirmed his belief in the aether many times. For example:

“Does an aether exist, the reason why we believe in an aether is simple. If light comes from a distant star and takes many years to reach us, it is during its travel no longer near the star, but not yet near the Earth, nevertheless, it must be somewhere and supported by a material medium.”[\[30\]](#)

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

The fact that Lorentz work was notably important is not disputable.

The fact that Poincaré was skirting the bush, coming close to arriving at a correct and provable theory of special relativity is correct.

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

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

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

"If I had to write the last chapter now, I should certainly have given a more prominent place to Einstein's theory of relativity by which the theory of electromagnetic phenomena in moving systems gains a simplicity that I had not been able to attain. The chief cause of my failure was my clinging to the idea that the variable t only can be considered as the true time, and that my local time t' must be regarded as no more than an auxiliary mathematical quantity."[\[31\]](#)

Bjerknes, in his blog-article, continues with quoting Max Born as proof of Einstein's alleged plagiarism. This was something I had previously criticized Bjerknes as it is nothing short of quote-mining with the adding of words and context into Born's mouth.

On the blog he writes:

*"In its haste to attack me, "LionAxe" misrepresents the context of my quotations of Born's statement. This quotation first appears in my book *Albert Einstein: The Incurable Plagiarist* on page 30 as follows:"*

After his complaint, he proceeds to quote Born from his books "*Einstein's Theory of Relativity*" and "*Physics in my Generation*". The problem here is that Born is not in any sense or form calling Einstein a plagiarist, nor is he negating any credit to Einstein, rather he's addressing Lorentz's and Poincaré's work on relativity and what it was.

In Born's introduction chapter to the aforementioned book he writes:

"The reason Einstein's name alone is usually connected with relativity is that his work of 1905 was only the initial step to a still more fundamental "general relativity", which included a new theory of gravitation and opened new vistas in our understanding of the structure of the universe.

The special theory of relativity can be justifiably considered the end of the classical period or the beginning of a new era. For it uses the well-established ideas of matter spread continuously through space and time, and of casual or, more precisely, deterministic laws of nature. But it introduces revolutionary notions of space and time, resolutely criticizing the traditional concepts as formulated by Newton. Thus it opens a new way of thinking about natural phenomena. This seems to be Einstein's most remarkable feat, the one which distinguishes his work from his predecessors, and modern science from classical science."[\[32\]](#)

The introduction by Born ends with these words:

"One should regard this method, used with such success by Einstein, as a heuristic principle pointing to weak spots in traditional theory which has turned out to be empirically unsatisfactory. It has become the outstanding method of fundamental research in modern physics, particularly in the development of quantum theory; and because of this fact Einstein's

way of thinking has not only led to the summit of the classical period but has opened a new age of physics.”[\[33\]](#)

Of course, Bjerknes ignores any such statements as he appeared to be dead set on extrapolating any mention of relativity's historical evolution as a mark of Born's admission to Einstein's plagiarism.

Bjerknes continues:

“My quotations are accurate. They demonstrate that Max Born questioned Einstein's priority for what Einstein presented as if unprecedented. Those are facts. I in no way misrepresented Born's statements.”

Yes, Bjerknes, you have been misrepresenting Born's clarification on the history of relativity as a sign of his admission that Einstein plagiarised their work and added little of note to them. Einstein never claimed to be the inventor of relativity, though laymen might assume him to be its inventor, because the history of relativity going back four-hundred years is not presented along with the cool relativistic mass or pop-icon fumbling by the media, none of which is Einstein's fault.

Galileo is the most important scientist in getting the Principle of Relativity (PoR) going in physics. Additionally: Newtonian mechanics (NM) satisfies the PoR in spirit, “LET” does not. It is true that both NM and LET are covariant under change of inertial frames, yet the similarity stops there.

I agree with Einstein's subjective appraisal of the situation then found in 1904. Because, you see, to leave LET as the paradigm of E&M was to leave a blatant disharmony in theoretical physics, so to harmonize the two, the solution seems obvious: either introduce absolute velocity into NM, or remove absolute velocity from LET (right move). Also the latter means conforming E&M to the PoR. Not just hinting about it, not just musing about it, but actually creating a testable and provable approach and detailing the methodology of doing so, adding the predictions and getting it correct.

I'm sure all that Bjerknes cares about is that SR *'merely reproduces the equations of LET'*, so he regards Einstein as a thief. The problem is that such an appraisal of what Einstein accomplished is completely stupid. Without SR, theoretical physics in the 20th century would have required the constant bending of the knee to the concept of absolute velocity, yet with SR, it did not. In fact, theories built on SR require (locally) the improved heuristic that they must be derivable from a Lagrangian using Lorentz covariance. Thus the practical and philosophical differences between LET and SR as a foundation to modern physics are not only substantial but fundamental. Most physicists since 1905 got it and still get it. Bjerknes does not apparently.

So, what Bjerknes and other Einstein-bashers ignore is that it is fairly easy to derive a theory in which light bends (like that of Soldner), or even a theory in which Mercury has a non-Newtonian perihelion advance (like that of Gerber), but it is much more difficult to derive a theory which gives you both of these phenomena in a precise fashion and without a bunch of free parameters.

Not to mention a wealth of phenomena Einstein had no inkling of, such as frame dragging and black-hole formation, but which are predicted by his theory.

What Special Relativity proves is what Einstein claimed it proved: i.e. that E&M can be formulated without using the ether concept of absolute rest (thus absolute motion). Poincaré didn't put forth work that proved this, while he did indeed provide much important intermediate work between Maxwell, Lorentz and subsequently Einstein. Again, it is clear Bjerknes does take any hint of scientific evolution of ideas and work in relativity as a sign and proof of Einstein's plagiarism.

I'm rather certain that had Newton been Jewish and, in Bjerknes' view, "hoodwinked" an historical relative of his, he'd be all over Newton with the same logic, which would be equally slanted toward irrationality and such pseudo-intellectual spew (pardon my French).

[1] <http://jewishracism.blogspot.com/2008/12/odd-and-misleading-attack-against-me-on.html> [Accessed: 10/01/2009]. All quotations from Bjerknes unless otherwise indicated are taken from this response.

[2] Private Correspondence with Professor Winterberg

[3] <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/descartes-physics/> [Accessed: 10/01/2009].

[4] Michael Lahanas, "The myth of Newton's apple, did Hipparchus discover Newton's gravity and inverse square law?", <http://www.mlahanas.de/Greeks/HipparchusGraviation.htm> [Accessed: 10/01/2009].

[5] Isaac Newton, Trans: Motte-Cajori, 1934 (1729), [1687], "*Philosophiae naturalis principia mathematica*", University of California Press: Berkeley. This is available at the following address: <http://www.physicstoday.org/mar00/principia.htm> [Accessed: 10/01/2009].

[6] Professor Campbell, "Einstein Theory Again Is Verified", New York Times, 18th December, 1921.

[7] Treder, H.J, Jackisch, G, 1981 "On Soldner's Value of Newtonian Deflection of Light", *Astronomische Nachrichten*, Vol. 302, p. 275.

[8] Roger Cerf, "Dismissing renewed attempts to deny Einstein the discovery of special relativity", *Am. J. Phys.*, Vol. 74, No. 9, September 2006

[9] Jules Leveugle, 1994, "*Poincaré et la relativité*", *La Jaune et la Rouge*, Vol. 494, pp. 31–51

[10] Ibid, p. 33 and Jules Leveugle, 2004, '*La Relativité, Poincaré et Einstein, Planck, Hilbert: Histoire Véridique de la Théorie de la Relativité*', L'Harmattan: Paris, pp. 23-24

[11] Henri Poincaré, "*La théorie de Lorentz et le principe de réaction*," in Lorentz Festschrift, 1900, *Archives néerlandaises des sciences exactes et naturelles*, Vol 5, pp. 252–278

[12] M. von Laue, "*Inertia and energy*," in P. Schlipp (Ed.), 1970, '*Albert Einstein: Philosopher-Scientist*', MJF Books: New York, Chap.19.

[13] Albert Einstein, 1905, "*Ist die Trägheit eines Körpers von seinem Energieinhaltsabhängig?*," *Ann. Phys.*, Vol. 18, pp. 639–641.

[14] Thierry Gaudin and François L'Yvonnet, 2003, "*Discours de la Méthode Créatrice Ose savoir-Le-Relié*", Gordes.

[15] Ibid, p. 161

[16] Paul Langevin, "*Le Physicien*," in P. Boutroux, J. Hadamard, P. Langevin and V. Volterra (Eds), 1914, '*Henri Poincaré, L'Oeuvre Scientifique, L'Oeuvre Philosophique*', Félix Alcan: Paris, p. 169

- [17] E. Bauer, 1964, “*La physique il y a 50 ans*,” Bulletin de la Société Française de Physique, January, p. 10.
- [18] M. Janssen, “*The Trouton experiment, $E=Mc^2$, and a slice of Minkowski space-time*,” in A. Ashtekar et al (Eds), 2003, ‘*Revisiting the Foundations of Relativistic Physics*’, Kluwer: Netherlands, p. 35.
- [19] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Length_contraction [Accessed: 10/01/2009].
- [20] Albert Einstein, 1906, ‘*Das Prinzip von der Erhaltung der Schwerpunktsbewegung und die Trägheit der Energie*’, Annalen der Physik, Vol. 20, pp. 627-633.
- [21] Oliver Darrigol, 2004, “*The Mystery of the Einstein-Poincaré Connection*”, <http://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/pdf/10.1086/430652> [Accessed: 10/01/2009].
- [22] <http://www.levynewphysics.com/3-someimportantquestions1.htm> [Accessed: 10/01/2009].
- [23] <http://arxiv.org/ftp/physics/papers/0607/0607067.pdf> [Accessed: 10/01/2009].
- [24] Supurna Sinha, 2000, “*Poincaré and the Special Theory of Relativity*”, Resonance: Journal of Science Education, February, pp. 12-14. This maybe found at the following address: <http://www.springerlink.com/content/h0331238v8010741/> [Accessed: 10/01/2009].
- [25] Darrigol, Op. Cit.
- [26] Sinha, Op. Cit.
- [27] “*Sur la dynamique de l’électron*” quoted in “*Relativity and Aether Theory a Crucial Distinction*” by Joseph Levy. This maybe found at the following address: <http://arxiv.org/ftp/physics/papers/0610/0610067.pdf> [Accessed: 10/01/2009].
- [28] Russell McCormmach, 1970, “*H. A. Lorentz and the Electromagnetic View of Nature*”, Isis, Vol. 61, No. 4
- [29] http://spartan.ac.brocku.ca/~lward/Poincare/Poincare_1905_toc.html [Accessed: 10/01/2009].
- [30] Henri Poincaré, “*La science et l’hypothèse*”, Chapter 10 of the 1968 French edition, “*Les théories de la physique moderne*”, Champs: Flammarion. Cited in Levy, Op. Cit.
- [31] Hendrik Lorentz, 1915, “*The Theory of Electrons: And its Applications to the Phenomena of Light and Radiant Heat*”, 2nd Edition, p. 197 in the original text, and p. 321 in the Dover 1952 reprint.
- [32] Max Born, 1962, “*Einstein's Theory of Relativity*”, Courier Dover, New York, pp. 2-3.
- [33] Ibid., pp. 3-4.

In Brief: The Abuse of Adolf Hitler’s Words to Dismiss/Ignore Arguments

Monday, 12 January 2009

A very common method used by Nationalists and anti-Semites to ignore arguments, or as a ‘get out of jail free card’, in a debate is the quotation of Adolf Hitler’s ‘Mein Kampf’. It is important to understand this quotation, because of the frequency of its use, as stated above, to get out of bad positions when debating opponents (or each other), which is usually the result of sloppy research and broad statements being made: without the specific knowledge and/or ability to evidence and clarify them. This is an ‘In Brief’, because the required clarification although considerable can be concisely dealt with. This quotation, in full (it is often given in part), is as follows:

‘The more I argued with them, the better I came to know their dialectic. First they counted on the stupidity of their adversary, and then, when there was no other way out, they themselves simply played stupid. If all this didn't help, they pretended not to understand, or, if challenged, they changed the subject in a hurry, quoted platitudes which, if you accepted them, they immediately related to entirely different matters, and then, if again attacked, gave ground and pretended not to know exactly what you were talking about. Whenever you tried to attack one of these apostles, your hand closed on a jelly-like slime which divided up and poured through your fingers, but in the next moment collected again. But if you really struck one of these fellows so telling a blow that, observed by the audience, he couldn't help but agree, and if you believed that this had taken you at least one step forward, your amazement was great the next day. The Jew had not the slightest recollection of the day before, he rattled off his same old nonsense as though nothing at all had happened, and, if indignantly challenged, affected amazement; he couldn't remember a thing, except that he had proved the correctness of his assertions the previous day.’ [\[1\]](#)

This quotation might, at first, appear to support the contention that it can be used to ignore arguments. However if we examine it closely we begin to comprehend Hitler's meaning. In that when the quotation states the jewish marxists lost the argument, but then returned again and again with the same arguments the days after, no matter how many times they were defeated or corrected, with the recollection that they, the jews and/or marxists in question, had in fact won the argument the previous day. What Hitler is actually talking about is repetition of the same arguments that have been answered as in simply repeating old claims without answering objections and/or modifying the assertion/argument in the light of new information.

What Hitler is not saying here is that if a claim/assertion/argument is considered 'jewish' by someone, i.e. a wholly subjective interpretation and only partially valid for an expert in the jewish question (i.e. somebody who has spent many years in-depth as well as primary research regarding the jews), then it can be countered/debunked by claiming the person making the claim/assertion/argument is in fact jewish and parroting jews.

This statement of what Hitler is not saying is the meaning often attached by Nationalists, who think he meant what I have stated he did not mean, to the quotation. What Hitler is making here is an observation about jewish and marxist strategy when debating [\[2\]](#), which is to make a long series of claims, but when challenged on them. The jew/marxist in question simply repeats bland assertions without factoring in coherent evidenced critique or answering the objections point by point. Then as an optional point, that again we often still see today [\[3\]](#), the jew and/or marxist will come back after a time and simply repeat the same old arguments that have been answered without answering or even recollecting the objections (often ignoring them entirely).

This is what Hitler speaks of when he discusses how the claims were repeated, but yet when coherent critique was offered: the arguments made by jews and marxists seemed to be made of jelly and nothing solid or substantial. By this he means that the jews were repeating the same assertions and platitudes after having admitted they were false the day before having no actual evidence to support them. By using this quotation as an excuse to not answer your critics/detractors you, in fact, become the same as the jew and/or marxist that Adolf Hitler is talking about in these very lines.

This quote is not an excuse not to answer your detractors and critics, but rather it is a declaration that you must and that by repeating arguments ad infinitum, but not addressing or taking account of counter-arguments presented, you are acting like the jews and/or marxists that Hitler so aptly describes. I dare say Adolf Hitler would have been quite sickened by the use of his words to avoid debate with jews and/or marxists. rather than to attack to the eternal enemies of the Aryan race in a measured and rational military manner.

If you have any real respect for Adolf Hitler, as a man, as a writer and as an ideal, then you would not use the words of this truly great man as an excuse for your own failings. Aryan men and women are honest, true and good: they don't hide behind the great men of the past and certainly not the hero the Second World War. If you don't know something, or make a mistake, then admit it and be honest: do your research and work hard. Please don't act like a jew and hide in a corner trying to invoke the name of Adolf Hitler to silence your opponent: it is utterly repugnant.

[1] Adolf Hitler, Trans: James Murphy, 1939, '*Mein Kampf: A Retrospect*', Vol. I, 1st Edition (Unexpurgated), Hurst & Blackett: London, pp. 63-64.

[2] One that I would contend could be more broadly applied today to include most of what are colloquially termed 'Conspiracy Theorists': including not a few of the so-called 'anti-Semites' in the world today.

[3] One obvious example of this can be found in the '9/11 Truth Movement' who seem to, once rebutted, simply reappear a variable, usually short, time later making exactly the same claims with the same sources having not introduced any further research or evidence to their claims (other than the accusation that their opponents are automatically jews or shills in the case the 'anti-Semitic' part of the '9/11 Truth Movement').

Opinion on World Events: The Gaza UN School Incident

Sunday, 18 January 2009

I am sure you have heard of the recent shelling of the UN school in Gaza by the Israeli Defense Forces (or IDF for short) using mortars. Now what you may not have heard or seen is the absolute hullabaloo going on in the background between the jewish and philo-Semitic supporters of Israel and the rest of the world. The former seek to justify the attack while the later condemn it unconditionally. I won't defend Hamas or the Israelis, but rather I am only interested in looking at this rationally taking into consideration what we do know and what this proves or doesn't prove.

Let us recap what supposedly happened:

The UN school in Gaza was a place of refuge, naturally since the UN is neutral, where it is estimated over 1,000 displaced persons had gathered. Israel proceeded to launch, what is said to have been, a mortar attack on the UN school. This is in violation of the neutral status of the UN school, which as a peacekeeping organisation is a place of refuge for those displaced in war.

How do Israel and her supporters seek to justify this attack?

We are told that the IDF attacked the UN school, because a Hamas unit/cell was using its grounds to launch a mortar attack on nearby IDF units. The Jews and their supporters then maintain that the IDF merely returned fire and then unfortunately hit the UN school. As a further argument it is asserted that amongst the dead in the UN school were two members of the Hamas unit/cell that was supposedly launching said mortar attack. This according to Jews and their supporters therefore justifies the attack and whilst they maintain they are very sorry about the Palestinian dead: they also maintain it was both necessary and an unfortunate accident (i.e. the IDF didn't 'know' there was a UN school there).

As evidential proof of this claim concerning the supposed mortar attack launched on the IDF from the grounds of the school: the IDF have released a video showing what they assert is a Hamas unit/cell launching a similar attack from the same school grounds a year ago.

Let us think about these arguments used by the Jews and their supporters for a moment.

Now if indeed a Hamas unit/cell did launch a mortar attack from a school on the IDF and please note we only have the IDF's suggestion and two 'anonymous residents', who 'feared for their lives', who spoke on the phone to the Associated Press as evidence for this being the case.

No UN staff, to my knowledge, have come forward to say this is the case, which we have to note is of interest. Since if there was mortar fire coming from the grounds of the UN school the UN staff there should have at least heard it and would likely have seen it. The UN staff would have no reason, as a neutral party in the war, to lie for Hamas, but yet we have heard nothing from them to support the Israeli version of events.

Why?

I would conjecture that the reason we haven't heard anything from this quarter is the simple reason that they didn't hear or see anything to indicate a mortar attack was being carried out from the UN school grounds. This isn't to say it might not have happened and due to circumstances it wasn't picked up on by the UN staff, but rather that it seems very odd indeed that nobody else, but the IDF and two supposed 'residents', seems to have noticed the first attack.

Does the assertion made by the IDF that they found the corpses of the two leaders of the Hamas unit/cell with weapons in the rubble of the UN school evidence of the first attack having taken place? No: it isn't. Why isn't it evidence?

It isn't evidence for the first attack by a Hamas unit/cell on an IDF unit nearby since there is no evidence, beyond the questionable assertion by the IDF, that these two Semite men were involved in the attack at all or even that the weapons they carried are their own. Carrying weapons is nothing unusual in Gaza and there is the very real possibility that they may have been simply been in the school for other, more innocent reasons, but because they were Hamas

members they armed themselves to protect their families from harm. There is also the possibility, which we cannot rule out because of the nature of cover-ups in military conflict, especially in police actions as this can be classed as. That Israeli forces placed weapons at the scene in order to give them an excuse after they had realised they had hit a UN building. We can't suggest this as anything, but a speculative point, however it is something that needs to be considered in any analysis for precisely the reason of doing as the jews claim they do in 'maintaining balance'.

We simply don't have any evidence to conclude that these two Hamas members were involved in this alleged mortar attack. It is, of course, perfectly possible that they were involved and that they did conduct a mortar attack from the grounds of the UN school, but no conclusive or even suggestive evidence has been given for this other than the official statement of the IDF concerning the matter.

However even if we assume that the IDF were responding to a mortar attack from the school grounds it begs the question that if they could identify that these two Hamas men were involved in this attack before the response, this seems to be implied by those defending Israel and even possibly in the IDF's own statement, why they could not wait to perform an ancillary strike or apprehend the two men at a later time?

Why was it necessary for the IDF to return mortar fire when they knew the rough position of the Hamas unit/cell and either did or didn't have the information that there was a neutral UN-administered school nearby? Either way the fault must lie with the IDF's commanders and/or troops on the ground or the operational staff at the command and control level.

You might ask why this is must be so. The reason that the fault must lie with either the commander and/or troops on the ground or at the operational staff level is that if there was a mortar attack and the IDF knew it had come from the UN school area and did not take precautions against civilian casualties. By co-operating with the UN to look for Hamas suspects potentially sheltering in the UN school as the two dead Hamas members were said to have done. There was no need to simply launch return fire on the UN school when a man hunt operation would have sufficed to flush out the alleged Hamas mortar unit/cell.

Therefore if the IDF commanders and/or troops on the ground launched a mortar attack on the UN school knowing it was there then they are guilty of war crimes: since they deliberately bombed a non-combatant target killing numerous innocents in the process. Likely, I suspect, because it contained those who many nationalist Israeli jews, i.e. a belief likely widely held among IDF soldiers, consider amalek and they believe that Yahweh, the jewish God, ordered them to exterminate from the face of the earth. This belief has been argued to be central in much jewish 'right-wing' thought by Elliot Horowitz among others and we can reasonably suggest that such thought is pervasive inside the IDF who are generally jewish nationalist in orientation. This belief, that Yahweh has ordered the death of implacable enemies of the jews who are identified as amalek, thus could act and perhaps did in this case, as a rationale for the attack if indeed it was, as I suspect, deliberate.

We should also take into account that Israeli society in general is notoriously opposed to the UN, because they deem it to be a pro-Palestinian organisation that prevents Israel from doing what it

believes must be done. This belief is also particularly predominant among nationalist jews who write about anti-Semitic conspiracies involving Arab states, oil companies and 'deluded liberals' at the UN. Opinion within the IDF although likely less visceral than that among the nationalist (secular and religious) right in Israel is similar since the IDF can be said to regard the UN as a yoke on their body preventing them from doing what they, as jews, feel they have to do against the Palestinian Arabs.

However if the IDF commanders and/or troops on the ground launched a mortar attack on the UN school without knowing it was such. Then it was an accident, but it thus becomes the operational staff at the command and control level's responsibility, because Gaza is a place well known to their troops and themselves. They also, as they have admitted, were and are well aware of the UN school's location and what it was. Hence if they failed to provide their troops with accurate intelligence and information as to their surroundings: they must be held responsible for this incident.

So we can thus say that the fault must lie with the IDF (hence Israel is at fault) and not with anyone else: regardless of whether Hamas launched a mortar assault from the grounds of the UN school or not.

Does the footage provided and cited by the IDF in their defence of what they assert is a Hamas unit/cell firing from the grounds of the UN school over year ago proves that such an attack occurred here? Of course it does not: all it proves was that in 2007 a mortar attack was launched by parties unknown from the UN school grounds not that one was launched from the UN school grounds in 2009.

It might be suggested by jews and philo-Semites that this suggests that the UN school was used by Hamas units/cells to launch mortar attacks on Israeli forces. Indeed this is partially true: since mortar attacks have been launched from the grounds before, but it does not prove it was the case this time or justify the attack on the UN school. Rather it further implicates the IDF in the action, because in 2007 when they assert they came under mortar attack from the UN school grounds: they didn't shell the UN school. Why did this become a necessity of war in 2009 when it was not in 2007?

It is also pertinent to point out that had the UN school been unintentionally sheltering Hamas units/cells then all the IDF had to do was make a request to the UN to search the premises and the Arabs in it. However launching a mortar attack on the UN school was and cannot be justified on any grounds even as counter-battery fire (since the jews either had access to, and the ability to read, detailed maps or did not: hence either the commanders and/or troops on the ground are responsible or those in operational staff at the command and control level are).

Therefore we can conclude in the absence of evidence that there was no military or political justification for such an attack and that Israel must be found to be worthy of indictment for war crimes for casually allowing their soldiers to attack a neutral power and a place of refuge for non-combatants and civilians.

This isn't to say that the *causus belli* of the jews and the Arabs on each other isn't valid: for race

is as valid a reason for war as any other and indeed is the basis of much evolutionary conflict. However we can learn from the Jewish actions how Semites fight: that is that they are interested only in 'fighting dirty', as they say. When one gets in the way of a 'dirty fight' then it is only natural one is going to get hurt, but this doesn't justify the attacks made by the Jews on neutral ground, but rather demonstrates the alien mentality of Semites, Jew and Arab, in general.

Zionism: Friend or Foe? (Part I)

Sunday, 25 January 2009

Since the end of the Second World War increasing focus in anti-Semitic thought has been given to the role of Zionism in the Jewish question. Works devoted to combating and exposing it as both a detrimental and powerful force in world politics and international relations have not only come from the anti-Semitic 'right' but also from the anti-Imperialist 'left'. 'Zionism' is a favourite hobby horse for 'anti-Semites' criticising and critiquing the Jews with it increasingly becoming a main focus of the vast majority of anti-Semitic writing. This focus on Zionism has, I would argue, caused many anti-Semites, genuine or otherwise, to turn exclusively to writing on the evils of Zionism related to the conduct of Israel and what has been aptly termed by former United States congressman Paul Findley as '*the Israel Lobby*'.

The enemy of the Aryan race is no longer seen as Jews a part of who adhere to a position in the political position of Zionism by these writers. But rather the enemy of the Aryan, or the more commonly the so-called 'White', race is seen as a political position, 'Zionism', and in particular its advocates: 'Zionists'. Zionist, of course, means different things to different people, because it is, by its very nature, a highly subjective description. To the Israeli 'right', for example, a Zionist cannot be anyone, but an individual, Jew or Gentile, who unconditionally supports Israel's hawkish actions and who opposes 'liberal' criticism of Israel. But to the Israeli 'left', for example, a Zionist is somebody who supports the right of Israel to exist, but who does not necessarily have to support or approve of the actions undertaken, particularly in Israel's defence, by the Israeli government in the past or the present.

However anti-Semites define what a Zionist is slightly differently and assert that a Zionist is someone who expresses support or aids the state of Israel knowingly in any way, shape or form. There is also a tendency in anti-Semitic discourse and writing to find the term 'Zionist' being used to equate a Jew.

This is, of course, problematic, because not every Jew falls under one or more of the many definitions of what a Zionist is. We also cannot assert that every Zionist is a Jew, because many, often well-meaning, [Aryan] Gentiles fall under one or more of the many definitions of what a Zionist is.

It is also true to state that the general anti-Semitic definition of what a Zionist is dangerously close to what the Israeli 'left's', and the international anti-Zionist left, definition of what a Zionist is. Since if anti-Semites are generally arguing a similar line, and indeed borrowing heavily, from the anti-Zionist 'left's' literature on the subject then it leaves the way open for

jews and/or their supporters of the Israeli 'right' and 'left', who identify with the two general definitions of Zionism I have outlined above, to charge that 'anti-Zionists' and anti-Semites are similar. As well as that anti-Zionists are anti-Semites and that anti-Semites are allied with Islam and Arabs against Israel and the jews.

This dangerous closeness between the definitions used by the anti-Zionist 'left' and the anti-Semitic 'right' largely originates in an increasingly advocated off-shoot of racialism, which has become increasingly popular especially on the American anti-Semitic 'right' as time has progressed. This is the theory, championed by that doyen of the post war anti-Semitic 'right': Francis Parker Yockey (who may well have been part jewish^[1]). This theory, which parallels other 'rightist' theories and draws on the work of Arthur Moeller van den Bruck and Karl Haushofer, is that in order to fight the jewish menace: Nationalists must garner support from Third World, or '*the dark races*' as they are sometimes referred to as, and to do this they must support these non-Aryan causes^[2]. This theory is dangerous precisely, because it introduces thought which is not natural to the nationalist and does not acknowledge, because of Yockey's rejection of biological race and championing of 'spiritual racialism' as the determining factor^[3], that the non-Aryans whose causes the Aryans under this theory are supporting do not have the interests of the Aryan race at heart. It also does not acknowledge that a non-Aryan, particularly a Semitic, ethnic or racial group could use this to manipulate Aryan sensibilities to their own ends.

This is precisely what has been in the case of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, which lies at the modern debate over the validity of Zionism. Philo-Semites and the jews have sought to claim that the province of Palestine is exclusively theirs by biological and historical right. While the Arabs and their, generally left-wing, supporters have sought to delegitimize this claim and/or to argue for a single state both jewish and Arab in Palestine. Now the problem the anti-Semitic right has faced in the debate over Zionism is how to respond.

This is by no means a very simple question since anti-Semites have historically been both antagonistic to Zionism and cautiously supportive of it. It is tempting to conclude, with the benefit of hindsight and knowledge of mainstream anti-Semitic thought today, that anti-Semites have always been opposed to Zionism as a rule of thumb. This is not true: since anti-Semites rightly saw in Zionism both a potential threat, hence their antagonism and an opportunity to solve the jewish question as it was in their own time.

The viewing of Zionism as a threat is indeed not a new phenomenon. In the early 20th century well known and populist anti-Semites such as Theodor Fritsch openly condemned Zionism as the latest part in the jewish conspiracy^[4] in so far as it sought to unite the jews of the world together in one nation and then, which Fritsch correctly predicted, spread out to attempt, consciously or otherwise, to conquer or subdue the world and fulfil the supposed jewish destiny as the chosen of Hashem. It was viewed, in the conception of the time, that the jews, if a Zionist state was established, could potentially grow in power to be an even greater threat to Aryan civilisation than had been hitherto known.

In a slight paradox many famous anti-Semites in Fritsch's time (and after), such as Adolf Hitler, saw the opportunity presented by Zionism to provide a relatively peaceful solution to the jewish question, which importantly had gained its scientific aspect in the acknowledgement of the jews

as a series of biological groups who shared much more in common with each other than they did their own host populations. This opportunity, which was especially necessary now that the jew had to be physically isolated and removed from the host population, was simply to allow the jews, i.e. the Zionists, to get their own people out of their host countries and into the new jewish state with the minimum of cost and fuss to the host people. Who then could deal with what remained of the jews in their countries in a much more simple fashion (such as sterilization, ghettos, deportation and/or labour camps).

This isn't to say that those who suggested Zionism was an opportunity to be rid of the jews once and for all were blind to the jewish nature, but rather that they understandably felt that it would be far better. To have the jews where one could know they were jewish, as representatives and citizens of a jewish state, than have the possibility of these same jews being lost in their host nations. Even with legal precautions, it was rightly argued, that there was the strong possibility that jews might in time be able to infiltrate into Aryan society unseen and even worse: mix their blood with unknowing Aryan men and women when they married and bred with them.

With the defeat of National Socialist Germany and the ideological destruction of anti-Semitism following the devastation, reprisal killings and terrorism of the Allies and the Comintern: the remaining anti-Semites began to look for a way to carry on the struggle against the jews.

Many anti-Semites found their metier following the creation of Israel and began to actively champion the cause of the Arabs as a medium to carry the fight to the jews. However over time this exposure to a Semitic environment and without a central ideological authority to act as a rudder: anti-Semites began to associate the anti-Semitic cause with simply being the true anti-Zionist cause. Since it was understandably held that the jews had wreaked destruction on National Socialist Germany and Europe and hence many anti-Semites intended to do all in their power to wreak destruction in vengeance on the jews: not only for smearing Germany with allegations about the so-called 'holocaust', but for destroying their lives and families.

This change is perhaps best exemplified in the figure of Professor Doctor Johann von Leers who was a prolific anti-Semitic author: before, during and after the Third Reich. Von Leers himself was an avid proponent of the theory that the jew is biologically criminal and wrote some expansive scholarly work on the subject. After the defeat of National Socialist Germany von Leers fled to Italy and then Argentina where he published and edited the leading voice of anti-Semitism in the world in years following the end of Second World War, '*Der Weg*', until the mid 1950's when the political climate in Argentina, with the premature death of Eva Perón in 1952, began to turn against anti-Semitism and the National Socialist refugees. With the climate turning against him: von Leers sought new employment, which he found in Egypt, which was struggling to come to intellectual and ideological terms with the recent formation of the expansionist state of Israel nearby and the displacement and massacres perpetrated by the Israeli jews and their allies. Von Leers threw himself into the task of creating an educated anti-Semitic discourse against the jews that the Egyptian, and the larger Arab, could understand and build on in order to destroy the jewish state in revenge for the destruction wreaked and the injustices, such as the Nuremberg (and subsequent) trials, committed by the jews against the Aryan folk.

In order to do this von Leers converted to Islam, changing his name to Omar Amin, and began

writing for what he increasingly argued was the anti-Semitic anti-Zionist cause against the state of Israel and Jewry. Von Leers had during his years of service become enamored with Islam and contrasted it with Judaism as a Hegelian opposite (i.e. an anti-thesis): von Leers had earlier supported a nostalgic call to revive the nature-based animistic religions of early Aryan history, but this gradually became subsumed by his need to find a more structured and morally encompassing antidote to Jewry with explicit condemnation of the Jew as the enemy of mankind. Von Leers found this in Islam and in particular with the strain of Islam advocated by his friend Muhammad Amin Al-Husayni: the Mufti of Jerusalem.

We can thus begin to understand the precedent that many anti-Semites claim to be following in that with the fall of National Socialist Germany and anti-Semitic fascism across Europe: the refugees who were still, commendably, loyal to the ideals and spirit of the times looked to find a way to strike back. Many of them found it by working against Israel, but this does not mean that one must automatically oppose Zionism in theory. The guerrilla war understandably waged against the Jews of Israel by those still loyal to the National Socialist and anti-Semitic spirit was a war against the Jews not a war against Zionism.

Von Leers and other National Socialists who supported the Arab's propaganda and military campaign against Israel, such as Francois Genoud^[5], did so as a means to an end and adopted anti-Zionist rhetoric as to fit the times. Not so much, because they opposed the concept of Zionism, but they, as I have said, understandably wished to strike back against the Jews of the world for their pre-eminent role in the war of destruction, terror and torture waged against National Socialist Germany during and after the Second World War. Anti-Zionism was thus the medium for the continuance of the fight against the Jews and not a condemnation by National Socialism, or the anti-Semites of that time, of Zionism as an ideology.

The popular anti-Semitic acceptance of a belief converse to the actuality of events, as I have explained them above, has been aided and abetted by Jews and their philo-Semitic allies: who have increasingly argued, since the end of the Second World War, that Arabic anti-Semitism is just the same as 'Nazi' anti-Semitism. The evidence, on which they base this argument, is the use of those loyal to the National Socialist and anti-Semitic cause made of the Arab peoples in facilitating anti-Semitism an opportunity to strike back for the war crimes committed by the Jews and their allies during and after the Second World War. The Jews and their allies also point to the relationship between the Arabs and the Third Reich during the Second World War and that the Mufti of Jerusalem (Al-Husayni) went to Berlin and met Adolf Hitler^[6] as well as becoming friends with Heinrich Himmler and several other high-ranking members of the SS such as Karl Wolff.

However this argued case all but collapses when we note that it wasn't an unusual thing for high-ranking officials to form a friendship with a non-Jewish non-Aryan in the Third Reich. For they maintained many non-Aryan friends from Italians, Spanish, Latin Americans, Slavs to Indians as well as Arabs such as Al-Husayni. All these friendly groups helped the Third Reich, and in particular the SS (including providing military volunteers for provisional SS Freiwilligen regiments and divisions), in some manner or another and often were strongly anti-Semitic in their orientation. It is thus ridiculous to suggest that there was an unusual closeness between the Third Reich and the Arabic world.

The Third Reich, much as the Allies and Comintern, saw the Arabic world as being a valuable geo-political arena in which they needed influence: in order to secure vital Arab oil supplies and secure/seize the Suez channel, which was the main artery of the British war effort. The Third Reich saw the opportunities offered by inculcating anti-Semitism among the Arabs as well as the fertile ground on which it could be sown. They thus conducted, using Al-Husayni as their primary tool[7], a sophisticated and well-financed anti-Semitic propaganda campaign amongst the Arabs and Islamic world in general in order to carry favour. In this they were quite successful, but only indirectly[8].

This influence has ironically been felt in modern anti-Semitism with the presumption, as I have said, of anti-Semitism naturally being opposed to Zionism and with an increasing anti-Zionist focus on the activities of Israel has allowed modern anti-Semites to take out of context their historical counterparts actual motivation and reasoning behind their anti-Zionism. Jews and their supporters have had, as I have said, a very considerable part to play in the rise of this assumption in that they have produced many works, popular and academic, and newspaper/magazine articles as well as documentaries suggesting that the Arabs are the 'new Nazis' and that Arab anti-Semitism is 'Nazi' anti-Semitism.

These beliefs have seeped into anti-Semitism through the mass media[9] with anti-Semites, although professing to remain sceptical of the mass media precisely, because of the overwhelming Jewish presence in and power over it, taking to heart the ideas purported by Jews and their supporters in their works and not taking a step back and thinking about the 'why' of supporting the Arab war against Israel. Let us however be very clear on this point: the Arabs do not wish to destroy the Jews and nor do they, as the Jews claim, wish to wipe them off the face of the earth. What the Arabs wish to do is to destroy the state of Israel, which they contend exists on their land, and in more militant cases they wish to, in the spirit of their own racial nationalism (which is very similar to the practical results of Zionism), to subject the world to dictates of Islam (with the Arabs as the pre-eminent racial group: much as in the Jewish conception of the world).

The ideology of using the '*dark races*' to fight against the Jews that was, directly or indirectly, championed by van den Bruck, Haushofer and Yockey makes its appearance here in the popular anti-Semitic conception that anti-Semitism must ally with the Arabs against the Jews. However as we have discussed the Arabs are not actually anti-Semitic: they merely associate Jews with Zionism and are as antagonistic to Israeli Arabs, such as the Druze, who actively support Zionism as they are Jews. When the Arabs write, march and attack Jews: they are not attacking Jews as a biological group, but rather are attacking Jews as a surrogate of Israel, which itself maintains that it exists as a homeland and a place of refuge for the Jews. Therefore to the consciousness of the Arab: if Israel is maintaining it is the homeland of the Jews and have or alleged to have done terrible things to Arabs in Palestine then it is only natural to seek out a surrogate to take out the pent up frustration, anger and rage on. That surrogate logically, became the wider idea of the Jews as the enemy of the Arabs (as argued by Al-Husayni), but the logic was not that the Jews were actually the enemy, but rather that Zionists and Israel were the enemy, but they professed that were representing the Jews (so therefore in order to lampoon or strike back at Zionists and Israel you need, in the Arabic mind, to attack the Jews: this doesn't meant

the Arabs are anti-Semitic only anti-Zionist).

When the Arabs write, march and attack the '*Israel Lobby*' they don't mean '*jewish world power*', even if they write and declare as much, but rather they mean the power of Zionist political and lobbying groups in the United States of America and parts of Europe. When President Ahmadinejad of Iran embraced the rabbis of the anti-Zionist organisation, Neutri Karta, in Tehran: he didn't lampoon them as jews, but rather he embraced them as his friends and talked of their common enemies: Zionists and Israel.

Why did President Ahmadinejad do that if he was anti-Semitic in the 'Nazi' sense?

The answer is quite simple: he wouldn't have. To accept a jew as a friend and an aid as a biological anti-Semite would and is an unforgiveable act: precisely because it goes against the fundamental point of biological anti-Semitism in the complete rejection of the jew and all of his wares: emotional, physical, intellectual and spiritual.

It thus cannot be said that Arabs are actually anti-Semitic, but they are ardently anti-Zionist as a rule. When we talk of Arab anti-Semitism what we are really talking about as a rule is Arab anti-Israel or anti-Zionist sentiment.

When advocates, knowing or unknowing, of this '*revolt against the modern world*', as Julius Evola styled it, speak of allying with Arabs and/or speak approvingly of the Arab war against Israel as a war against the jews. They are, in fact, firstly misunderstanding the nature of Arab anti-Semitism and presuming in their racial subjectivity that the Arabs understand the jewish question in the same way that they do as well as presuming that the Arabic peoples have the same fundamental grievances against the jews as themselves.

These advocates presume this in that they assume that what might on the surface seem to be anti-Semitic critique is just that, but rather Arab nationalists will happily accept the aid of an anti-Zionist and/or a sincere converted jew (to Islam) into their rank, but yet in anti-Semitism this is not so. The Arabic peoples, as I have said, are not anti-Semitic, but rather anti-Zionist. The Arabic grievance is with the Zionists and the state of Israel not the jews themselves. Thus it is not a war against the jews, but rather a war against Israel and may even be considered a war to help create the conditions, which might allow for an Arabic, through the medium of Islam (much like the jews use of Judaism: although actually more invidious, because it makes the pretence of being universalistic), empire to be established.

This leads us into the second misunderstanding these advocates makes in that they assume that the Arabs interests are identical or close to the interests of the Aryan folk, but they are not. As I have noted the Arabs are a people who, like their Semitic kin: the jews, wish to rule the world as part of what they consider to be their right to do so. Their medium for this, as I have said, is the religion of Islam: whose leaders have historically always been of Semitic racial stock (and more often than not Arabs).

How can the Arabic peoples, whatever their grievances, as Semitic kin of the jews be regarded as allies or even as informal partners in the war against the jews?

The answer is simply that they cannot.

The reason for this in the biological conception of the Jewish question is relatively simple. In that if the Jews are Semites and bear close relation to the Arabs, who are also Semites, to such an extent that they can be considered genetic 'brothers'. Then the Jews and Arabs must be of similar if not the same stock and thus the nature of the Jew must also, and is, inherent in the Arabs. All that has changed between the two is the language, the professed religion, the customs and some of the physical attributes.

The Arab is the cousin of the Jew: so why should one oust the Jew from his death-grip on the Aryan folk only to allow the Jew's relation, the Arab, to take the Jew's place at the neck of the Aryan folk by suggesting an alliance with and/or celebrating the anti-Semitism of the Arabic peoples?

Have they not learnt from what the biological struggle against the Jew has taught us?

Have they not understood that the Jew's very existence in the Aryan folk is a threat to them even when they are under legal and police scrutiny? It is the biology of the Jew that is the fundamental threat for every creature can only develop, evolve and act within its biological frame and not exceed it. The Arab is the genetic cousin of the Jew so therefore the Arab is to be considered in the same sentence as the Jew: as an enemy of the Aryan folk and a parasite on the organism of the nation.

When we understand that the Arab and the Jew are cousins it becomes increasingly clear how the Arabs, especially the Arabic Palestinians, have used the Aryan folk in their struggle against Israel and its Zionist supporters. Much as the Jew has used the Aryan folk in their much wider aims: the Arabs have their own supporters in North America and Europe who champion their cause as much as the Zionist Jews and the philo-Semites champion the cause of Israel in those same lands.

[1] For more information see Kevin Coogan, 1999, *'Dreamer of the Day: Francis Parker Yockey and the Post War Fascist International'*, 1st Edition, Autonomedia: New York.

[2] This can be contrasted to National Socialism's own doctrines where-by such a 'revolt of the Third World' would be unthinkable and Adolf Hitler's famous refusal to even suggest that a non-British India would be a positive thing and his subsequent refusal to use Indian nationalism to his advantage. Despite the potentially large positive bonus for Germania's war effort that would accrue from this recognition: as the Japanese found with Subhas Chandra Bose and the forces he raised to fight for them. For a contrasting view to that offered by Yockey please see the work of Lothrop Stoddard and Madison Grant, which influenced Adolf Hitler.

[3] See Revilo Oliver's comments and critique of this in Revilo Oliver, 1981, *'The Enemy of our Enemies'*, 2nd Edition, Liberty Bell: Reedy, pp. 2-50.

[4] Fritsch went as far as to suggest that the Protocols of Zion, the authenticity of which he understandably believed, were the unofficial minutes of the first Zionist congress in Basel led by the official, although not actual, founder of Zionism: Theodor Herzl in his Theodor Fritsch, 1933, *'Die Zionistischen Protokolle: Das Programm der internationalen Geheimregierung'*,

14th Edition, Hammer Verlag: Leipzig.

[5] This doesn't include Ahmed Huber: who, like von Leers, converted to the Islam as it was preached by Al-Husayni (although more sincerely than von Leers I would contend), but doesn't, as many philo-Semites would contend, mean he supports the kind of Wahabist lunacy purported as a means to racial revival by Arabs all over the world.

[6] Who then supposedly explain to Al-Husayni that he wanted to exterminate all the jews of the world. However no convincing proof has ever been offered as to Hitler's words to Al-Husayni and certainly such a statement would be contrary to what Hitler himself often spoke of when he discussed the solution to the jewish question i.e. emigration and deportation with the placing in ghettos of those jews who chose to remain in the borders of the Third Reich.

[7] Since he had the reputation as an Islamic hero for his part in the guerrilla war fought against the jews and the British by the Arabs under Al-Husayni's aegis in the mid-late 1930's, as well as his authority as a high-ranking Islamic religious leader and his claim to be a descendent of the Prophet Mohammed.

[8] Due to Al-Husayni's post war status as the leader of the Arabic Palestinians against the Israeli jews: his opinions influenced by anti-Semitic works of the Third Reich became highly thought of by Arabs seeking cogent explanations for Israel's sudden re-emergence on their land.

[9] Good propaganda is subtle and the subject of the propaganda does not realise he/she has been successfully influenced by the propaganda: anti-Semites, whatever they may personally or collectively maintain and sincerely believe, are not an exception to this rule and have merely been propagandised in a different way to the mainstream audience for which the jewish and philo-Semitic propaganda was intended.

In Brief: The 'Truth' and 'Bias' Assertions

Monday, 26 January 2009

It is often said by jews and gentiles as well as by philo-Semites and anti-Semites that the other side whom they are arguing against is '*biased*' and therefore cannot be said to be making a '*truthful*', '*balanced*' or '*objective*' case. These terms are all well and good, but it is very important to realise that these are not accurate terms and that the very function of such terminology in most writing is as propaganda for the thesis, argument and/or interpretation the author is putting forward. Since by applying these forms of rhetoric the author in question seeks to give the reader the impression that they, as well as often other authors they favour, are giving the best argument that the reader should then believe. It needs to be remembered that the function of writing is as propaganda for the author: regardless of whether that writing is meant for an academic, learned or popular audience. If you have a thought or thoughts regarding a subject then the primary function of writing down those thoughts is so they can be communicated to others through an intelligible medium and in such a way as to convince others of your own views.

People do not write thoughts down merely for their own amusement, but rather with some other motive. When an author appeals to the reader that their argument is '*the truth*', '*objective*' or '*balanced*' it is not so much that their argument is these things, but rather that this is what they wish the reader to believe and/or it is what they believe to be the case themselves.

We must note when we view the use of these words from a racial perspective that the particular jewish preoccupation with the use of these terms is a reflection of the jewish belief that they are the 'Chosen people' and hence are special. Hence because they are special and the 'Chosen' of Hashem it is presumed by jews, as well as by philo-Semites, that their arguments must be objective, balanced and/or truthful: either literally or with the purest intention in the vein of their racial ambition of tikkun olam (or '*repairing/perfecting the world*'). This belief can also be linked to the jewish inferiority complex regarding their own work in that it must be objective, balanced and truthful (hence praiseworthy and should be believe by others: jew or gentile), because if it is not then the jew in question will suffer an egoistic set back due to their perceived loss of pride, status and the questioning of their integrity.

Objectivity is not a simple thing to allege your argument is since your argument can only subjective since one is only applying ones interpretation using ones knowledge to a set of data and information. This data and information is not complete and nor can we reasonably suggest it can ever likely be. Even if we give full consideration to other opinions and report all the evidence then we are still being subjective, because we are applying our interpretations to that evidence based on the existing state of our knowledge. This is very important, because once we recognise this is it naturally follows that everything written must be held to be biased and prejudiced in some way.

But this, we can contend, is natural, because the human being is an organic creation and individuals, as well as races, have different perspectives on how something should be interpreted precisely, because they are viewing the subject or object from a different biological and experience base than their fellows. This applies to individuals as well as groups. Hence '*truth*' and '*bias*' must be seen as racially and individually subjective qualities. We must thus state that there is no '*truth*' other than what that author believes to be the '*truth*', but rather this is the author's own biased interpretation of what the '*truth*' is.

In dealing with the jewish question: we must remember that we are looking at it from a completely different biological and experience basis to the jews themselves (and vice versa). Hence our theories, arguments and interpretations with are only our perceptions of jews not necessarily how jews, in fact, are. This is important to recognise, because once we recognise this: it becomes imperative that in the study of jews we must get as much primary data as possible in order to form the best biased interpretation of jews that we can (i.e. that secondary literature based on analysis of literature written by gentiles has little value, because it is not a jewish mind being studied).

Hence we cannot, as has hitherto been the case since the end of the Second World War, sit on our laurels regarding the jews and we must research them thoroughly and in the spirit whereby we know that what we will find will be biased presentation and may or may not be accurate. But what we can do, as Aryans, is to develop the best evidentially and logically sound interpretation of jews that fits and explains what we know about the jews without having to resort to make facts fit theories. Instead we must, in order to guide ourselves to a better biased understanding of jews, make theories fit facts.

I make no bones about the fact that I am biased against jews: I don't like the jews either individually or as a race. My knowledge base is such that I cannot see any good in jews individually or as a people, but at the same time, because I recognise this: I have to take into account the fact that anti-Semites, like myself, maybe be wrong about parts of the jewish question and that in order to be an anti-Semite in the proper sense of the term. I must let the data and information guide my thought not let my thought guide the data and information. Even if I or you are biased it doesn't make us wrong (nor is it a negative attribute outside of propagandistic perception), but it is something that has to be born in mind when reading other author's work as well as reading your own. When an author, especially when that author is a jew, claims to be objective, balanced or truthful then it is best to pay attention most carefully to what they write, because it often serves as a mask for their argument and that when you dig deeper into the footnotes and citations it becomes clear that alternative and perhaps more plausible interpretation suggest themselves. The more you dig into an argument, interpretation and/or thesis: the more ammunition you will find against that argument, interpretation and/or thesis. This is why close study of jews and jewish works is so important in anti-Semitism.

In short: deal with the reality of the jew and the world will applaud anti-Semitism. Treat the jew as an imaginary, inhuman fantasy and the world will have justified contempt for anti-Semitism.

Was Josef Stalin Jewish?

Thursday, 5 February 2009

A common assertion among anti-Semites is that Joseph Stalin, the infamous Soviet dictator, was in fact a jew. This argument is so tenuous that it can be dealt with relatively quickly. However it is important to state that this argument occurs with alarming rapidity despite the obviously problematic nature of the assertion: hence it is important to deal with the few 'proofs' offered for this argument.

The argument that Stalin was a jew would seem to have been popularised by the reference to it in Maurice Pinay's famous anti-Semitic book, *'The Plot against the Church'* [1], which was translated into at least three languages [2] and has been reprinted four times in English since its original publication [3]. Pinay argues as follows:

'[...] at the head of the names stands Stalin himself, who for a long time was regarded as a Georgian of pure descent. But it has been revealed, that he belongs to the Jewish race; for Djougachvili, which is his surname, means "Son of Djou," and Djou is a small island in Persia, whither many banished Portuguese "Gypsies" migrated, who late settled in Georgia.

Today it is almost completely proved, that Stalin has Jewish blood, although he neither confirmed or denied the rumours, about which mutterings began in his direction.' [4]

Then if we compare this to the most commonly cited source on the internet for this allegation, to which many anti-Semites challenged on this subject reference back to. We are told as follows:

'Stalin's childhood origins were supposedly Georgian, but the truth is his mother was Ossete, from the Khazarian region. In the Georgian language "shvili" means son of, or son, as in Johnson. "Djuga" means Jew. Therefore Djugashvili means Jewison.

So Joe Stalin's real name, before he changed it, was Joe Jewison. It gets better, his name was Joseph David Djugashvili, a typical Jewish name. During his revolutionary days he changed his name to "Kochba", the leader of the Jews during one of the anti-Roman uprisings of the Jews. Russians don't change their names. Georgians don't change their names. Jews change their names.

Stalin's mother Ekaterina did laundry and housekeeping for David Papisnedov, a local Jew, who was Stalin's real father. Their nickname for Stalin was "Soso". Stalin received Papisnedov at the Kremlin often. Comrade Papisnedov often was visited by Nikolai Przhevalsky, a Jewish trader, and he is also considered a possibility as Stalin's father.' [5]

We can immediately see that Stalin's surname, Djougashvili, meaning the 'son of Djou' has been transliterated by the author of the second; more modern, argument from the first argument (i.e. Pinay's) into being 'son of a jew' (the phonetics in English pronunciation apparently being similar). This has allowed the author of the second argument to claim that Stalin was jewish by taking the second part of Pinay's assertion and combining it with the first via what I can only speculate to be the phonetic sound of the two words in English: 'Djou' and 'jew'. We can see this referenced more in Pinay's argument when he refers to Portuguese gypsies in that Sephardi jews (and some Ashkenazim) were known in Europe as 'Portuguese' (for example when you asked the question: 'How many Portuguese lived in London in 1600?' you would simply be asking how many jews and Marranos [secret jews who outwardly kept to Roman Catholicism but practiced jewish rites, fasts, and feasts privately] were in London in 1600). This might infer that Stalin's parents were the descendents of settled Mizrahi and/or Sephardi jews, but this has been taken by the author of the second argument and folded into the claim that Stalin's father was a jewish merchant and that Stalin's surname means 'son of a jew' or 'Jewison/Jewson' in English.

Therefore we first of all establish the ostensible evolution of this argument in noting how close the arguments are, but how the second oft-cited argument likely takes Pinay's [6] argument and then twists it into a new form.

If we look at both arguments: we can see they particular stress on the meaning of the surname 'Djougachvili' or 'Djugashvili' and that in Pinay's opinion it means 'son of Djou' [7] and in the second argument it means 'son of a jew'/'Jewison'. Neither of these are, in fact, correct since the word 'Djuga' (or 'Dzhuga') in old Georgian does not mean 'jew' or 'Djou', but rather it roughly equates 'steel'. The old Georgian words for jew were actually 'Ebraeli' or 'Uriya', which bear absolutely no resemblance to 'Djuga' or 'Dzhuga'.

So Stalin's surname would actually mean something equivalent to 'son of steel', which then makes sense of Stalin's adoption of 'Stalin' as his surname, which in Russian roughly means 'man of steel' ('Stal' means 'steel' in Russian). Since in Stalin's eyes he was the 'son of steel' in Georgia and hence has become the 'man of steel' in Russia. Hence Stalin didn't change his name particularly much, but rather simply added in 'man' rather than 'son', which can easily be

suggested to be a sign of his coming of age as an atheist marxist revolutionary and a devout follower of Lenin (rather than the seminary student on a scholarship from a poor broken family in a little town in Georgia).

Pinay's argument is by the far the more sophisticated and educated out the two. Since his reference to Djou is a historically plausible one. Although I can find no reference to an island of/called '*Djou*' outside of Pinay: it is quite possible that Pinay's reference to an island where '*Portuguese*' were sent is accurate. Since this was a policy in the Ottoman Empire who did send jews to economically backward areas in order to boost the economy in that area and make the territory more profitable for the Ottoman Sultan through his (largely jewish) tax-farmers, administrative and customs service. However since '*Djougachvili*' does not actually mean '*son of Djou*' Pinay's argument must be regarded as incorrect, but it is at the very least an educated conjecture (since it is unlikely Pinay could have found a suitable source as to the meaning of old Georgian words). The second argument seems on the other hand to be completely inventing its interpretation out of whole cloth by alleging that '*Djuga*' means '*jew*' in old Georgian (again perhaps '*Djuga*' if pronounced a certain way might sound like a similar word to '*jew*': hence one could reasonably speculate that the origin of the argument made is from the author, whose first language is English, pronouncing the words and then because they to some ears might sound alike claiming that one means the other).

Hence Pinay's argument can be reasonably said to be disposed of, but there still remain a series of assertions in the second argument that deserve consideration. Firstly is the note that Stalin's mother, Ekaterina Gheladze Djugashvili, was from the '*Khazarian region*' is a indirect argument by implication that Stalin was jewish since it is commonly claimed by anti-Semites that Ashkenazi jews are the descendents of the jewish Khazar Khanate (or Khazaria). There is no evidence for this on both counts: i.e. we have no evidence that Stalin is descended from Khazars and secondly the evidence is heavily against the Khazars being the origin of the Ashkenazim [8].

Therefore we can only suggest this is an attempt to suggest a stronger argument that Stalin was of jewish descent than has been offered. It is in fact contradicted by the author in the reference page [9] he has added regarding Stalin's mother when he asserts that she was that she was from tribe of the Alans [10] and not a Georgian. However this is essentially irrelevant since the Alan territory was in the borderlands of northern Georgia and they are closely related to the Georgians. Hence the argument being made not only contradicts the early inference, but then secondly derives into pure Semantics to claim that Stalin's mother was not Georgian.

Further on this reference page it asserts that there are doubts as to the identity of Stalin's biological father. There has been little doubt expressed in the biographies of Stalin for the simple reason that there is no evidence suggesting that Stalin's father was anyone but Vissarion Ivanovich Djugashvili. This claim is asserted in more detail in the second argument when it is claimed that there are two candidates who are reported to be jews: David Papismedov and Nikolai Przhevalsky.

The claims are then referred back to the reference page and the detail of why the author thinks these two were Stalin's father is given. The claim surrounding Nikolai Przhevalsky is given as follows under the title of '*Stalin's Real Father*':

'The most notable such speculation was that Stalin's father was the Belorussian Nikolai Przhevalsky. The face of Joseph Stalin is almost identical to that of Nikolai Przhevalsky. Apparently Przhevalsky did stop off in the town of Gori in Georgia on his way to Tibet. According to the story, in Georgia he was hosted at the home of wealthy Georgian where Ekaterina Gheladze worked as a maid. According to the speculation Przhevalsky seduced Ekaterina and left her pregnant as he journeyed off to Tibet. According to the story the Georgian family (or Przhevalsky) to avoid scandal paid Vissarion Djugashvili a substantial amount of money for him to marry Ekaterina Gheladze and this was the source of the capital for him to have run a shoe-making business employing about thirty cobblers. He subsequently lost the business and later died in a drunken knife fight.

There appears to be no hard evidence for Przhevalsky being the father of Stalin. There was a city in Siberia that was named after Przhevalsky. The Bolsheviks changed the name after they came to power but Stalin later changed it back to Przhevalsky. However it would not be out of line for Stalin to deviously promote the notion that he was really Russian rather than Georgian. he was of Jewish blood from the Dinaric race.' [11]

It is worth noting firstly that the use of the qualifiers '*apparently*', '*according to the story*', '*according to speculation*' denotes that these are essentially bits of gossip heard and enlarged upon as time has gone on (if indeed they are genuine: since no originating source is cited) in the manner consistent with folklore in general. If I was to suggest that Elizabeth I of England was Jewish and then say '*according to speculation*', '*according to the story*' etc ad infinitum: then I could not suggest that this is the case without corroborating sources of a primary nature or examining the secondary literature explaining why they are wrong. The author does neither so one must take his words with more than a pinch of salt.

The author himself admits that there is '*no hard evidence*', but then speculates in his title that Przhevalsky is '*Stalin's Real Father*' and then asserts in direct contradiction to the earlier sentences in his own paragraph that Stalin '*was of Jewish blood from the Dinaric race*'. In fact Przhevalsky during his travels to the East was in a different part of central Asia during 1878-1879 (the years between which Stalin was presumably conceived) and there is no evidence that he even visited Georgia in his lifetime. There also no evidence I am aware of that Przhevalsky was Jewish, but rather a scion of an aristocratic Polish family (not a '*Jewish trader*' as asserted in the second argument, but rather a famous Russian geographer). If we have no evidence to suggest that Stalin was the product of a lover's tryst between Przhevalsky and Stalin's mother then we cannot assert that it is simply a fact as the author does: contradicting himself in the process.

We must secondly note that this story about Stalin's father being paid off to marry Stalin's mother and that Stalin's father is without any apparent factual foundation. Stalin's father would seem to have created his own success by hard work (employing several apprentices [the number of 30 seems excessive]), which then deteriorated as he began to drink heavily and came into conflict with Stalin's mother over Stalin's future occupation. Stalin's father also did not die in a drunken knife fight (this is again a folkloric rumour), but rather from tuberculosis and pneumonia according to current academic opinion.

Thirdly the assertion that the changing of the name of the city of Karakol, the city's original name, back to Przhevalsk in 1939 by Stalin after it had been changed back to Karakol in 1921 by the Bolsheviks (in reaction to popular demand) is not an indication or evidence of Przhevalsky's asserted status as Stalin's biological father, but rather that Stalin was changing place names back to those of great Russian heroes (of which Przhevalsky was but one: as a famous Russian geographer) in order to inspire nationalism in his population (which was a key element in much of Stalin's internal policy).

Fourthly in the second argument the author claims that Przhevalsky often visited David Papismedov who was a local Jew in Gori and whom was one of Stalin's mother's laundry clients. Papismedov certainly showed kindness to the young Stalin giving him books to read and giving donations of money to his mother. However there is no evidence Przhevalsky even knew Papismedov (or visited Georgia or Gori for that matter) let alone was a frequent guest in Papismedov's house: as I have said Przhevalsky was at the time (1878-1879) far away in the East and a long way away from Georgia.

This leads us to discuss the second alternative candidate for Stalin's biological father: David Papismedov. Who unlike Nikolai Przhevalsky was, in fact, Jewish. The evidence cited for this is even thinner than that given for Przhevalsky's fatherhood and it consists entirely of Stalin's relationship with Papismedov, which is given on the reference page as:

'Stalin's mother Ekaterina did laundry and housekeeping for David Papismedov, a local Jew, who was Stalin's real father. Their nickname for Stalin was "Soso". Stalin received Papismedov at the Kremlin often.' [12]

The fact that Stalin's mother did the laundry and housekeeping for a local Jew who treated her and Stalin himself comparatively well, certainly in comparison to Vissarion, does not make him the father of Stalin nor does it offer evidence of such. Since Stalin's mother had other clients, for whom she did laundry and housekeeping as well, if Stalin was not Vissarion's son then one would have to look at the other clients who would have equal opportunity of having a lovers tryst with Stalin's mother as Papismedov. In terms of giving Stalin's mother money and Stalin books to read: these can be seen simply as acts of charity rather than an acknowledgement of paternity. It is well to remember that acts of charity by monastic orders, for example, towards single mothers or married women does not mean the monk or monks having sired that single mother's or married woman's children. So therefore we can't simply assert that because Papismedov was kind to Stalin and his mother that he was Stalin's real biological father and that as a result Stalin is Jewish.

Papismedov did indeed call Stalin by his family nickname; 'Soso', but then so did his mother and Vissarion. For it was a family tradition with Vissarion's family nickname being: 'Besos'. Again it is not proof of paternity or an acknowledgement of such for a family friend to call Stalin by his family nickname and speculations of such can hold no evidential merit. When Papismedov went to the Kremlin he went there to look for a boy of whom he was presumably fond and to see if he was still alive (and if so what had happened to him). Stalin greeted him much as he did any old friend whom he thought warmly of and was quite congenial and friendly towards him as an early

kind influence in his life (who he probably saw as giving him the means and the skills to begin his career as a marxist revolutionary i.e. books). It is again not an argument in favour of Papismedov's paternity that Stalin treated him well when he came to the Kremlin, of his own volition, looking for Stalin. In fact had Papismedov been Stalin's father and Stalin had known this there would have been no reason for Stalin not to openly proclaim this when he was the Soviet dictator, but yet he did not.

Hence we must conclude that the claim that either Nikolai Przhevalsky or David Papismediv was Stalin's biological father is without foundation and until sufficient primary evidence is brought forward for this interpretation of the argument that Stalin must be regarded as nothing but un-evidenced speculation.

The only other piece of evidence brought forward to support the contention that Stalin was jewish by this second argument is that Stalin used the name; '*Kochba*', in his early revolutionary days. Kochba, or more properly bar Kochba, is a reference to the jewish leader of the Bar Kochba revolt against Rome in 132-135 A.D. In fact Stalin didn't use '*Kochba*' but rather '*Koba*'. Koba is a mythological figure in old Georgian literature roughly approximate to the figure of Robin Hood: i.e. a noble outlaw who robbed from rich and gave to the poor. The parallel between the figure of Koba and Stalin's political beliefs is obvious as it coincides with Marxist ideas concerning the redistribution of wealth from the rich to the poor to make a more equal society. Bar Kochba was a fanatical jewish zealot who fought on religious grounds to install a jewish theocratic dictatorship free from Roman control on Judea (as well as potentially much of North Africa, Syria and Cyprus). The parallel, in Stalin's marxist thought, between Stalin the Marxist revolutionary and bar Kochba the fanatical jewish zealot is non-existent, but between Stalin and Koba the Georgian Robin Hood: it is obvious.

Therefore we can only conclude in summation that there is no evidence that Josef Stalin was in fact jewish and that the evidence that has been advanced for this being the case is inaccurate, highly speculative and possibly deliberately distorted.

References

- [1] Maurice Pinay, Trans: Anon, 2000, [1967], '*The Plot against the Church*', 4th Edition, Christian Book Club of America: Palmdale
- [2] The original was written and published in Italian, but it was translated within a few years into Spanish, German (in which there are two separate editions: one for Germany and one for Austria) and English (as well as quite probably French, but I cannot find reference to a French edition).
- [3] This is notable, because post-1945 anti-Semitic books don't often run into multiple editions as well as printings and are rarely translated into different languages. Only anti-Semitic classics such as Arnold Leese's '*Jewish Ritual Murder*', Henry Ford's '*The International Jew*', Adolf Hitler's '*Mein Kampf*' and the '*Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*' can boast such sales and/or perceived/actual importance: hence Pinay's '*The Plot against the Church*' must be regarded as an anti-Semitic classic irrespective of its intellectual merit.
- [4] Pinay, Op. Cit., p. 65
- [5] http://judicial-inc.biz/Bush_Mossad11.htm [Accessed: 05/02/2009] (Warning: this site plays

an awful rendition of classical music at you, which may frighten you, your children and/or your pets).

[6] Pinay cites Bernard Hutton in the French language magazine, '*Constellation*' (of March 1962), as his source and having dealt with the author of the second argument before I am aware that he is not fluent in French (he also happens to be half-jewish as he admitted on LibertyForums some years ago). Therefore this lack of fluency in French and that the author is unlikely to have looked up the reference suggests that either the author of the second argument is taking Pinay's argument and/or a citation of it (or possibly another earlier source) and twisting it into a slightly different argument from the one that Pinay offers.

[7] Simon Sebag Montefiore in his 2007, '*Young Stalin*', claims that it means '*son of juga*' (similar to Pinay's suggestion), suggesting it derives from '*djogi*' meaning herd, but doesn't make a compelling case for this interpretation.

[8] On this point please see Kevin Alan Brook, 2002, '*The Jews of Khazaria*', 2nd Edition, Rowman & Littlefield: New York.

[9] http://judicial-inc.biz/st_alin_supplement.htm#stalins_mother [Accessed: 05/02/2009].

[10] Who were famously used as a light cavalry mercenaries by the Byzantine Empire.

[11] http://judicial-inc.biz/st_alin_supplement.htm#Nikolai_Przhevalsky [Accessed: 05/02/2009].

[12] http://judicial-inc.biz/st_alin_supplement.htm#david_2nd_father [Accessed: 05/02/2009].

Jews and 9/11: A Response to John Martinson Jr.

Friday, 6 February 2009

By way of introducing this response it is pertinent to explain briefly how it came to be written. At the urging of a friend and associate of Semitic Controversies I approached John Martinson Jr with the prospective offer of writing some form of intellectual material for his website: Jewish Crime Network (<http://jewishcrimenetwork.com/>). I stated quite openly that I did not believe a substantial number of the claims purported by anti-Semites regarding jews and that I could argue and evidence these beliefs. Now Martinson took exception to what he called my '*pompous attitude*', which is quite alright for he is entitled to his beliefs, and then promptly proceeded to inform me that I needed to do cutting edge research in areas such as the '9/11 Truth Movement'.

Our particular disagreement was based around 9/11 and Martinson was kind enough to write out a series of statements that he intimated were 'facts'. Hence this response, written by another contributor with a considerable , is directed towards these statements as both the agreed on response to his 'facts' and as a general reference tool for those seeking to combat the '9/11 Truth Movement's' unfortunate lunacy. It is further worth noting that upon investigating these claims we have found that the majority of them seem to be related to Christopher Bollyn's articles and are not based on any kind of 'cutting edge research' (unless you count investigative journalism as 'cutting edge research' of course).

Some of the claims are also apparently complete speculations since I can find no evidence of Jason Bermas or Dylan Avery being jewish[1], but however there does remain that possibility. However it should be noted that it remains for Martinson, and those who agree with him, to

prove that these two individuals are in fact jewish and if indeed they are then it is up to him, and those who agree with him, to prove with evidence their interpretation, while offering cogent, en pointe argument as to why their interpretation must be the case in contrast to other potential interpretations.

Anti-Semitism must, in order to be both effective and factually arguable, fulfill these basic criteria in making its arguments. Otherwise anti-Semitism, as has unfortunately been increasingly the case since the defeat of National Socialist Germany, will remain in the rut it has dug for itself and unable to become both coherent and organised in its opposition to the jews. Only through being coherent and organised as well as factually arguable will anti-Semitism be able to reclaim the popular and intellectual ground from the jewish and gentile exponents of anti-Zionism, which seeks only to criticise the nebulous foe that are 'the Zionists' not root the jew, and his genetic kin: the Arab, out of Western civilisation once and for all.

So with that in mind let us begin with Martinson's first statement:

1) *'The hijackers were from Saudi Arabia. Saudi Arabia is controlled by the Jews and the Saudi royals are confirmed Jews.'*

This argument is quite pointless since the presence of jewish ancestry amongst the echelons of the Saudi royal's doesn't prove anything concerning Martinson's preferred case: that Israel/the US did 9/11.

Furthermore, Mohamed Atta was born and raised in Egypt before he, at the age of 22, moved to Germany. Marwan al-Shehhi was born in the United Arab Emirates to an Emirati clergyman and an Egyptian mother. Fayed Banihammad was, as well, from the United Arab Emirates. Ziad Jarrah was born and raised in Lebanon: later moving in his mid-teens to Germany. So: 15 out of the 19 hijackers were from Saudi Arabia. However this doesn't prove a Saudi conspiracy let alone an Israeli or US conspiracy behind the planning and execution of 9/11. Hence the statement is essentially meaningless, because it proves nothing.

2) *'The supposed hijackers got past airport physical security. The company responsible for the airport security was ICTS International (run by Jews and manned by some Jewish Israeli Shin Bet personnel).'*

First of all let me point out that people do get past airport security every now and then with a variety of items, including potential weapons and explosives, that would otherwise be prohibited. For a brief example that I found by a brief internet search:

"In October security at Stanstead airport in Essex was criticised when it emerged that government inspectors smuggled a gun and a fake bomb past security checks...

In February, another reporter sneaked a replica pistol into Britain after arriving at Newcastle airport from Florida. Last year it was revealed that a reporter got on a jet after getting a job as an airport cleaner, giving a string of false details at a five-minute interview...

The News of the World said its reporter bought the pilot's uniform from a London outfitter used by the airline for £140 without checks being made on his identity. He told staff he was a "freelance pilot".

Using a fictitious company name, it is claimed the reporter then applied for an ID card which allowed him airside access from Crawley-based Baseops Europe Limited. He gave his real name and address but a false date and place of birth. Two weeks later the pass, which cost £10, arrived in the post. The newspaper claimed it was easier than getting a card for a video shop."[\[2\]](#)

There have been many on-plane hijackings in the past 20-30 years and always involved hijackers getting onboard without getting caught at the airport security, not to mention all other instances of smuggling without hijacking. Perhaps Martinson believes that, the Israelis and the US were behind the bombings of the three hotels in Aden and Yemen in 1992? Or Operation Bojinka? Or the bombing of a US military facility in Riyadh (1995)? Or the Khobar Towers bombing? Or the 1998 bombing of US embassies in Kenya, Nairobi and Tanzania? Or the Al Qaeda planned attacks against tourists in Jordan, which also involved attacking LAX (Los Angeles International Airport), foiled by the Jordanian government with the apprehension of Ahmed Ressam.

Also, ICTS International didn't handle the airport security. The ICTS owned Huntleigh USA handled Flight UA175's security at Logan airport, Boston. The airport security in itself at Logan was provided largely by Argenbright Security, who also provided security for Flight AA77 (Washington) and Flight UA93 (Newark). Flight AA11's security was handled by Globe Security at Logan, Boston. So: out of all the given airports and security instances, only UA175's own security can be linked to the ICTS International on September 11th 2001.

As an interesting curiosa: Argenbright Security's contract at Logan airport was cancelled in December 2001 according to this article which stated:

"The company has agreed to be out of all Massport properties by the end of the day on December 14, said Massport interim security chief John DiFava. He originally pulled Argenbright's license on November 15 because of several security lapses at Logan, but agreed to let the company stay on until the hearing.

Among the security breaches were two instances in which Argenbright employees left their stations unattended, in one case forcing the rescreening of hundreds of passengers.

Argenbright, which has been under federal investigation, was also the security firm involved in Chicago last month when a man slipped by a screening area at O'Hare International Airport with knives and a stun gun."[\[3\]](#)

So: the largest airport security provider in the United States had been under federal investigation for security breaches, not to mention the security lapses noted above at Logan airport or even the faulty screening procedures that allowed a man in Chicago to slip by a screening area with stun gun and knives. Is it thus any surprise that the September 11th hijackers managed to slip through airport security?

As with first claim made by Martinson: the second claim is not entirely correct and certainly does not qualify as evidence for Israel/US complicity.

3) *'The hijackers got passed electronic airport security (also run by Jews). That would be Guardium.'*

We've already covered the fact that the hijackers who carried the knives (etc) got past airport security. However airport security was not anywhere notably provided by jews: let alone Israelis. Also Christopher Bollyn's inference of "Guardium" comes up here, which is where I suspect Martinson got this trinket from (I could be wrong).

Here is the claim made by Christopher Bollyn:

"From Goff Communications website, you will notice that one of his current prize clients is an Israeli company known as Guardium. Guardium is less than 5 miles from Hanscom AFB, site of MIT's Lincoln Labs and about the same distance from Boston's Logan Airport. The Israelis are all over MIT and Boston. See: www.guardium.com/

Guardium, a "database security" firm, is clearly a Mossad operation working in a critical area - the same area that the two planes that hit the World Trade Center originated - Boston's Logan Airport. "[4]

The problem with this claim, besides his obsessive drop of "Mossad" at every possible hint of Israeli ownership of a company, is that Guardium was founded in 2002. [5] So there is little one can do with this claim as far as credible and coherent critique is concerned, but then again that has unfortunately never really been Bollyn's strong suit.

4) *'Odigo employees were notified previous to the attack to leave their office. Odigo is an Israeli company.'*

I've addressed this claim, along with a couple of others pertaining to the foreknowledge issue, in another article on Semitic Controversies. This article can be found at the following address: <http://semiticcontroversies.blogspot.com/2008/09/jewish-911-debacle-odigo-missing-jews.html>.

I invite Martinson to read and provide a full rebuttal of this article instead of me repeating it in this response.

5) *'Goldman Sachs employees were notified of the attack (Jewish company).'*

I believe, perhaps incorrectly, that this refers to the "Tokyo Memo" claim. I've tried to trace this claim in the hope of actually finding something corroborative or even of remotely sourced validity. The trail ended here [6], with the following quote:

"CounterPunch has also learned that an internal memo was sent around Goldman Sachs in Tokyo on September 10 advising all employees of a possible terrorist attack. It recommended all

employees to avoid any American government buildings. -- September 14th 2001"

Unless Martinson has some additional evidence of this claim that we are unaware of then it must be regarded as a journalistic mistake or hoax made by CounterPunch for there is no evidence for this assertion offered other than a broad claim that this piece information has been devulged to CounterPunch by its sources. Hence this claim must be regarded as false until such time as cogent new evidence is brought forward to support it.

6) *'One week before 9/11 Zim International (Israeli company) moved out of the WTC.'*

This claim has been covered in detail by Semitic Controversies at following address:
<http://semiticcontroversies.blogspot.com/2008/09/jewish-911-debacle-odigo-missing-jews.html>.

I invite Martinson to read and provide a full rebuttal of this article instead of me repeating it in this response.

7) *'Project For a New American Century (founded by Jews and almost exclusively Jewish) said they were planning something like a "new Pearl Harbor".'*

There has been a lot ado about this particular claim. Personally I do not consider it especially noteworthy in any conspiratorial context and certainly not as proof of any culpability. The actual quote is as follows:

"Further, the process of transformation, even if it brings revolutionary change, is likely to be a long one, absent some catastrophic and catalyzing event – like a new Pearl Harbor."^[7]

It doesn't appear to actually talk about any necessity or even planning of a new Pearl Harbor, but rather that the discussed change will take a long time to happen unless some catastrophe happens to the nation like an attack on it.

To clarify further their meaning of transformation I quote from a preceeding passage:

"To preserve American military preeminence in the coming decades, the Department of Defense must move more aggressively to experiment with new technologies and operational concepts, and seek to exploit the emerging revolution in military affairs. Information technologies, in particular, are becoming more prevalent and significant components of modern military systems. These information technologies are having the same kind of transforming effects on military affairs as they are having in the larger world. The effects of this military transformation will have profound implications for how wars are fought, what kinds of weapons will dominate the battlefield and, inevitably, which nations enjoy military preeminence."

As this context clarifies this passage doesn't refer to any plan of attack, or anything related to 9/11, but the introduction of new information technology and systems to the military. However the phrase "Pearl Harbor" is used in one other instance in the discussed paper:

"Absent a rigorous program of experimentation to investigate the nature of the revolution in

military affairs as it applies to war at sea, the Navy might face a future Pearl Harbor – as unprepared for war in the post-carrier era as it was unprepared for war at the dawn of the carrier age.”

This again has nothing to do with 9/11 at all, rather it is used in the context of possible attacks that the country does not have enough information or technology to stop or counter.

And yes, the PNAC was founded by Robert Kagan and William Kristol, both jewish. Although this isn't proof of Israeli and/or US complicity in 9/11.

8) *'Conspiracy theorist, Alex Jones, continues to cover up the Jewish / Israeli connection to 9/11 even when the most horrible researcher could readily find every point stated herein. Jones is married to a Jew.'*

Well I cannot fault Martinson for not approving of Alex Jones, then again I haven't seen any research from Martinson to convince me is any better at "not" doing his research. However this is not evidence for Israeli and/or US complicity in 9/11.

9) *'Jason Bermas and Dylan Avery (both Jews) are the makers of the post popular movie concerning 9/11 conspiracy theories. The movie entitled "Loose Change," conveniently leaves out any Jewish connection. Alex Jones is good friends with Bermas and Avery.'*

While I can find no evidence that both or even one of them are jews: it doesn't actually matter. They are wrong as Alex Jones, despite their "omittance" of jewish connections. However again this doesn't prove Israeli and/or US complicity in 9/11 nor a conspiracy to hijack the '9/11 Truth Movement'.

10) *'The movie "9-11 Eyewitness" was done by Rick Seigel (Jewish, and nephew of Bugsy Seigel). Seigel just so happened to be filming that day in the general direction of the World Trade Center.'*

I fail to see how this is relevant to anything relating to the suggestion of Israeli and/or US complicity in 9/11.

11/12) *'We caught five Israelis dancing around on 9/11. The five Israelis (later confirmed to be Mossad) were put through lie detector tests and they failed every time. They were released by Michael Chertoff (Jew). Chertoff is now the head of our Homeland Security. For the record, the Israelis were in a "moving company" van.'*

Yes: there were two of the five israelis, who reportedly waved hands or hopped around after the first plane had hit the WTC, that were suspected to be mossad operatives since according to a spokesperson of the FBI: the van's driver and his brother were linked to the Mossad. They were held and questioned for over a month, but were finally released and expelled to Israel. What is odd here is that as soon as they get back to Israel, three of them appear on Israeli national talkshow and talk, for example about the reason for filming the burning chaos was to document it, like every body else of course who had a camera and were filming the WTC's, then they issue

lawsuits against the Department of Justice for the incident that caused their long arrest and alleged abuse. It doesn't strike me as something Mossad agents would do: especially not if they were complicit in a terrorist attack.

In any case, this particular issue can indeed be considered to be worthy of further consideration, but yet it doesn't suffice as proof of US and/or Israeli culpability. Since it is circumstantial at best and requires a series of issues with these 'Mossad agents' to be investigated and preferably resolved as far as is possible.

13) *'We caught a group of Jews in Chicago filming the Sears Tower. They were in a "moving company" van and could not produce any evidence that they were on their way to see a client, or that the stated client even existed. With all this filming going on (Rick Seigel, etc.), you might recall that the man who filmed JFK's assassination was the Jew, Abraham Zapruder.'*

Well yes and they were later detained for having filmed the Sears Tower, which on any normal day wouldn't have been odd, but this happened at least a month after 9/11 and authorities, both local and federal, were a bit on edge to say the least. As it is: it doesn't prove anything. Perhaps the Mossad has some operations in the United States where they track terrorist activity and potential cells and so forth: there can be a lot of speculation on material that, like this, is this fuzzy and inconclusive. Reportedly the FBI office, as well as the CIA, received threats and warnings of increased terrorist cell activities in the US, potential hijackings, plans relating to attacks aimed at the WTC, even in 1999 the terrorist bomber Ahmad Ressaam testified that plans were ongoing concerning an attack on New York.[\[8\]](#)

14) *'Loyal agents to America caught numerous Israeli spies working at mall kiosks, as well as pretending to be art students. The Israeli spy network has recently flared up again, and it's all over the world. Israeli spies were recently shot (not fatally) at a mall kiosk in Denmark. An Israeli "art student" also gave testimony that she was standing outside the Pentagon when it was hit on 9/11.'*

There were indeed an issue raised by, for example, ONCIX (The Office of the National Counterintelligence Executive) that warned against Israeli "art students" circumventing security to some federal buildings and so forth. Reportedly, according to a DEA memo, another warning was given about these art students and that these spies were there to somehow stop investigation or gather information about the DEA's work concerning Israeli organized crime[\[9\]](#) [\[10\]](#).

It is not clear exactly what this would have to do with 9/11 culpability or actual foreknowledge thereof. It is even less clear to me as to how this point is supposed to be proof of it. The fact that Israeli intelligence has operatives gathering information in other countries is hardly news and so shouldn't be treated as a newly revealed gospel, because it is the standard practice in the world of foreign intelligence agencies and departments to have agents skulking around a la cloak and dagger. Yet, this observation as such is not good enough to assign complicity or prove anything relating to it.

15) *'Larry Silverstein (Jew) owned the WTC and made billions from the operation. Just weeks before 9/11, he had the "foresight" to put out an insurance policy on the buildings that would*

specifically cover acts of terrorism. Silverstein also owns the Sears Tower.'

Leased, not owned. Silverstein had to insure the building to please the lenders, so he first tried to insure it for just 1.5 billion dollars, but the lenders wouldn't have that:

"In its court papers, Swiss Re shows how Silverstein first tried to buy just \$1.5 billion in property damage and business-interruption coverage. When his lenders objected, he discussed buying a \$5 billion policy. Ultimately, he settled on the \$3.5 billion figure, which was less than the likely cost of rebuilding."[\[11\]](#)

As noted above, the set 3.5 billion dollar figure wouldn't even be enough for the estimated cost (6.3 billion dollars[\[12\]](#)) of rebuilding the properties if damaged and the insurance was for damage and business-interruption, which encompasses a variety of events, terrorism for example. This is hardly "foresight" and if he knew that the buildings would be attacked, why not insure it for more as opposed to hardly get enough money to rebuild? Also: Silverstein did not make billions of profit from the "operation", ultimately after six years in a court battle and six years of having to pay 102 million dollars annually for the rent[\[13\]](#), he received a settlement of 4.6 billion dollars, for WTC 1-5, that was to be used for rebuilding purposes.

So there was hardly a windfall, no billions of dollars in profit and the insurance money finally recieved from years of court-haggling resulted, in 2007, in the settlement of 4.6 billion, which was marked for rebuilding purposes. It thus rather implausible to suggest that Silverstein knew what would happen prior to 9/11.

16) *'The WTC metal was shipped out by Metals Management (Jewish run company).'*

I haven't been able to confirm jewish ownership of Metal Management, unless Martinson is referring to the Sims company with which they merged in 2007?

Either way, about 40,000 tons of steel was purchased by Metal Management, collected from the Fresh Kills site in New Jersey where the debris was first investigated, screened, processed and to a large extent recycled. There was an 18 month investigation and examination process at the aforementioned site, so the fact that material, which had been screened and examined, would be recycled or sold off as scrap is not only expected but guaranteed. I've researched the latter case quite thoroughly but instead of elaborating too thoroughly as of yet I feel the following article excerpt will suffice:

"Dr. W. Gene Corley and the rest of the FEMA/ASCE investigation team gained full access to the World Trade Center site, on September 29, 2001. The team also had access to the Fresh Kills Landfill on Staten Island, where they examined structural debris. The team also examined steel and debris at two recycling yards in New Jersey. They obtained samples of the structural steel, which were subjected to laboratory analysis.

Numerous other professional engineers (members of SEAO NY) continued this work through Spring 2002, visiting recycling yards and landfills regularly to examine debris and obtain more samples. Additional samples were obtained and sent to NIST, for further study and analysis.

While others have expressed some concern that the work of the team was hampered because debris was removed from the site and was subsequently processed for recycling, that was not the case. The team had full access to scrap yards and to the site, and was able to obtain numerous samples. There is no indication that having access to each piece of steel from the World Trade Center would make a significant difference to understanding the performance of the structures. [\[14\]](#)

Aside from the FEMA/ASCE team, other structural engineering experts were also allowed access to the site to examine steel. Dr. Abdolhassan Astaneh-Asl, of the U.C. Berkeley Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, arrived one week after 9/11 and started collecting data and investigating structural steel remains. He mapped out the collapsed structure and debris, inspected steel for quality of construction, collected samples for further study, and collected drawings and information on design, construction and maintenance of the buildings. He collected pieces of steel that appeared to be from the impact area, which were later provided to NIST for testing and identification.”[\[15\]](#)

17) *'Jeremy Glick was made out to be the "hero of the day" on 9/11, insofar as the person responsible for taking on the "hijackers" onboard Flight 93. Glick is a Jew. His widow has written a "touching" book about him.'*

I must ask if this is in fact a list of statements aiming to prove the case of Israeli 9/11 complicity or is it just another “*Jews are opportunists*” list? When it comes to the latter, what else is new? Seriously, what is the argument here? Is he still alive, or was he killed by the CIA since Martinson obviously doesn't believe the hijackers were real, and that as some sugar upon the leftovers his widow got a book-deal and Jeremy got a post-mortum award?

Again I fail to see how Martinson's point is related to proving that there was US and/or Israeli complicity in 9/11.

18) *'Michael Mukasey, Michael Chertoff, Alvin Hellerstein and Kenneth Feinberg are the men responsible for insuring that 9/11 victims families were unable to press for further investigation. All four of those men are Jews.'*

We have to assume this has to do with 9/11 lawsuits, since there would be little need to insure against victim's families pressing for further investigation as this is unrealistic in any setting either way. You do not get alternative non-federal investigations of the scoped evidence by private people into events of terrorist attacks on the given homeland: for example is it plausible that we imagine a Mr. Johnson or Mr. Bryan snooping around the FBI or CIA evidence holds? No, not really.

Would we like to do so, would I like to have a look for myself? Sure, why not, but it is not a realistic appeal, because it will not and cannot happen, you don't really need any Chertoff or Mukasey to ensure this. If non alternative investigation by private people is the argument here, but just another one by the officials, what good would it do if done by the same agencies and government who allegedly were behind the attacks?

We could however see alternative validations made on technical reports such as the ones relating to the WTC's, but then again we already have those, and a lot of them, ranging in shades of critic as well as in the affirmative.

When it comes to the 9/11 lawsuits, they do not stipulate alternative investigations, but rather compensation, which have been given to a lot of 9/11 victims families for many reasons.

19) *'Dov Zakheim's SPC corporation provided the Flight Termination System and Command Transmitter System. FTS and CTS allow you to control a plane by remote control. Despite complaints of those unfamiliar with flight systems, this technology has existed for decades. Zakheim is a Jew.'*

The problem with this is: there were no such systems on 757/767 and these have mechanical control systems as opposed to electronic ones. There's a thorough and clarifying paper written by an experienced avionics technician which, apart from addressing the technical improbabilities and difficulties, describes another problem for this remote-control theory:

"Central to many "inside job" 9/11 conspiracy theories is the idea that hijackers weren't controlling the 4 ill-fated flights involved in the attacks. Instead there was some sort of remote system guiding the aircraft to their targets. How might this work? Lets look at the options:

Military tankers fitted as "drones" and disguised to look like AA and UA jets. The problem with this approach is the questions that remain unanswered. What happened to the 4 flights? The passengers and crew? The airplanes themselves? Neither the people nor the airplanes were ever heard from again, that much we do know. A further look at this theory really makes it seem implausible especially since the airlines involved, United and American, would have to be involved in the murders of their employees and customers. Think about this for a moment. What possible motive would these airlines have to do that? Especially since they've lost billions of dollars in the wake of the attacks. United, having lost close to 10 billion dollars itself^[16], wallowed in Ch. 11 for 4 years. American has only recently returned to profitability after suffering staggering losses itself, barely escaping bankruptcy.

These airlines had everything to lose and nothing to gain by partaking in a government sponsored terror operation. If you are thinking that only a few fat cats agreeing to this would be all that was necessary, think again.

The pilots are dead - they were not involved. So, if the 4 flights landed safely somewhere else as part of the conspiracy, that's a pretty neat trick considering the pilots would never agree to be murdered. How did they fly the planes to secret bases against the pilots will? Remote control? I'll go into that in lucid detail a bit later. But wait a minute, if they can control the airplane from the ground, why go to the trouble of military drones then? Why not use the actual flights themselves in the attack?"^[17]

The paper goes into further depth concerning the technical problems that simply renders the theory not only implausible, but demonstrating that a 757/767 was the worst choice for putting in a remote control function to provide anything near the intended effect. This isn't the technician's

mere opinion on the matter, but straight from the 757/767 maintenance manuals. I suggest Martinson reads the linked paper and educates himself on the technical realities before running with yet another canard of the '9/11 Truth Movement'. Just because Martinson found another Jew in a high-ranking position it doesn't evidence Israeli culpability or anything else except that there are a lot of Jews, in western societies, in positions of considerable influence and power in both the corporate and the governmental spheres.

20) *'PTech is a computer security software company that had its programs installed on the most sensitive American computer systems. Thus creating a backdoor. PTech is a Mossad front company and connected to the Saudis (Jews).'*

This unfortunately reeks of Christopher Bollyn's research. And, as expected, the claim relating to how Ptech manipulated NORAD software (etc) rears its ugly head.[\[18\]](#) The initial problem with this statement is that it is in ignorance of the fact that Ptech is not an operational software. It is a virtual organisation software and so it is not run on operational computer systems, ergo it has nothing to do with, for example air traffic control.

In the linked Bollyn article, he ignores the distress expressed about Ptech's alleged Arabic/Middle-Eastern funding links and dismisses it as front for the Mossad. Then assumes in his own opinion who the Mossad agent placed in Ptech was. Bollyn, as is obvious from his arguments, is not bothered by evidence or facts to reach his conclusions. In fact: he seems to do very well in making claims almost completely independent from them. Ptech was closed down in December 2002 as part of Operation Green Quest when it was raided by federal authorities due to concerns of its alleged funding of terrorists.

21) *'In 1979, Isser Harel (former head of Israeli Mossad) stated in a book by the Jew, Michael Evans, "The tallest building in NYC will be hit by terrorists".'*

Actually, according to Michael Evans himself as related in an article, he was referring to the Empire State Building (hence the singular "tallest" [although this was not actually correct]):

"I sat with former Mossad chief Isser Harel for a conversation about Arab terrorism. As he handed me a cup of hot tea and a plate of cookies, I asked him, "Do you think terrorism will come to America, and if so, where and why?"

Harel looked at his American visitor and replied, "I fear it will come to you in America. America has the power, but not the will, to fight terrorism. The terrorists have the will, but not the power, to fight America - but all that could change with time. Arab oil money buys more than tents."

As to the where, Harel continued, "New York City is the symbol of freedom and capitalism. It's likely they will strike the Empire State Building, your tallest building [he mistakenly thought] and a symbol of your power." [\[19\]](#)

I know some conspiratorially overcharged people like to take evidence out of context, over 20 years later, and have it seem bizarrely prophetic. The problem with that is, there is nothing odd or prophetic about it. It is a rather safe guess that New York would be a target in the minds and

plans of terrorists considering its symbolic value. As well as in any other political or capitalistic context relating to desirable targets for terrorists and New York has a lot of tall buildings that are important trade, political and commerce centers.

Also, Harel was thinking of the Empire State Building, not the WTC's, but it doesn't matter either way. The North WTC was subjected to a bombing in 1993: interestingly to have it collapse onto the South Tower in order for both to be brought down. So clearly the larger and more profoundly important the target the more appeal it will have for any terrorist plot involving a violent attack.

So claim twenty-one has nothing to do with 9/11. It does not carry with it any evidence. It is unrelated and only a huge leap of logic in a hollow conjecture can make it appear as anything but irrelevant.

22) *'When asked on 9/11 what the attack meant for Israel, Benjamin Netanyahu replied, "It's very, very good."'*

Yes: this is accurate. Then he heard what he himself had just said and tried to "correct it". Of course, I do not doubt that Netanyahu truly feels the incident was good for Israel in the way he specified.

"On 9/11/2001, former Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu was asked what the 9/11 attacks meant for US/Israeli relations, and Netanyahu replied: "It's good it's very, very good er well, it's not good, but it will generate immediate sympathy for our cause."

Source of Netanyahu quote: New York Times, 9/11/2001"

A classical freudian slip: in my opinion. I do not think it is odd that he regards the attack from a beneficial point of view. Since from where he is standing, he like many Israelis probably view such events (except when it happens to them) from the perspective of possible benefit to them. A coherent conclusion one can derive from this statement is that Netanyahu isn't concerned with the loss of American lives, but more so with what can be used to the benefit of Israel and what will make people more sympathetic to Israel. It is hardly proof of culpability, just a run-of-the-mill freudian slip we would expect to hear given the self-serving nature of Israel politics and lack of scruple.

23) *'Today American and its allies fight wars in the Middle East for the Jewish State of Israel.'*

While the war in Iraq is definitely something related to the United States' alliance with Israel against, basically, any opposing Middle-Eastern state and Israel is oft a notable factor. The above is a bit of a typical absolute, that anything the US does in the Middle East is for the sake of Israel and caused by the direct control Israel has over the US. There is too much blowhard nonsense about that, yet instead of opening up the rather different and expansive discussion of the Iraq War, let's focus on what this has to do with proving Israeli complicity of the 9/11 attacks, which is nothing. It adds nothing to that case at all.

[\[1\]](#) 'Avery' and 'Bermas' are not listed in Benzion Kaganoff's, 1978, *'A Dictionary of Jewish*

Names and their History, 1st Edition, Routledge & Kegan Paul: London, as Jewish names for example. 'Avery' is listed as an English first name on p. 62 (not a Jewish surname) and 'Bermas' is not listed at all. Nor can I find any articles providing proof of such.

[2] <http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk/2000/nov/20/transport.world>

[3] <http://edition.cnn.com/2001/US/11/30/rec.logan.argenbright/index.html>

[4] <http://www.bolyn.com/index/?id=10761>

[5] <http://www.guardian.com/index.php/t1/245>

[6] <http://www.counterpunch.org/aftershocks.html>

[7] <http://www.newamericancentury.org/RebuildingAmericasDefenses.pdf>

[8] <http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,53065,00.html>

[9] <http://www.antiwar.com/rep/lemonde1.html>

[10] <http://dir.salon.com/story/news/feature/2002/05/07/students/>

[11] http://www.forbes.com/2003/09/11/cx_da_0911silverstein.html

[12] [http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?](http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=940CE7DC133FF934A15757C0A9609C8B63)

[res=940CE7DC133FF934A15757C0A9609C8B63](http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=940CE7DC133FF934A15757C0A9609C8B63)

[13] <http://www.911myths.com/html/windfall.html>

[14] Congressional Testimony of Dr. W. Gene Corley. American Society of Civil Engineers (March 6, 2002). http://www.asce.org/pdf/3-6-02wtc_testimony.pdf

[15] Astaneh-Asl, Abdolhassan (2003). "World Trade Center Collapse, Field Investigations and Analyses", <http://www.ce.berkeley.edu/~astaneh/1-Publications/Astaneh-9ASEC-WTC%20Paper%202003.pdf>

[16] <http://www.wsws.org/articles/2005/may2005/unit-m13.shtml>

[17] http://www.911myths.com/Remote_Takeover.pdf

[18] <http://www.iamthewitness.com/Bolyn/Bolyn-Ptech.html>

[19] "America the Target", Jerusalem Post of September 30, 2001

A Christopher Jon Bjerknes Debacle (Part 2)

Wednesday, 11 February 2009

Editors Note:

Before reading the below response issued by one of our contributors to Christopher Jon Bjerknes: it should be noted by readers that Bjerknes has not actually answered our contributor's critique of him. Bjerknes in his response attempts to deflect the critique by maintaining that he had been 'misrepresented'/'misinterpreted': however Bjerknes has not, as is the custom when making an assertion of misrepresentation, given specifics as to what our contributor has 'misrepresented', but has rather given wide generalities and even when he has asserted that '*Winterberg referenced him in a published piece of work*' (to paraphrase). We can ask perhaps the more pertinent question of where has he done this and in what context (Bjerknes doesn't cite the published piece he mentions). Also we can ask more pointedly: how does this make Bjerknes' arguments accurate? If Winterberg has indeed cited Bjerknes in a published piece of work then it doesn't mean that Bjerknes or Winterberg are correct. Since what Bjerknes is doing here is trying to play the logical fallacy of an appeal to authority[1] to suggest his arguments are accurate without having to go en pointe with a response to defend them (especially since his

arguments are contrary to general expert opinion on Einstein: i.e that Einstein was not a plagiarist).

Bjerknes also questions the contributor's conversation with Winterberg and suggests that because he didn't quote it that it didn't happen. Bjerknes forgets that it is the academic custom not to quote private correspondence. Unless explicit permission has been granted and that the contributor didn't feel that it was necessary to seek such permission, but merely to do as is common in academic work to summarise the outcome (while citing with whom the private correspondence was with). It is disingenuous for Bjerknes to imply that it simply '*did not happen*', because our contributor has obeyed the niceties of academic discourse. If Bjerknes wanted to clarify his claim that Winterberg 'relied on his research' then it is up to him to prove it, but it doesn't, as I have stated above, indicate that either Winterberg is correct and nor does, even if Winterberg was correct, demonstrate that Bjerknes is correct. However Bjerknes is not free to simply assert it didn't happen or infer that it was a lie: since that is simply *ad hominem* unless Bjerknes has some proof to back up his claim (which I doubt given that I've seen the correspondence in question).

We would suggest that either Bjerknes gets down to pointing out specific assertions regarding 'misinterpretations'/'misrepresentations' and how our contributor's arguments are wrong or he concedes that he is in error. It is not fitting for someone who maintains himself as a 'researcher' and has obvious pretensions to scholarship that he doesn't answer critique *en pointe* and on the basis on which the critique is made. In essence: Bjerknes needs to stop beating around the bush and to start making clear responses to the critique of his claims.

Recently, Christopher J. Bjerknes (author of the blog "*Jewish Racism*") replied[\[2\]](#) to my latest response, on his arguments pertaining to Einstein's plagiarism, and my alleged "*misrepresentation*" of them. I had hoped, against my better judgement, to receive a detailed and specific counter-critique. However, as it turns out, my hopes were in vain, while my fears were confirmed.

Characteristically for Bjerknes' responses, as the reader will note for him themselves along the way, they carry with them the elements of bewildered reaction at the mere sight of criticism, with little idea what to do with it except to habitually complain, and berate the opposing writer who dared to make such an unforgivable act as to criticize his beliefs.

Bjerknes' recent response begins:

"This sophist, calling itself "LionAxe", has responded to my article on its blog, and yet again misrepresented what I have said, and the history of the theory of relativity:"

On "*its*" blog?

Well, instead of actually providing an *en pointe* critique to my previous critical retort[\[3\]](#) unto some of his fundamental arguments and claims, the reader will observe the customary trend of

Bjerknes to utter unevidenced complaints without on-point retorts to the actual arguments made. I was quite clear, specific and left few rocks unturned in my previous response to Bjerknes' given arguments: where I quoted what he had stated following it with clarification of where he had erred in deriving the charge of plagiarism. I further explained how Bjerknes, picking from many works relating to relativity prior to Einstein, basically strives to equate the existence of such papers and thoughts as proof of plagiarism on Einstein's part, and I also explained thoroughly on several key points, purported by Bjerknes, where and why this is incorrect.

Of course, we will not find any critique of what I actually countered Bjerknes previous reply with, but we will find much whining and complaining about being "misrepresented" ad nauseam.

"LionAxe" then proceeds to misrepresent my arguments regarding Einstein's plagiarism of Johann Georg von Soldner's prediction of the doubled Newtonian value of the deflection of a light ray grazing the limb of the Sun, and Newton's prediction that gravitation should deflect the path of a light corpuscle according to the law of universal attraction. Though I have not confused these separate issues of Newton's theory and Soldner's prediction, "LionAxe" has confused them, and "LionAxe" has failed to acknowledge that I accuse Einstein of plagiarizing the work of both Newton and Soldner, among many others."

No: I didn't misrepresent you Bjerknes. Since you argued that Einstein plagiarised the both of them and after having read your previous comments and also the parts in your latest convergent Einstein-bashing book, which dealt with the Soldner issue. I attacked your given arguments thereof and thoroughly explained why they were wrong: yet I cannot see, nor will the reader see, Bjerknes directly countering them. On the contrary, we will see him continue to whine about me, ignoring my critique and sticking with his incorrect views as if they weren't directly challenged.

"LionAxe" repeatedly misrepresents my statements regarding Einstein's two different predictions for the deflection of a light ray grazing the limb of the Sun and thereby ignores, and in effect confuses, the separate charges I make of Einstein's having plagiarized the Newtonian prediction in 1911 and the Soldnerian prediction in 1915."

No: I didn't misrepresent you. I factored in both cases and how they were equally in error. If you were arguing that Einstein was plagiarising the Newtonian prediction in that instance, by using his two quotes, cited in your chapter on Soldner, that I addressed in my previous critique, where Einstein mentions Newton in both of them. But instead of me repeating what I had just countered your work with, please go back and comment on the clarifications I actually debunked you with. If you can do that, excellent, then we can continue, but do not ignore my specific counter-arguments by slithering away and repeating that which I have already critiqued. Reply to the retort instead of repeating that which was already retorted on-point.

"LionAxe" next accuses me of confusing "priority" with "plagiarism", when in fact, that is what "LionAxe" is doing in order to raise a straw man of his own manufacture which he deceptively attributes to me. I correctly point out the obvious fact that one of the elements of plagiarism is the priority of the work of the man or woman whose work is copied by another. It is necessary to establish that priority in order to establish plagiarism. "LionAxe" deliberately misrepresents my statements of isolated facts of priority as if they exist in a vacuum and then picks upon my

representations of factual issues of priority of a given element of RT to next address a separate element of RT to falsely claim both that there was no priority and that priority is not the same as plagiarism."

Yes: I did indeed accuse you of confusing the two and using any hint of relativistic priority with plagiarism, and the existence of preceeding work relating to science that was continued through the 19th century and culminating in part with Einstein's work. This is what you do. You do not *"correctly point out the obvious facts"*, but bandy about someone elses work with little to no knowledge of the physics involved, and this shows, as if you were trapped in a freudian argument of projecting your argumentative short-comings unto Einstein.

I retorted to your fundamental arguments, notably those you brought up in your previous reply, by a point for point, paragraph by paragraph routine, explaining how Einstein's work differed from Poincaré, how and why it is complete nonsense to claim Einstein didn't add anything to the work of Lorentz et al, to the conundrum of those days which was approached and written about by several leading scientists before Einstein and ultimately how and why the charge of plagiarism is dependant upon ignoring all of the glaringly obvious facts of differences, which made Einstein's imprint on theoretical physics significant in light of other at the time existing work.

Alas no: Bjerknes doesn't want to engage my actual critique on point, but rather to casually ignore it, claim it is wrong and repeat over and over how he had been misrepresented.

"LionAxe" ignores the fact that I have established the several elements of Einstein's plagiarism, including, but not limited to: priority, knowledge, failure to acknowledge prior works, and claims of originality--in some cases even after publicly acknowledging knowledge of the original work in question. "LionAxe" confuses these sometimes separate issues, while falsely accusing me of doing the same."

Poor defensive comments like these really take the cake, especially considering my entire critique of Bjerknes was based on his fundamental arguments of Einstein's alleged plagiarism. Of course, since Bjerknes has compiled thousands of pages repeating a variety of stuff on the matter, (as I stated in my previous critique) I decided to address the bigger and culminative ones, which the arguments boil down to. These would be those concerning the plagiarism of Poincaré, relativity work and others like Lorentz et al that Bjerknes jumps back and forth between in his work. I issued detailed and specific counter-arguments to these and we do not get a single on-point refutation by Bjerknes after having been debunked six-ways-to-sunday, instead one is left with the lamentively polemic, wailing sounds of someone playing the abused and misrepresented victim who's been far too insulted to actually do anything else (like providing an on-point critique in turn).

"LionAxe" then makes a lengthy presentation of the falsehoods Jews have been pitching for quite some time in a desperate effort to conceal Einstein's obvious plagiarism of the works of Henri Poincare."

As we can see: Bjerknes should have had a golden opportunity of directly ripping my arguments

(where I prove how the claim of plagiarism concerning Poincaré's work is simply wrong) apart on point if I was incorrect. Yet instead we get the aforementioned whining and the expected dismissal of my critique without even bothering to counter the arguments.

"LionAxe" would presume to lecture me on the fact that others stated the PoR before Poincare, when I have given the most thorough proof of same in all the literature on the subject. "LionAxe" ignores the fact that Poincare applies the PoR to electrodynamics, which Newton and Galileo did not do. He was not the first to do so, but he did do so."

No: Bjerknes was the one who argued that PoR belonged to Poincaré and that he was the first to state it/formulate it, which was wrong and I explained why. However as usual Bjerknes does not provide a critique of my retort, but rather casual complaints with additional straw-men arguments on material other than the given argument. I didn't ignore the fact of Poincaré's application of PoR, it would be rather hard to claim I did since I retorted at length with clarifications of it, especially in its differentiation from Einstein's work, which Bjerknes erroneously stated were the same as Einstein's and I called him on that as well.

"LionAxe" is either ignorant of the commonly known facts, or pretends to ignorance of the commonly known facts, that Poincare dismissed the Ether as a metaphysical concept in the 1800's, and that Einstein declared the necessity of the Ether in 1920."

Either Bjerknes did not read my critique to him or he's deliberately throwing another straw-man into the mix. Poincaré maintained a preferred inertial frame, which simply didn't go along with the relativity principle. Even if he dismissed some other specific characteristics of it that failed to be validated by experiments: it is not as if he had dismissed the concept of said preferred frame, aether, since he never managed to exclude it. As I said before, although Poincaré did equations to explain why the Michelson-Morley experiment hadn't yielded proof for aether: he continued to base his predictions and assumptions that there was an aether. In my previous direct critique: I showed the error of such arguments oft made by Bjerknes and I further clarified why he was and is wrong on these notes in detail. Such as how Poincaré formulated the principle differently, because according to Poincaré's relativity principle: it would be impossible by means of an experiment internal to a given inertial frame to know whether this frame is in motion or at rest with respect to the aether frame. Hence: Poincaré's approach to extended space time transformations, unlike Einstein's approach, assumes an aether frame.

One of the many aspects of my previous critique, with which Bjerknes has been handsomely debunked already, is the following quote from Poincaré himself on the aether (from a text he wrote in 1902):

"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."[\[4\]](#)

Again, as I brought this to Bjerknes' attention in my previous critique, Poincaré's work was more an intermediate, or transitional step between the prior standard of electrodynamics and the

more complete and defined theory formulated by Einstein. Besides the aether problem persisting within Poincaré's explorative works: he also persisted with holding a difference between the effect of contraction of moving bodies, along the direction of relative motion, and the notion of relativity of simultaneity, which follows from the idea of a local time.

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. There was no preferred state of rest attached to it.

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

Yet: why do we bother with clarifications of physics when it is so much easier to act like Bjerknes who just found the word "*ether*" and didn't think of its contextual meaning beyond what he had read relating to Michelson-Morley experiments? Well, because it further demonstrates his next to non-existent understanding of not only the scientific complexity and differences inherent with the aforementioned works on relativity, but also of basic theoretical physics in general and its history. That is a necessary demonstration as it shows how Bjerknes manages to make a pig's breakfast of the history of science.

"The fact that Poincare eventually developed a more comprehensive theory than Einstein, which sought to include the Ether as a physical basis for observed phenomenon, does not refute the fact that Einstein's theory is a lesser subset of Poincare's more broad and comprehensive theory. Poincare sought a physical theory in addition to the metaphysical and numerological theory which Einstein plagiarized. As Prof. Logunov has stated, Poincare's theory is far more advanced and encompasses more detail than Einstein's parroted copy, which is a mere subset of Poincare's theories."

You see, Bjerknes, while Poincaré's memoirs on the dynamics of the electron were, at that time, more sophisticated from a mathematical standpoint, you miss one of the many actual facts I've already retorted with in my previous critique. For example: that while Einstein ignored gravitation until 1907. He did however (from 1905) apply his theory to the problem of the intensity of radiation reflected from a moving mirror. Poincaré did not apply his 1905 theory to this problem. As I see it, the question of which paper is more detailed or comprehensive is somewhat of a toss-up, there is no clear answer, but this should not be translated to mean the works are the same or equally valid.

Again, in my previous critique I responded to your claims on this very matter, where the very

notable differences between the two were explained and clarified. The similar basis of both were mostly the mathematical foundations, which are equivalent and consequently it is nonsense to claim that one theory is a “subset” of the other or “encompasses more detail”. More generally they just disagree, e.g. Poincare must hold that the geometry of space (and time) does not provide for moving bodies to contract. All such contractions are dynamical effects resulting from physical interactions among the parts of the bodies. Einstein, however, does say that space and time themselves provide directly for that contraction without need to consider particular theories of the dynamics of matter.

“I will add in passing, that, as I have repeatedly stated in the past, Isaac Newton was a plagiarist and a Cabalistic Jew. He was often accused of plagiarism and he conjured up lame excuses to account for his plagiarism. He also set Physics back by introducing the pantheistic mythologies and dogmatic absolutes of the Jewish Cabalah into the more advanced Physics of Christiaan Huygens and others. Leibniz accused Newton of these occult beliefs and practices, and John Maynard Keynes has proven that Leibniz was correct, as I have repeatedly demonstrated in the past.”

The above is nothing short of an intellectually barren description of Newton, applying direct, yet equally wayward, character assassination in an attempt to belittle his scientific contributions and accuse him of plagiarism. Further added by the jew (Bjerknes has claimed to be jewish in the past unless I am much mistaken) is that Newton was a Cabalistic Jew, as if Isaac's interest of jewish mysticism (he was overall interested in scriptural mythologies) has anything to do with whether his *Philosophiæ Naturalis Principia Mathematica* is a great work of science or not.

This latest response by Bjerknes is a disappointment, for he does not move to counter the lengthy arguments I made in my previous reply to him. Instead he ignores them and mentions some light hints of the content's tone in passing, while telling the readers of his blog how he was being ‘misrepresented’ and how his “proof” was ignored: the irony is, of course, bitter sweet. Not only did I tackle the proverbial groundhogs of Bjerknes’ thesis, I also elaborated upon other aspects, which went from covering the arguments of his past reply to claims hailing from his work he so often likes to cite. Therefore, I can not think of an excuse why Bjerknes insists on whining like a school-boy, dismissing my critique, instead of correctly addressing the points of the critique where I countered his arguments with his own point-by-point refutation.

While polemics and fly-by-night dismissal is the easy way to go, it is clear Bjerknes didn't take my points of critique seriously, because he doesn't appear to have actually read them, and if he read it he didn't really understand them, and despite which of aforementioned scenarios is the true one. In light of this latest response: he didn't address them at all.

[1] <http://www.fallacyfiles.org/authorit.html>

[2] <http://jewishracism.blogspot.com/2009/02/lionaxe-has-responded-with-more.html>

[3] <http://semiticcontroversies.blogspot.com/2009/01/christopher-jon-bjerknes-debacle.html>

[4] H. Poincaré, 1968, “*La science et l’hypothèse*”, chapter 10 of the french edition, “*Les théories de la physique moderne*”, Champs, Flammarion.

In Brief: Some Background Notes on Revilo Oliver's Articles

Sunday, 15 February 2009

I have been studying the work of the late Professor Revilo Oliver for quite sometime in regards to his anti-Communist and anti-Semitic arguments with a view to writing a biography of him and his thought. Now certainly while Oliver's arguments have much merit in and of themselves: there is an observable trend in Oliver's writing that I would like to make a point to explain (because it impacts on anti-Semitism). Since many of Oliver's articles both from his John Birch Society and Liberty Bell years are often cited as authoritative: it is worth noting that Oliver doesn't often use original arguments in his articles. This is worth addressing since, as I have said, Oliver wrote voluminously on a plethora of subjects and his articles, because he was highly intelligent and a highly distinguished academic, have been taken as the statement of fact regarding these points. For example: his article '*Those Awful Protocols*'[1] is often cited in defence of the Protocols of Zion, because in it Oliver offers a supporting case for the potential authenticity of the Protocols.

Now the point I am making here is that Oliver has simply repeated the standard arguments in their defence and expanded a little on the evidence for them. In so far that Oliver in his '*Those Awful Protocols*' uses a letter pertaining to come from the '*Prince of the Jews*' in Constantinople[2], but yet Oliver doesn't mention from whence this letter comes in terms of a source. As far as my own research indicates this letter was first published in support of the Protocols in the 1934 American expanded edition of the Protocols (under the pseudonym 'Victor Marsden': Marsden himself died in London in 1919), which is the most common version of the Protocols of Zion in circulation today. Without having access to the Spanish copy (unfortunately I am also not fluent in Spanish), which Oliver intimates is an expanded edition with commentary, that Oliver refers his readers in general: I cannot say for certain whether Oliver repeated this claim from an edition based on the Marsden 1934 edition, but since this piece of evidence is one of the key points in the most popular English edition of the Protocols. It is thus reasonable to assert that Oliver very likely found this piece of evidence in either the Spanish edition he cites earlier in his article (which would very probably have been based on the 1934 Marsden edition in some or all respects) or the popular English version as I have described it above. Hence Oliver simply repeats Marsden's evidence, which he thinks cogent, and leaves out that, which Oliver knew had been readily and correctly answered.

This is not a pattern that is unique to this article or Oliver's thoughts concerning either jews or communists in general. In his speech, '*The Mad Marxmen*'[3], for example Oliver discusses the campaign of defamation that was launched against him for his speaking out in regards to Fidel Castro being a communist, when Castro had been styled by leading papers of the time as an '*agrarian reformer*' and not a communist. However as an introductory remark he calls attention to the orders given by the Soviet Union to the communist international in December 1960 and the early 1961 pamphlet, '*The New Drive against the Anti-Communist Program*', written and published by the US Senate Sub-Committee on Internal Security describing these instructions to Communists to make it their priority to mount attacks on anti-Communist organisations. Oliver implies by his then status as a founding, as well as a council, member of the John Birch Society as well his comments in his speech that the focus of these attacks was the John Birch Society

itself (and hence it thus must be considered the premier anti-Communist organisation in the United States at that time).

However in these comments Oliver makes no mention of the apparent source of these comments, although he does give it later, in the Robert Welch's book *'The Politician'* [4], which was a source of much controversy at the time due to its argument that President Dwight Eisenhower was in fact a communist agent. The argument that Oliver makes with these introductory comments can themselves be found in the then recently published *'The Politician'* in Robert Welch's introduction and it would seem that Oliver took them from there when he spoke about the issue of censorship and some of the matters relating to the publication of *'The Politician'* in his speech: *'The Mad Marxmen'*. What is unclear is whether Oliver may have taken them from a different source other than Welch than Welch himself may have got them from, since it has to be remembered that Oliver was associate editor of the John Birch Society's main organ at that time, *'American Opinion'*, and Welch was the founder and leader of the John Birch Society. Hence it can be suggested that if another source had cited them, for example in *American Opinion*, then it would have been likely that both Oliver and Welch would have picked up on the citation at the same time and may well have used it in conjunction with one another (since Oliver's speech was made shortly after the publication of *'The Politician'*). However regardless of this it indicates that Oliver had a tendency to repeat arguments made by others at the time largely without specific citation (although often Oliver brought up the work he took the argument/evidence from in general before or after his specific citation from the work or works in question).

I am not here seeking to impugn Oliver's work, as I might seem to be, but this fact about Oliver's writing in general seems to be unknown among anti-Semites today who cite Oliver's writings on various issues regarding the jews. Oliver cannot be said to have plagiarised the author's concerned since he does cite their work in general and Oliver himself wrote his anti-Communist and anti-Semitic work with some exceptions, such as *'The Enemy of our Enemies'* [5], in a polemical style based on his opinion regarding matters that Oliver thought were important and was not writing for scholarly consumption, but rather for the popular audience.

The reason for Oliver's writing in this style and for his lack of specific citation of where his arguments come from is indirectly given in his autobiography of sorts, *'America's Decline'* [6], and is given where he talks about his time in the John Birch Society. Oliver states it thus:

'I was teaching full-time in a major university, giving graduate courses, directing doctoral dissertations, and necessarily conducting research in Classical Philology. Every remaining moment of my time was devoted to my share of work for the Society. I had assumed editorial responsibility for a large part of each issue of American Opinion in addition to writing copiously for it; I spoke frequently in public and often in private on behalf of the Society and appeared on the platforms of organizations with which the Society was to maintain an unofficial liaison; I undertook certain negotiations in which Welch was unwilling to appear personally; and other activities for the Society entailed a voluminous and sometimes exacting correspondence.' [7]

This statement suggests that Oliver was working very hard while he was a leader of the John Birch Society as well as being an academic whose rate of production and amount of work was

not '*equalled by many in the field*'. It is obvious that if you are producing a lot of academic work as well as editing a periodical, writing pamphlets and giving speeches/talks: then there is going to have to be a cost somewhere. Now traditionally this would be in academic work in that the rate of production of new articles and the conducting of new research would decrease, but with Oliver he seems to have offset the problem of balancing his John Birch Society work with his academic work by a much heavier reliance than was normal for Oliver on anti-Communist publications, which may account somewhat for his general credulity regarding their claims. We might also reasonably suggest that Oliver's wife, Grace Needham, may have helped Oliver with his research: since Oliver, as he himself noted, further slowed his rate of production down by not '*touch-typing*', but rather punching the keys with his index fingers (as he tells us: this is a result of the first typewriter he ever owned and he never saw the point of breaking the habit). This trend appears to have carried on in his articles after his resignation from the John Birch Society in 1966 in protest about Robert Welch's mismanagement of and conduct within the John Birch Society. This is also evident after Oliver's retirement in 1977 and can be seen within the corpus of his work up to his death. Although we must note that in his articles in his retirement it is quite evident that the borrowing from other publications has lessened in its extent and its importance, but it has not ceased entirely. Notably perhaps the borrowing from others work and arguments without specific citation is almost completely absent in Oliver's many books. We can suggest this is because Oliver regarded them, as he revealed to Dr. William Pierce^[8], as projects and hence would spend a lot of time checking, developing and reflecting on his arguments. Hence leading Oliver to thoroughly check his sources rather than relying on those, which sounded correct to his mind.

All this is important to note about Oliver, because he is viewed as the one of the key thinkers of contemporary anti-Semitism and hence is considered very authoritative (which is backed up by his very real academic brilliance). If we view Oliver knowing that Oliver may have relied, due to time considerations, on somewhat dubious sources then we can better understand why we should be critically read Oliver's work rather than simply accepting it as fact on the assumption that Oliver had done the research. Oliver's contribution to anti-Semitism has and will continue to be of primary importance, but what does need to be understood is that Oliver was often very wrong in his estimation of jews, but there are also equally times when he shows a depth of insight that is truly rare regarding both the jewish question and the jews themselves.

^[1] Revilo Oliver, 1990, '*Those Awful Protocols*'. This is available at the following address: <http://www.stormfront.org/rpo/PROTOCOL.htm>.

^[2] The '*Prince of the Jews*' is often mistaken for '*the Elders*' or the leader of the jews in the Protocols of Zion. In fact this reference refers to a jew appointed head of the jews in Ottoman lands. There also existed similar posts in some East European and Islamic lands (for example: the Nagid of Egypt). The letter is seeking to use jews as agents for the personal benefit the jewish official, the Sultan and the jews of the Ottoman Empire: essentially the letter is trying to set up a jewish fifth column within Spain itself who was one of the Ottoman Empire's principle foes at this time.

^[3] To listen to this speech please go to the following address: <http://www.revilo-oliver.com/>.

^[4] Robert Welch, 1963, '*The Politician*', 1st Edition, Belmont: Belmont.

^[5] Revilo Oliver, 1985, '*The Enemy of our Enemies*', 2nd Edition, Liberty Bell: Reedy.

^[6] Revilo Oliver, 2006, '*America's Decline: The Education of a Conservative*', 2nd Edition,

Historical Review Press: Uckfield.

[7] Ibid., p. 198

[8] Robert Griffin, 2001, *'The Fame of a Dead Man's Deeds: An Up-Close Portrait of White Nationalist William Pierce'*, 1st Edition, 1st Books: Self-Published, p. 138

The Kosher Food Tax: Fact or Fiction?

Wednesday, 25 February 2009

One of the more unusual anti-Semitic arguments to have been brought against the jews has been the suggestion that the jews are essentially levying a tax upon non-jewish consumers by their requirement that if firms wish their food to be certified as kosher then it must be inspected by a rabbinical committee by the relevant jewish organisation (that they have contacted). This claim asserts that this charge is in fact a form of indirect tax on the population, which is then used to finance other activities.

Kashrut, or a food being kosher, is the common name given to the jewish halakhic dietary laws that govern whether or not a food is in fact permissible to be eaten by jews who adhere to Judaism. In practical terms: the animal itself has to be permissible to eat. For example: it has to have cloven hoofs and chew the cud (i.e. eats plants not meat or waste) or if it was a fish then it would have to have scales and fins (and so on). There is also the important further restriction that milk and meat must not mix so different utensils and areas of the kitchen are generally used. In terms of food being certified as kosher, which is the subject of the kosher food tax argument: this is a process that a firm has to apply to a jewish organisation for. Jewish organisations do not as a rule go to firms to ask them if they would allow the organisation in question to certify their products: since the firms have to pay the jewish organisation a fee for the certification (the hechsher). The jewish organisations might look to generate sales leads as would be the general business custom, but unless it can be shown to be out of the ordinary this cannot be suggested as cogent argument surrounding the kosher food tax issue.

This certification process, which is an annual event, however differs on just how stringent it is due to the different halakhic interpretations and authorities used by different Judaic sects: this is important, because there are special rules that apply in some foods, such as cheese (gvinat akum) and there are different standards for some cooked foods (bishul akum), which mean that some sects place differing standards on what is kosher and what is not. What is kosher to an observant Conservative jew may well be treif (i.e. forbidden) for an observant Orthodox jew: hence why there are different labels for each different jewish organisation that conducts kosher certifications.

The rabbinical committee then has to visit the factories where the produce is made and observe the entire production process. Once the visit has been concluded then the rabbis will go away and compare their findings/thoughts: if they rule that the firm's production process violates their kashrut standards then they will explain in detail to the firm concerned what has made the process treif rather than kosher. The firm can then choose to implement these changes in order to make their produce kosher and then be subject to another inspection by the rabbinical committee

in order to gain their certification and be allowed to place the jewish organisation's kosher symbol on their packaging and marketing materials. This symbol will then let jews, and others (such as Seventh-day Adventists), who wish to keep kosher, which jewish organisation has certified that the produce is kosher and by inference inform the kosher consumer just how stringent the process has been.

Now it is debatable whether kosher certification organisations should charge for this service, but what is under debate here is whether this is significant in terms of its impact of consumers. The argument being that the jewish organisation's issuing the certifications are heavily penalizing the company financially and that the company, as is the general custom, is passing on the cost to its customers by increasing the price.

We find a short article on the Kosher Food Tax at the '*LibreOpinion*' website[\[1\]](#), which can be taken as representative since it produces all the claims made in anti-Semitic arguments[\[2\]](#) regarding the Kosher Food Tax theory. This article makes the following claims (I will list them sequentially and discuss each claim after quoting it):

'The Kosher Food Tax is the biggest consumer fraud existing in America. Examine every item in your cupboards for either the (U) or (K) labels. These symbols represent a Jewish "blessing" and when these small symbols are detected, it means that you have unwittingly paid a tax to a Jewish religious group.'

Unfortunately this is manifestly incorrect: the symbol that a product has been certified as kosher does not mean that the product has been blessed or that the rabbinical committee has given their blessing to the product. Rather the symbols mean that the product has been formally certified to be kosher by a rabbinical committee. The difference is quite substantial in that a blessing or giving their blessing implies that money has been paid for no actual work/inspection having been done (other than that the rabbis have chanted a Psalm or some such over the process), however the actual process is more akin to a health inspection, but done using jewish halakhic criteria rather than scientific standards.

The article then goes on to state:

'They will not always be on the front of the package; they may be hidden amid the small print near the label's seam. This cryptic code has to do with a Hebrew "secret," a heist, which illuminates the Jews' power in the United States. The circled "U," sometimes with the word "Parve," stands for Union of Orthodox Jews (UOJCA), the "K" stands for Kosher (KOV K). Both will not be found on the same package. These symbols mean that the product's producer paid the Jews a kind of "tax" to have some rabbi "bless" it. Don't confuse these letters with the letter "R" which stands for registered trade mark or a letter "C" which stands for copyright. These two letters will probably be there too. You have now discovered what the Jews call "hechsers," a rip-off code found on most grocery items.'[\[3\]](#)

This is indeed true: the mark that the product has been officially certified as kosher is often found alongside the information on the product's packaging. However there is nothing 'secret' about it: notable in this regard is the reference the author makes to the 'R' and 'C' symbols,

which standard for Registered Trademark and Copyright respectively.

These are symbols included on the packaging, which do not often come with a clarification of what they mean. Also both require the firm in question to pay a fee to register their trademark and/or their copyright and use their symbol accordingly. It is true that these registration fees are much lower than the rabbinical fees for the use of the kosher symbol, but we must remember that these are proportionate to the amount of work done and the expertise involved. It is indeed arguable, as indeed I would conjecture myself, that the rabbis do overcharge for their work and expertise, but the argument that there is some hidden tax involved here cannot be made by suggestion that the symbols equate some sort of secret. Since if one was unaware of what the 'R' and 'C' symbols of the packaging mean then one could equally suggest that it is a secret tax to defraud the firm and thereby the general consumer, because money is paid for a service that is then indicated on the packaging by a special symbol.

Therefore we cannot consider this argument to be of any value regarding the 'secrecy' involved: especially so since the customer can, if they are curious, search these symbols on the internet and find out what they mean.

The author then goes on state that:

'In 1959, the Wall Street Journal estimated that this massive Jewish payola at about \$20 million. That is almost forty years ago. Since that time, the Jewish owned Wall Street Journal has remained silent. The rip-off is thought to be in the hundreds of millions today. The Jewish Post of July 30, 1976 reported that Rabbi Harvey Sentor admitted that Kov K was a "profit-making concern." The UOJCA extracts exactly the same levy as Kov K, and in exactly the same way. Jews, of course, defend these "blessings" in any way they can, but what this rip-off really boils down to for the Gentile is legalized extortion.' [\[4\]](#)

This 'evidence' for the suggestion of a kosher food tax being a considerable pay off for the jewish organisations who certify food as kosher is indeed very slim and tenuous at best. There is no specific article or date cited for the Wall Street Journal article therefore until specific reference is given this cannot be considered as evidence. There is also no evidence cited for the 'hundreds of millions' figure, which we must suggest is simply a speculation on the part of the author. As for Kof-K [\[5\]](#) being a 'profit-making concern': of course this is the case, since Kof-K is a company itself (i.e. it seeks to provide a service to firms wishing to trade with the jewish community, but is actually a business in itself rather than just an arm of a particular jewish communal organisation). It would be true to state that the rabbinical certification of foods as kosher is a profitable business, but the key issue here is whether the business is unduly profitable (i.e. it is extortion): since this is what the author's argument assumes implicitly.

As of this writing: I have not been find any published accounts for the Kof-K firm and nor can I find an investor pack for them. Until I, or anyone else associated with Semitic Controversies, can find concrete numbers, a scale of fees and/or an investor pack for Kof-K or any other jewish organisation certifying food products as kosher. Then we cannot make the argument that the amount of money being made is extortionate/disproportionate, because we lack the evidence to say and can only at best make educated speculations.

On this basis therefore we can say that we suspect that there maybe a disproportionate scale of fees as an educated speculation, since a legal entity that does not publish its accounts and nor produce any kind of scale of fees with 300 employees would seem to infer it has something to hide. However that does not mean it does, but it is worthy of note and further research when considering this issue.

The author then goes on to assert that:

‘After all, the Jews represent but 2.9% of the population. It is not an option for the Gentile to have this "tax" removed from products he buys or have the little Jewish letters erased. He has to pay this "tax" to the Jews whether he wants to or not.’ [\[6\]](#)

The statement that the jews are a tiny minority in the United States is correct: however the argument the author is using here is not a cogent one. In so far that it can be asserted that the gentile or the jewish consumer does not have to buy kosher and can check the products for the kosher identification should they not wish to buy food certified as kosher. It also important to note that in United States law: a company does not have to acquire certification and can label their product as being kosher if they genuinely believe it to be so (i.e. there is no legal standard of what is kosher and what is not under United States law). So therefore the consumer does not have to purchase the product and therefore does not have to contribute to the fee: therefore the author’s argument falters.

Further: we can note that there are halal certification organisations, such as the Muslim Consumer Group, who perform a similar process to that undertaken by the jewish organisations certifying food as kosher. They also place their symbols on food packaging and also charge for the privilege as do the kosher certifying rabbinical organisations. Hence if there is a jewish kosher food tax: then there is also an Islamic hahal food tax, which we can assume is potentially being passed on in the price, in the majority of cases, to the consumer.

It could also be stated that the trademark and copyright symbols, which are charged for, could also be construed as a tax of sorts, but however the rates for these are very low in terms of the amount of items produced with the identification on them: hence the comparison between trademark and copyright and kosher and hahal cannot be reasonably made in this regard (although we can reasonably assert that they are superficially similar). Hence we must ask why the author has not mentioned halal as well as kosher certification: since if one is regarded as an indirect tax burden then the other must be as well.

The author then asserts as follows:

‘If this was nothing more than a bizarre religious ceremony, giving rabbinical approval to food and food products prepared in a specific way to meet an unusual diet, then why are steel wool and kitchen utensils also included?’

The reason that non food items are included in kosher certification is quite simple in so far as the jewish consumers may wish to be assured when being non food-products that they are not made

from and that they have not encountered any materials considered to be treif. The use of the kosher utensils and so forth can be considered understandable when we realise the levels of kashrut strictness differ between the Jewish sects and that Hassidic Jews in particular would wish to particularly be care about consuming non-kosher food. Therefore we can see there is arguably a reason for this certification rather than as simply a money-making.

Despite this however it can be reasonably be argued that this is taking the certification process too far in terms of charging firms for the privilege of certifying their non-food produce manufacturing process when the possible benefit to the firm in question would likely be small: since the market share loss should the firm's process not be kosher would be absolutely minimal.

Therefore one can legitimately criticise this aspect of the kosher certification process in so far as it unnecessary and is not likely to significantly benefit the firm in question and nor is it likely to be use or benefit to the majority of Jews (since only the stricter levels of kashrut would express deep concern over utensils and such things: assuming them to have been made from suitable materials and not to involve any contact with any treif products, which could, in kashrut, contaminate them).

The author continues:

'If these "blessings" are so important to Jews, why do they charge for them? You would think that they would be willing to give this service free--for benefit of their own people--and perhaps pay something to food product companies for providing this Kosher identification. Instead, it's the reverse-companies have to pay to have the Kosher identification. Since Jews represent a small percent of America's population, why is it that they place most of the burden of this "tax" on the shoulders of the Gentile? Why have the Gentile consumers been so silent for so long about this perennial extortion by the Jews? And since this burden comes off as a "tax," don't Gentiles have a right to know where and how this money is spent? How on earth do the Jews get away with this daylight robbery? The answer is that the Jewish blessing agencies wield enormous power through Jewish domination of the retail and distribution trades..and Jews own America's press. Non-compliance by a food producer would quickly bring about a Jewish boycott of the product. Bankruptcy!

Here is how this clever scheme works. An Orthodox Rabbi will approach a company and warn the owners that unless their product is certified as Kosher, or "fit for a Jew to eat", they will face a boycott by every Jew in America.' [\[7\]](#)

The reason Jews charge for kosher certification is quite simply that it requires professional rabbis who are highly knowledgeable in this particular area of halakha. It is quite similar to the idea that in order to build a new building you require your plans to be drawn up and checked by an architect, because the architect has the technical skills and knowledge that the layman does not have. The firm is also paying for the rabbinical certification organisation's brand in so far that they believe, rightly or wrong, that by going through the process of kosher certification process so that they can place that organisation brand on their products as a seal of approval: they will broaden their product's appeal and increase their market share. Whether this is indeed the case or not is debatable, but it is what the firm believes when it goes through the process of kosher

certification.

We should again note that the firm's in question do not have to be certified to label their products as being kosher under United States law, but they do have to genuinely believe them to be so. The gaining of the kosher certification is therefore a proof via branding that this belief is certified by the relevant Jewish organisation: that [the trust in the brand] is the key to the entire industry.

Although Jews are a minority in terms of the market: they are still 2.9%, as the author says, of the total United States population and firms will attempt to capture that market share by trying to cater to Jewish needs and requirements. When a firm wishes to target a specific market segment then it will often be prepared to spend what it considers a reasonable amount of the capital to grow its business by moving into that area of the market. In this case the firm can grow their market share by getting their food certified as kosher by the rabbinical Jewish organisations that we are discussing so that Jews and others who wish to keep kosher will buy their food.

It is indeed correct to state that this cost of kosher certification is likely passed on to the consumer, but again so would the cost of a halal certification and so are other non-essential costs: where it is possible to do so. The point here is that although it is debatable whether firm's should be paying for certification: it is important to note that this is only one of many costs, which are not in the customer's benefit that maybe passed on to them in the price. Hence it only makes sense as an argument to suggest legislation that the food certification for religious reasons should be made to be a charitable act donated by the religious community. Since it can be convincingly argued, which the author briefly alludes to, that since it is a niche requirement and does not fall into the best interests of the nation concerned then the process should be made a charitable act with no payment attached. However this argument we must note in passing that the preference should be for the banning of halal and kosher food, because of the cruelty to animals involved in the process.

The spending of the profit gained from the kosher certification process, especially by the Orthodox Union and other non-commercial enterprises (rather than the commercial kosher certification agencies such as Kof-K), is indeed a matter of legitimate concern (since these Jewish organisations are also politically involved and some of them are involved in Jewish communal activities, which are potentially detrimental to the nation's interests), but it doesn't evidence there being a kosher food tax per se. All it would indicate is that Jewish organisations are deriving their sources of funding from diverse sources, which would likely include an undetermined amount indirectly from the non-Jewish consumer.

The author also alleges that the Jews wield considerable power in the retail and distribution trades and that if a firm does not go through the kosher certification process with their products then there will be an organised Jewish boycott of the firm's products leading to inevitable bankruptcy. This is illogical to argue since unless the firm is only producing niche products aimed at the Jewish market then Jews are only 2.9% of the population and hence are not able to perform such an action themselves. Also even if Jews are significantly overrepresented in the media industry, which is indeed true, there is no reason to suggest there is an organised and coherent bond between the Jews in the media and those certifying kosher products. The author

therefore posits an organised jewish operation to benefit jewry, but since the rabbinical organisations are actually composed of religious jews who are known to have a great antipathy towards secular jews [who form the bulk of the jewish presence in the big business community] (and vice versa) it would seem unlikely that secular jews would co-operate with religious jews to maintain a religious jewish monopoly on kosher certification. Since the author brings forward no evidence of this occurring or having occurred in the past in regards to the kosher certification issue: we cannot but conclude this argument is without foundation (since there is little evidence to suggest that the jews are an organised conspiracy, but rather the evidence suggests that jews are a group of egotistical individuals of Semitic racial origins who believe that by serving the perceived jewish cause they will win fame and favour among the jewish community).

The author then states:

‘Once they succumb to this BLACKMAIL, they are required to keep the total amount paid the Rabbis every year a strict secret! The growth of this Kosher racket has been nothing less than phenomenal. In 1960, only 225 food products paid the Kosher tax. By 1966, this figure grew to 476 and jumped to 1000 by 1974. Today, a whopping 17,500 companies have been intimidated into paying this multi-level tax.’[\[8\]](#)

Although I have found no originating source for this assertion that 17,500 companies are paying for kosher certification: it is a plausible figure if one considers the highly competitive market that now exists internationally. Hence firms are likely to wish to maximise their profits and market share by gaining any and all certification that may or may not do this for them. However it is worth noting that we would need to know how this 17,500 figure is composed given that many firms operate a small number of legal entities, which if the legal entities are listed separately would alter the figure considerably.

If we assume that this figure is correct: we still have to say that indeed the growth of the kosher industry may indeed be phenomenal, but what the author leaves out in his statement is the wider business context. In so far as from the 1960’s there has been an increase in the amount of information regarding certifications and so forth that a firm can apply for to increase its market share. Where-as before there would have been more specialist jewish shops from the 1960’s the rampant conglomeration has progressively pushed out small firms and larger firms are taking their place in the market. These small specialist jewish shops and companies who sold kosher products would have not presumably been counted as firms in the statistics that the author is citing, even though technically they are firms (since they operate as such), and hence the growth in terms of the number of companies gaining kosher certification can be partially explained by the fact that more information is available, the market is more competitive (hence the incentive to gain access to increased market share is higher) and that those firms, which were not previously included in the figures, are now formal companies so would now be included.

With the suggestion of secrecy regarding the total income of these jewish organisations: this would indeed seem to be true in so far as there do not seem to be any obvious public statements of accounts or of revenue from any of these jewish kosher certification organisations[\[9\]](#).

Therefore we may regard this as firstly suspicious and secondly worthy of further detailed

investigation, but it cannot be considered an admission of guilt regarding a 'secret', again I will state there is not anything particularly secret about it [just a lack of knowledge outside those who use it that it exists], kosher food tax being in operation.

However in terms of individual companies: it is not an argument to suggest that there is some special secret about keeping the cost of their kosher certification a secret given that it is sensitive financial data and therefore is not going to be realised into the public domain (unlike public accounts and investor financial material).

Therefore we can state that: although the issue of just how much revenue and profit is being made is an area of particular further interest, since the figures are not immediately accessible and are important to this argument, and may evidence some quite disreputable business practices, which do need to be called attention to. There is no 'secret agreement' between the firm and the kosher certification organisation: since that is standard business practice and hence is not unusual (and therefore is not an exception to normal business cost and therefore cannot be a 'tax' in the sense meant by the author).

The author then proceeds to write as follows in a section entitled '*How the Kosher Tax Operates*':

'The Union of Orthodox Rabbis which issues the (U) symbol controls 80% of the Kosher certification business. They employ some 300 Rabbis who travel nation-wide "inspecting" food processing plants. First, the company must pay an annual fee for the use of the copyright symbol--the (U) or (K) or a version thereof. Second, the company must pay a separate heavy fee each time a team of Rabbis shows up to "inspect" their plant (Certain meat packers are required to hire Rabbis full time at extravagant salaries). Third, the company must pay these fees over and over again for each different product they make. Thus, General Foods pays dozens of separate fees. Also, each sub-contracting company which provides any type of ingredient which goes into the finished product must also pay separate fees to the "visiting Rabbis". Sometimes a single product may eventually be taxed as many as a dozen times right down the line before it reaches you the consumer! Last, but not least, these fees must be paid annually and they are increased each year. Only by increasing the public awareness of the Kosher Food Tax and doing our best to refrain from purchasing products with the "K" or "U" symbols, can we begin to end this outrage being perpetrated upon our people.' [\[10\]](#)

The information provided by the author regarding how kosher certification is conducted is indeed correct, with the process being outlined concisely and ably: however again what the author is missing is the context here. In that when any health or quality check is made it is done to each production line for each product separately including a check on the suppliers. The reason being that you have to assure the process from beginning to end meets with the standards you are measuring it against: in this case the halakha dealing with the issue of kashrut. This should not be a surprise to the author nor the reader: hence it is reasonable that if fees are to be paid then you are going to have to pay for each inspection separately.

However this does not mean that there is no valid argument over whether the rabbis should be paid for their services, but if they are paid then it is logical they should be paid per inspection

they make rather than as a more general fee (because each inspection would be classed as a different project since each production process is a system unto itself and thus requires individual inspection).

On the other hand: there is no real defence over the payment of the copyright for the symbol for each individual product since that is behaviour for the maximising of the revenue and profit margin, which is not ethical behaviour for ostensibly religious-based organisations. I am presuming this assertion from the author is correct since, as I have stated, information regarding general pricing has not been forthcoming from these Jewish organisations and they have not provided information as to whether they charge a general fee for the use of their copyrighted symbol, charge per product or even perhaps per volume of product. Hence I will proceed with the median assumption given that in terms of business behaviour this would fit with a rational economic man approach.

This, once corroborating information is located, can be argued to be a constructive against regarding the behaviour of these Jewish kosher certification organisations, because although some of them, like Kof-K, are incorporated firms, others such as the Orthodox Union, that the author cites, are in fact general Jewish fraternal organisations and are not businesses per se, but rather religious organisations. Hence you can argue while keeping to a reasonable interpretation of what facts we do have available that these organisations are in ethical breach of their duties to the nation as a whole since they are looking to maximise profit in a wholly religious organisation.

A point of particular interest here maybe found in the issue of whether these kosher certification organisations are in fact benefiting from a tax-exempt status as religious organisations. This would be worth further investigation since if these Jewish organisations are doing so then it would be a point of critique that would not only be cogent, but also a potential piece of useful anti-Semitic propaganda.

The other point at which we must express critique is whether the fees increase every year. It is quite possible that they may well do so, but is the increase above, below or in line with inflation? That is the key question here. Since if indeed these increases are above the rate of inflation then there is a legitimate case for critique and if they are below or in line with inflation then there is no legitimate case for critique.

In summing up our critique of this representative article on the kosher food tax issue: we must state that although there is a useful kernel of arguable fact to the kosher food tax argument. The issue with it is that it has been subject to serious exaggeration and that a far more candid, as well as factually accurate, variant of this argument maybe written by toning down the sensationalist language and focusing on the issue as one of unnecessary cost for lack of reasonable gain. It is also worth mentioning that one of the best arguments that can be used against the kosher certification process is its certification of unnecessary items, utensils and so forth, for a minor niche market, which can potentially is being fraudulently advertised to firms as a far more significant part of the kosher market when it is not so. Another point of real interest that we have covered is the revenue and profits of these kosher certification organisations and whether they are tax exempt as religious organisations or not. There is even the potential for a law suit against the kosher certification organisations if indeed this is the case!

I would like to make some points of potential specific critique that have been missed in every article on the kosher food tax that I have read. The following points of interest in the discussion aren't arguments in and of themselves, but if anyone wishes to argue that the Kashrut certification process is open to the manipulation, corruption and the defrauding of those firm's applying for kosher certification (i.e. the defrauding of non-jews by jews) then these points will hopefully serve as a guide of what to look in order to begin to develop your argument.

What is particularly interesting with kosher certification is the multitude of jewish organisations who offer it on conflicting halakhic standards, which can easily lead to organisations confusing and/or misleading firms about how far their own mark will satisfy kosher requirements. It is easy to understand how this might indeed be the case: in that firms are often looking for ways in which they can increase their customer base and therefore their sales. One way they might look to do so is to get their food certified as being kosher and thus appeal to any segments of the population who are both kosher and looking to buy kosher food of the type produced by the firm. However a problem occurs with this strategy in so far as how does the firm select the right kosher certification for its product?

Since as I have said there are a great many different kosher certifications out there at different levels of Kashrut stringency. Although there are the main issuers of kosher certification, such as the Union of Orthodox Congregations (better known as the Orthodox Union), there are nevertheless many different firms and organisations out there offering this service. There is a considerable grey area for those jewish organisations, which can supply valid kosher certifications, to manipulate the gap in the knowledge within the firm as to what benefits could accrue and as to how many congregations hold this certification of kosher status to be valid.

So for example: if a firm wished to get its produce certified as kosher, but knew very little about the process itself and the halakhic law regarding kashrut and sent out inquiries to one or several jewish organisation(s) who issue kosher certifications. Then it would be simple for the jewish organisation or organisations to claim that their certification covers a wider segment of the population than it does and to aggressively sell the kosher certification to the firm as a simple process, while involves very little cost.

When in fact the jewish organisation/organisations have kept back the differences in certification and what is considered to be kosher by different sects within the religious jewish community, which may impact the firm's decision to go into through the process of getting their produce certified as kosher by that particular jewish organisation. This is made possible by the fact that the firm doesn't know any better and is forced, because of this gap in the firm's knowledge base, to trust the word of the jewish organisation.

Hence the firm has been essentially defrauded by the jewish organisation who can easily profit from this by either setting a very high kashrut standard (and therefore demanding sourcing and manufacturing changes, which of course they will be paid to advise on) or by offering to give kosher certification at a lower kashrut standard if the firm will agree to pay the jewish organisation a higher consultancy charge. Hence the jewish organisation while also in the position to easily defraud a firm can also easily blackmail that firm into giving that organisation

more money.

To give an example of how a jewish organisation could easily raise or lower their halakhic standard according to the fee that was paid to them we can look at the issue of leafed vegetables, which are included as ingredients in a great many food products. In halakhic guidelines the preparer of the food must be sure to check all the leaves thoroughly for insects: this in a jewish household traditionally involves the jewish woman holding up the leaves to the light to look for black spots, which might indicate the presence of an insect, which is considered treif, and if there are insects present they all have to be removed in order for the vegetable to become kosher (and for the process to continue).

Now if the jewish organisation in question wished to raise the halakhic standard: they could insist that a process be implemented by the firm whereby all leafed vegetables that are to be part of their products to be certified as kosher are checked by hand for any insect presence at all in much the same manner as the checking is performed by the jewish woman preparing a kosher meal. However if the jewish organisation in question wished to lower the halakhic standard then it would be a simple matter to simply insist that the leafed vegetables have been thoroughly washed in flowing water and therefore they have been cleaned and all traces of treif can be assumed in halakha to have been removed by this cleansing process.

Hence it is a simple matter for a jewish organisation to raise or lower the halakhic standard according to whether they consider the firm is willing to pay them the amount of money they wish for their certification. If not then they can take revenge by inflicting a high halakhic standard, but if so then they can ease relations with the firm by imposing a low halakhic standard on the firm's production process when reviewing it with a view to kosher certification. Hence the certification process is very open to manipulation based on the perceptions of the firm whose production process the rabbinical committee is inspecting.

One further point of interest in discussing the kashrut certification process and its liability to be abused and manipulated is that there are certain categories of produce, such as cheese (gvinat akum), wine, butter (chem'at akum) and some cooked foods (bishul akum), which according to halakhic kashrut law have to be prepared in whole or in part by jews. There are differences between the different Judaic sects regarding this with Conservative Judaism disregarding the need for jews to be wholly or in part involved in the production process for some cooked foods (bishul akum).

Also debated between these jewish sects is just how much jewish presence is required: some strict sects require whole jewish participation and others require only a small amount (measured as a percentage of the total production process). This breadth on the part of how strict, in terms of halakhic interpretation, a sect is: is therefore a potential avenue for a firm to again be defrauded and/or manipulated by these jewish organisations in so far as if the firm wishes its produce to be satisfactory as bishul akum, in terms of being kosher rather than treif, then the firm would have to actively employ jews on part or across the whole of their production line, which would be a discriminatory practice in the workplace and against current commercial ethnical guidelines regarding the nonsensical concept of 'racial equality'. It does however demonstrate the scope for manipulation and potential defrauding of firms through the certification process.

So therefore we can reasonably suggest that the kosher accreditation process is open to abuse, corruption and fraud since it is monopolised by jews with no standard authority regulating the use of the term: '*kosher*'.

It is important to note that the points of interest I have suggested are less sensational than the argument concerning a kosher food tax, but that the points I have briefly explained here are based on a good working knowledge of halakha and the application of that knowledge to examining the jewish question. It is possible my suggested arguments are incorrect, but at the very least the opportunity exists and you can look to examples like the recent Agriprocessors scandal in Iowa to show just how an organisation involved in the production and/or the certification of kosher food can do manipulate, lie and defraud much as I have described it. The key, as I have said many times in the past, to making a good, factually sound anti-Semitic argument is not to simply repeat emotionally appealing arguments (which often tend towards sensationalism), but to step back, take a deep breath and think about the argument in the context of the specialist literature in the area and suggest points of interpretation, which you rationally suggest rather than those which sound satisfying, but do not harmonize with either logic or the literature.

I will cite Semitic Controversies' motto again here, because it underlines perfectly why I have written this article in the style I have: '*Deal with the reality of the jew and the world will applaud anti-Semitism. Treat them as imaginary, inhuman fantasies and the world will have justified contempt for anti-Semitism.*' That is the key to defeating the jew.

[1] <http://www.libreopinion.com/members/standartesc/jewishquestion05.html> [Accessed: 15/02/2009]. Also reproduced on:

http://www.fourwinds10.com/siterun_data/health/food/news.php?q=1218068407 [Accessed: 15/02/2009].

[2] For example the article from the anti-Semitic publication, 'The Truth At Last', which is reproduced on http://www.fourwinds10.com/siterun_data/health/food/news.php?q=1218068407, reproduces all the LibreOpinion article's claims, but with different data: presumably acquired from different sources (there is a considerable disparity, but this is not particularly relevant to cover in detail).

[3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid.

[5] I believe the author was referring to Kof-K Kosher Certification when he referenced 'Kov-K' as a kosher certification organisation. Kof-K's website can be found at the following address: <http://www.kof-k.org/>.

[6] <http://www.libreopinion.com/members/standartesc/jewishquestion05.html> [Accessed: 15/02/2009]. Also reproduced on:

http://www.fourwinds10.com/siterun_data/health/food/news.php?q=1218068407 [Accessed: 15/02/2009].

[7] Ibid.

[8] Ibid.

[9] Emails to several of the jewish organisations in question requesting some general information regarding pricing and where to find public statements of their accounts have not been returned as

of this writing. There is no information regarding these on any of these jewish organisation's websites.

[10] <http://www.libreopinion.com/members/standartesc/jewishquestion05.html> [Accessed: 15/02/2009]. Also reproduced on:

http://www.fourwinds10.com/siterun_data/health/food/news.php?q=1218068407 [Accessed: 15/02/2009].

Zionism: Friend or Foe? (Part II)

Thursday, 26 February 2009

Little is different between the two camps of philo-Semites, either pro Arab or pro jew, other than that they are roughly split between two general political positions in Aryan lands. The jews, i.e. Zionists, but many non-Zionist jews lend themselves to these activities indirectly knowingly or unknowingly through their creation of pro-jewish arguments (such as the conception that Jesus Christ was a jew and therefore believing Christians should support the jews not the Arabs), propagandise and target the 'right' wing for the cause of Israel, while the Arabs propagandise and target the 'left' wing for the cause of Palestine. Their rhetoric, attitudes, arguments and mentality are little different from each, and both are as polemical and as vicious as the, other.

Both attitudes of the Aryan folk have been duped by Semites by appeals to either jewish or Arabic victimhood. The jews consistently push the theme of the 'six million gassed jews' of the 'holocaust' and their Zionist brethren and their supporter's transform this alleged genocide into the morally questionable justification for the jewish state's existence and have placed it as an ideological lynchpin of jewish victimhood. That jewish victimhood is the reason that Theodor Herzl is suggested to have created Zionism when he saw the 'terrible anti-Semitism' surrounding the case the infamous Dreyfus affair. Jews of the Zionist persuasion subsequently substituted the Dreyfus affair with the 'holocaust', which is in terms of propaganda is far more effective due to the supposed scale of the events. After all if one jew is supposedly being persecuted: it is just one individual, but if an entire race is being persecuted and that leads to the alleged deaths, in a supposedly industrial program of genocide, of six million. Then it can be portrayed that the goals of the Zionists in the formation of a jewish state were a justified concern that should be heeded. Precisely, because of the wider scope it allows it to be claimed that the entire jewish race is in danger therefore they need a home where they can be safe from a future program.

Thus the jews, with many, usually religious, dissenters^[1], established Israel on the claim that, because of the 'holocaust', the jews would be never safe in a world without a homeland. However as time has progressed this argument has evolved into a more broad-based argument brought about by the need to justify Israel's vicious wars of expansion, which it styles as 'defence', to the 'right' wing of other countries: whom Israel had early identified as a potential powerful groundswell of support if these 'right' wing parties and groups could be propagandised correctly. This lead to the formulation of a broader base to Zionist arguments, largely based on the arguments, again, being used by their jewish kin, which included, for example, the arguments that Israel was civilising the Middle East, that Israel was retaking its biblical inheritance (and hence hastening the return of Jesus in the eyes of dispensationalist Protestants) and that Israel

was a bulwark against the Soviet-allied and armed Arabic countries.

Over time these arguments have further evolved to fit the domestic and international circumstances in which Israel then finds itself. If we take one example of this in the argument that Israel is a bulwark against Communism, which was maintained up until the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991. Communism thus, at a stroke, became irrelevant and the argument used to court the North American and European 'right' wing, at a stroke, collapsed: so the argument was reworded in order to fit the circumstances in which Israel found herself by her own agents and her Jewish and philo-Semitic supporters. This took time in order to identify who the new opponent that Europe and North America might unite against might be. The answer was in fact to re-market the Arabs, not as supporters and allies of Communism, but rather as religious hardliners who wanted to establish their version of Islam upon the world.

The parallels with the aforementioned argument are simply that in one of the pillars of Communist ideology is the concept that there has to be a world revolution and that the '*oppressed proletariat/masses*' will, with proper direction and class consciousness, rise up against their '*bourgeois oppressors*' and create a world revolution. This was an ideology that the Soviet Union itself championed for precisely the reason that it was a key pillar of Communist ideology and because it offered great advantages to the Soviet Union overseas.

Islam on the other hand has as one of its pillars the idea that Islam has come to save the world by bringing the word of Allah to it and that the world will eventually submit to the will of Allah as given by the Prophet Muhammad. Islam has, in contrast to Christianity, always advocated armed struggle as a method for gaining believers by conquering lands and by doing so Muslims are engaging in a holy duty. This is the ideology that the Arabic peoples have increasingly begun to adopt since the late 19th century and it offers them great advantages in their nationalistic ideas, because it adds a religious twist to their goals and gives Arabic nationalists a powerful justification for their action (i.e. Allah the Almighty has told me to do this).

Thus Islamism, as a medium for Arabic racial nationalism, has replaced Communism as Israel's *raison d'être* in the propaganda of Israel's Jewish and philo-Semitic supporters. Hence when you see or read propaganda by Israel's Jewish and philo-Semitic supporters you will see the argument that Israel is only defending herself against the ravaging horde of Arabs is put forward as a key point in why the Jews and their supporters argue the North American and European 'right' wing should support Israel unconditionally.

Israel's Jewish and philo-Semitic supporters however, in their styling of Islam as the new opponent of Western civilisation, were and are quite aware that they have to link the struggle for national identity within Europe and North America to Israel's state of war between her and the Arabic peoples. To do this Israel's Jewish and philo-Semitic supporters argue that the internal problems with Islamic, and particularly those of Middle Eastern origin, immigrants and communities are the same as the problems Israel has with the Arabic Palestinians.

It is also a truism to state that concerns, especially among the European and North American, 'right' wing concerning suicide bombers and Islamic terrorism are in the wake of 9/11 and 7/7 have reached close to fever pitch. This has been heavily exploited by Israel's Jewish and philo-

Semitic supporters, in particular David Horowitz, Aaron Lerner and Robert Spencer, who have increasingly begun to comment on the problems of Islam's presence in Europe and North America and have deliberately mixed in Israel's conflict with the Arabs and in particular the Arabic Palestinians in with this more innocent sounding concern. In order for concern for Israel to appear as simply an extension of the European and North American 'right' wing's own concerns in their national borders: so the European and North American 'right' wing will be begin to support Israel as a *'bulwark against Islam'*.

This argument is particularly invidious, because contrary to the argument that Israel was a 'bulwark against Communism': Europe is not the frontline of this struggle, but this has changed to Israel. Thus Israel's jewish and philo-Semitic supporters claim that in order to support the struggle against Islam: the European and North American 'right' wing should support Israel. This should not only be intellectual, political and moral support Israel's jewish and philo-Semitic supporters maintain that economic support is required and that everything possible should given to Israel as the *'frontline against Islam'*.

Often these appeals are indirect and are by organisations that support Israel on matters that are ancillary or unrelated to Israel's actual defence. In so far as these supporters will receive emails from the American Friends of David Magen Adom, which is the Israeli version of the Red Cross/Ambulance Service, to support their work, but this of course helps the jews by providing medical services to them and allowing them to save jewish lives that would have otherwise be lost in the battle between Arab and jew. It is a truism to state that help to such organisations, who take advantage of jewish propagandising the European and North American 'right' wing, will seem humanitarian and in the best interests of the jewish people. However, because these are donations to an organisation, which actively assists the Israeli government and military then they are actually contributing to Israel's defence.

What these jewish organisations are doing is simply capitalising on the propagandised concerns of the European and North American 'right' and are seeking to take resources away from these patriots own struggles and giving them to Israel. These organisations are not run for the benefit of Europe and North America, but rather for the benefit of Israel, which seeks to identify its interests, as I have argued, with the interests of Europe and North America, but only benefit of Israel. It is notable, as well, that Israel has sought any and all allies for itself and in the process of doing this their Zionist Diaspora has propagandised that Israel must be protected, because if it is not then, the propagandists suggest, Islam will rise and seek to subdue Europe in a repeat of the early rapid Islamic expansion, which was ultimately defeated by Charlemagne at the first battle of Poitiers and Tours. This might indeed be an Arabic plan, but it is also important to note that Zionism has a similar agenda founded in the very basis of the distinction of the jewish people as a 'chosen people' (i.e. that are above others and will one day rule the world by the order of God).

Therefore: we can reasonably suggest that Zionism is not a friend of the West at all. For all Zionism is doing in this regard is draining away the wealth of Europe and North America on false pre-tenses, to fight a war that it is not in Europe's and North America's best interest to fight. However unlike most authors who critically discuss Zionism: I cannot conclude that the Arabs are a wholly victimised group and that therefore Europeans and North Americans should support the 'Arab resistance' as it has been styled. Rather: we must conclude that Arabs have in

fact been copying the jews in running a propaganda campaign for their cause in Europe and North America targeting the European and North American 'left' wing and have equally been draining away the wealth of Europe and North America on false pre-tenses to fight a war that is not in Europe's and North America's best interests to fight. That is why anti-Semites must reject both jew and Arab, because they are genetic cousins who both seek to dupe the people's of Europe and North America into supporting their side in their brutal civil war that has been raging on and off since the mid-twentieth century.

However much Zionism, as a theoretical concept, is not opposed to the best interests of the peoples of Europe and North America: its practical application by jews has meant that it is in application opposed to Europe and North America's best interests. Since it is being applied by the jewish mindset, which works on the basis, whether egocentric or ethnocentric, of what is in the best interests of jews: not what is in the best interests of Europe and North America's peoples. That is why Zionism cannot be endorsed, but nor can we endorse the ideal the Arab who seek to use the peoples of European descent around the world for their own singular benefit: just as the jews do.

Therefore we must, in order to be coherent and ideologically sound, oppose both jew and Arab equally. Otherwise if we just oppose one then we will be exploited by the other. For that is the true nature of the Semite: the perpetual sponger off European and North American society!

[1] It must be stated that these jews do not dissent from the creation of Israel per se, but what they argue is that the jewish Messiah has to come before Israel can actually be created and that by forcing Israel's recreation Zionists are going contrary to biblical injunction (and hence the jewish Messiah will not come until Israel disappears again).

A Change to the Posting and Format of Semitic Controversies

Sunday, 8 March 2009

Since Semitic Controversies began it has been an ad hoc blog of essays, responsa, book reviews, in briefs and critiques being published more or less weekly. However in order to facilitate Semitic Controversies planned move from the format of an ad hoc blog to a more formal format: there is going to be a change in posting here at Semitic Controversies.

The reason for this switch is that Semitic Controversies is that, as I have noted previously, Semitic Controversies intends to split into four different forms. These forms will be as an anti-Semitic news source, as an intellectual periodical similar in nature, although not so much in content, to the jewish magazine 'Commentary', as a popular anti-Semitic periodical for the majority of the folk and as an information source with summarily updated listings of jews in the world (for example jewish ownership and involvement in the media) as well as basic anti-Semitic critiques, myths and information about jews.

This blog will be of this second form: an intellectual anti-Semitic periodical. The other forms will begin to appear when Semitic Controversies moves to its new home beginning with the first

(as a news source) and fourth (as an information source) forms. Once these two forms have been established the intellectual anti-Semitic periodical will move to being a monthly publication. Once all this in place the third (as a popular anti-Semitic periodical) form will emerge an unspecified number of weeks later.

This change is from an informal pattern of posting what has been written and submitted by the various authors who contribute to Semitic Controversies to a regular format with a specific number and type of articles in each publication. What will happen will be that twice a month issues of at least eight pieces of written work will be added to this blog, which will be referenced by a volume number and an issue number. The volume number will refer to the year when the issue was published and the issue number will refer to the specific issue that it is in that year (for example Vol. 1 No. 1 would be the first issue). So each article will have a specific Volume and Issue number in it to identify when it was published.

Each issue will contain at least an editorial, one lead article, three feature articles, two book reviews and a summary of the news as it relates to the jews. Recognising that this requires a considerable amount of work beforehand we will put publishing on hold until Sunday 28th March. Then each new issue will be published fortnightly there-of. Once Semitic Controversies has moved to its new home this periodical will be, as I have said, published monthly and will contain an editorial, one lead article, five feature articles, three book reviews and a summary of the news as it relates to the jews.

We hope that you will enjoy the new improved format!

Yours truly,

The Editor,

Semitic Controversies (Volume 1, Number 1 [Part I])

Monday, 30 March 2009

Editor's Foreword

Welcome to the new look Semitic Controversies, a bi-monthly periodical of news and intelligent thought regarding the jews. Your first reaction upon reading these words is probably surprise given the candid statement I have just made above. However please be assured that this is a publication that is dedicated to giving a truly alternative and intelligent differing perspective on the news, history and thought regarding our current times. We are not interested in trying to convince you about a lurid conspiracy emanating from the headquarters of the United Nations and nor are we interested in trying to suggest to you that the jews are inhuman child-eating monsters similar to those many of us, myself included, once thought lived under our beds.

What Semitic Controversies is here to do is to challenge you and bring you an alternate view on world events allowing you to make up your own mind regarding national and world news and events. Necessarily we will focus our attention on the jews as a people, because they are a people that little is really known about despite much being written about them for public consumption. Most of what you have read about the jews has I suspect been very flattering to them and their importance and contribution to civilisation. We at Semitic Controversies do not believe in this vision of the jews as a perfect people and seek to know them as they are rather than how they and their supporters portray them to be.

We have no interest in lying about the jews, but neither do we have a vested interest in making them out to be victimised or unjustly treated when they have not actually been victimised or unjustly treated. However if they were or have been victimised or unjustly treated, which in some instances in their history they have, then we acknowledge that fact. However what are doing here is to review the jews as a people and giving you, as a member of the folk, the opportunity to hear a different, we think more accurate, side of the story. Since, as the old proverb says, there are two sides to every story and you have heard one side of that story. Now please allow us to tell our side of the story as well.

In Semitic Controversies we will often use the terms anti-Semitic and anti-Semitism, particularly in second part of each edition, but is necessary to realise we use these terms to mean somebody who is opposed to Semites. We include both Arabs and the jews, not just the jews, in that term since both Arabs and jews are genetically close to each other (even the ones who look as ostensibly European as you or me) and neither the Arabs or the jews have North America's or Europe's interests at heart, but rather their own.

I hope that you find Semitic Controversies an informative publication to read and that it challenges you as an individual to think about things and consider an alternative point of view. Please remember that Semitic Controversies is absolutely free and that we will never ask for any donation or subscription from you: all that we ask is a fair hearing.

Yours truly,

Karl Radl,

Editor of Semitic Controversies Magazine,

News Headlines

Former AIG Chairman Maurice 'Hank' Greenberg sues the American Taxpayer

On the 4th of March 2009 the Guardian's Alan Clark reporting from New York City informed the Guardian's readership that the jewish former Chairman of the disaster-laden insurance group,

AIG, had decided to, in his capacity as a major shareholder, sue his own former company for ‘*misrepresenting itself to shareholders*’ (i.e. Greenberg)[1]. AIG has gone down in world history as having the largest quarterly loss of all time when it said it lost 62 billion dollars and then has had to be bailed out by the American taxpayer four times to the total amount of 170 billion dollars of public money resulting in an 80 percent taxpayer stake in AIG.

Greenberg accuses AIG of wiping out 2 billion dollars of his personal fortune and is seeking restitution for the loss from the company and some of its senior executives and directors such as former CEO Martin Sullivan. He also claims AIG’s ‘*material misrepresentations and omissions*’ meant that he bought a considerable number of AIG shares as his ‘*retirement package*’. However let us think about that for a moment: Greenberg is suing his own former company for his own incompetence and/or bad luck in purchasing AIG shares with his own fortune.

You would think that if you have 2 billion dollars to spend on a ‘*retirement package*’, as Greenberg did, then you would not be looking for a ‘*retirement package*’ at all, but rather put the money in a bank managed portfolio, take out a small proportion of it buy a luxury home in Hawaii and leave you enough money to live comfortably on for the rest of your life. Not to mention donating a portion to worthy causes, such as helping feed, clothe and house the poor in New York City, since nobody can reasonably spend 2 billion dollars in a lifetime let alone when they are 83!

Not Hank Greenberg however: he decided he was going to try and make a lot more money.

For what purpose we might ask? He had at least 2 billion dollars!

The answer is simple: sheer greed. In that Greenberg decided he was going to place a large portion of his ‘*retirement package*’ in AIG as shares in the company presumably hoping to make a considerable return both on share price fluctuations and shareholder dividends distributed by his former company. Greenberg was greedy and he received appropriate judgement as such since he lost the money, which he had sought to make even more money with.

Greenberg however is under strong scrutiny regarding this claim since Greenberg himself was forced to resign in 2005 over allegations of off-balance sheet transactions (i.e. fraud and misrepresenting the financial position of AIG [which he is now trying to sue AIG for!]), which were an indicator of things to come at AIG. Since these off-balance sheet transactions very likely were the beginnings or the maturing of what Ben Bernanke, the Jewish chairman of the Federal Reserve, has called ‘*huge numbers of irresponsible bets*’.

This in itself would be suspicious, but when we consider that Greenberg was the Chairman of AIG between 1968 and 2005 it begins to look like a case of fraud on Greenberg’s part. In that a company does not simply go from one of the world’s biggest companies to making a 62 billion dollar loss in a quarter over the course of three years. This type of commercial change in fortune takes many years, a decade or more, to achieve and with Greenberg having formed the financial products unit, which caused much of the loss, in his time as Chairman and set its business strategy. This same division alone, according to the Examiner, gave the Obama campaign 138,928 dollars in donations and yet is now being protected and molly-coddled by the Obama

administration^[2] despite its pretend ‘*outrage*’ over the AIG bonuses that it looked the other way about until there was a public outcry.

Greenberg’s further accusation that after he left AIG a ‘*freewheeling*’ culture developed also seems completely untenable if we consider that for such a culture of corporate irresponsibility to develop in the first place it must have many years to incubate itself within the company with gradually increasing levels of risk being used in transactions. Then over time this builds up into the considerable imbalance that caused AIG to lose 62 billion dollars in a single quarter. This cannot be built up quickly in even the most pro-risk of environments since brokers will not take more risks than any need to in any transaction in order to secure their bonuses, salary increases and the promotion possibilities for that year. Otherwise said brokers are unlikely to get either unless they are very lucky or astute, which seems extremely unlikely when spread out over a single business unit let alone an entire company of the size of AIG.

Thus Greenberg can hardly blame anyone, but himself for his losses (and is also as a result must bare a considerable amount of the responsibility for this commercial disaster). Since Greenberg would have well known what the strategy was and presumably just how high risk it was, but still he invested 2 billion dollars in his own company as a calculated risk since he either thought to make even more money quickly or he knew the bubble was going to burst and foresaw the possibility of a large legal suit against the US taxpayer who were almost certain to prop up AIG financially by buying it out should it go close to bankruptcy.

As to which of these theories is correct is something we cannot know for certain, but we can suggest that it is one of the two. Since at best Greenberg made a very greedy and ill-timed mistake and at worst Greenberg knowingly bought AIG shares in preparation to launch a suit against the US taxpayer owned AIG.

What business has Hank Greenberg in launching a legal action looking for recompense on losses that are at least his own fault?

It was Greenberg’s personal capital, Greenberg’s personal decision and as a former insider at the highest level for decades he had the information and the contacts to know better. So why must the US taxpayer fund Hank Greenberg’s mistakes? After all he must be held at least partially accountable for the losses at AIG and the resulting need for 170 billion dollars worth of American taxpayer’s money to prop up the company he created and whose downfall he was partially involved in.

So why has Greenberg launched this legal suit?

We come back again to the same answers: utter greed.

Greenberg shouldn’t be trying to clear up, he should be locked up!

Obama Administration gives 1 billion dollars to Jewish Charities

On the 20th March 2009 the Jewish News of Greater Phoenix[\[3\]](#) reported on some of the ways in which the jewish community in Arizona is going to be spending some of the 1 billion dollars that President Obama allotted specifically to jewish social support in his February 2009 Stimulus bill as reported by the Jewish Telegraphic Agency on the 17th of February 2009[\[4\]](#). The total allotted in the Phoenix area alone is \$50,000 and is split out as follows:

‘The Helping Hands Program of Jewish Family & Children's Service, which offers short-term financial assistance to Jewish individuals and families experiencing financial hardship, has been awarded \$20,000. Jewish Free Loan's Tzedakah Fund, which provides emergency interest-free loans for Jews who need help paying for rent, utilities, medical bills or other basic necessities, also received \$20,000.

The Valley of the Sun Jewish Community Center in Scottsdale and the Barnes Family Jewish Community Center in Chandler each received \$5,000 to support early childhood education scholarships to families experiencing financial hardship.’[\[5\]](#)

We note here that all the money has not gone into providing what you could be deemed essential services to help jewish families and individuals in times of crisis, but rather into giving jews, and only jews mind you, interest-free loans and offering short term financial assistance. While it is hard to begrudge anyone a helping hand at this time of economic hardship: we have to note that if there was a free loans fund for Europeans only, in order to stop illegal immigrants from queuing up to several streets away for what they regard as ‘*free money*’, would be attacked as ‘*racist*’, ‘*nazi-like*’ and so forth. However when jews have such a fund for jews alone: it is suddenly not ‘*racist*’ or ‘*nazi-like*’.

What we have to realise here is that this is not a religious foundation in the sense of a Catholic charity where the recipients have to be religious Catholics. Jews that apply for loans only have to be jews under jewish religious law, or halakha, which means that born jews (i.e. with a jewish mother or a jewish father of a priestly line) who are non-observant or are converts to other religions. The definition of a jew to jews is a biological one and not so much to do with whether the born jew in question is observant or not.

So therefore is this not a double standard on the part of the jewish community? In that some jews, most like converts, would happily use Catholic and other religious social relief agencies, but yet know that if they can also get help from jewish social relief agencies, because they were born as jews. This would thus allow them to be able to claim social relief from two (or more) agencies at once by registering at a jewish agency and also at a Christian agency for example. What is there to stop them doing so: considering that the jewish agency uses a biological definition of who a jew is and a Christian organisation would use a religious definition (although Christian organisations may well open their doors to non-Christians as well as part of fulfilling the mission of Christ)?

What can be done about this travesty?

The answer is that there is not much that can be done: since that a family or individual has registered with two different agencies of differing faiths is hard to evidence, especially since jewish social relief agencies are notorious for being unforthcoming about who they are helping. The only way to stop such a problem would be for non-jewish social relief agencies to refuse jews, even if converts, aid on the grounds that they could get the same aid from jewish social relief organisations who have just received 1 billion dollars from the Obama administration for the very purpose of helping support jews during the deep economic depression that we have now entered.

Regarding the split I have cited above: we can also wonder as to why 10,000 dollars is being allotted to '*early childhood education scholarships*' for these are not essential by any means. How can this be considered to be essential relief since that is just giving jewish children opportunities, which a non-jewish child of European descent would not have. Why cannot jewish children go to public schools like other children? Why is American taxpayers money going towards funding jewish children to go to jewish schools: when surely the jewish community should foot the bill for such a scheme not the American taxpayer.

The double standard here is both astounding and worrying at the same time in that 10,000 dollars could have been used to feed dozens of hungry families in New York City or in Phoenix for a considerable period of, but rather is being used to fund jewish children going to jewish schools. We cannot help but find that completely disturbing. When Catholic families wish to send their children to Catholic schools more often than not they have to pay to do so and that means sacrifice on the part of the Catholic family to do so. So then why must Catholic families sacrifice, scrimp and save to allow their children to be educated at Catholic schools, while jewish families can get taxpayer-funded scholarships to jewish schools?

We can only suggest this as a government funded discrimination against non-jews to the benefit of jews. Since the funding for this scheme has been given by the Obama administration as part of its '*Stimulus*' package for the Medicaid program. One has to wonder why the Obama administration would give 1 billion out of 87 billion dollars to jews so that they can have this special '*social relief*' that I have cited above. Of course: this money is for jew-only social relief services and is not for non-jews, but importantly these jews still have access to all the other benefits in the social relief system, but yet they still receive a very large amount of American taxpayer's money for their own jewish-specific programs.

For an administration that preaches inclusion and anti-discrimination: the Obama administration is very discriminatory against non-jews and those of European descent, especially in its allocation of funds and services, which primarily go to jews and other non-Europeans such as Mexicans, Negroes and American Indians. This unfortunately does not bode well for the many European families who are left out of the Obama administrations largesse, because they worked hard and own their own homes, but now have been left close to destitute by irresponsible financial companies, which seem on the face of it to have predominately jewish leadership and owners. I shall leave you, the reader, to draw your own conclusions from this...

National News

Bernard Madoff's Accountant on Fraud Charge

Bernard Madoff's former jewish accountant, David Friehling, the owner of Friehling & Horowitz, has been charged for aiding and abetting Madoff's Ponzi scheme the BBC reported on the 18th of March 2009[6]. Friehling was arraigned on fraud, aiding and abetting fraud and four counts of filing false audit reports. Madoff has always insisted that he acted alone in his destructive financial transactions, but this has always seemed unlikely and Friehling as Madoff's accountant is unlikely to have not known about the scheme. The charge by prosecutors merely confirms what many have unfortunately suspected since the Madoff Ponzi scheme was revealed to the public: that the corruption was more widespread than just Bernard Madoff.

We would not be surprised if it was discovered that there were other apparently financially astute individuals involved on the inside of this scheme since the scheme itself allowed Madoff and anyone on the inside of it to make very large sums of money very quickly. We can only state that we hope that all the perpetrators of this fraud are brought to justice.

One question that has been on lips recently regarding the Madoff case has been as to why he hasn't tried to strike a deal with US prosecutors regarding testimony as to the others who were involved. Madoff simply repeats that he is 'sorry' and then takes all the dubious credit for managing one of the largest Ponzi schemes in history and one of the most destructive.

The reason Madoff didn't turn in Friehling and his other potential jewish accomplices is two fold.

Firstly: we expect US prosecutors do not wish to cut a deal with Madoff, but rather make an example of him, because of the damage he has caused to many wealthy, often jewish, individuals and institutions.

Secondly: we suspect that Madoff wishes to be seen as a financial genius who single-handedly master-minded one of the largest Ponzi schemes in history and was able to single-handedly tip the world's top economies from growth to recession. This wouldn't be true of course, but Madoff wishes to take the credit so he can flatter his own ego and go down in history as a genius albeit an evil one in the eye of millions. Thus allowing him to be remembered for something that he is not, i.e. a genius, and gaining for Madoff in his eyes the status that he craves.

I would suggest the thing to be done with Madoff and his wife, who abided and abetted in his conduct, to give them a trial with the death penalty as the possible sentence. The death penalty should be on the table, because of the extremely destructive nature of their actions and to serve as a warning to others planning other such dishonest schemes, which hurt the American people. Only when there is a real punishment in place, as opposed to the current slap on the wrist, for such individuals can we hope to make con men think twice about their actions. All of Madoff's money should then go towards social relief for the poor, the homeless, the destitute and those

who do not have millions of dollars who have been left near bankruptcy, directly or indirectly, by Bernard Madoff and not to replace the lost money of the, largely jewish, individuals and organisations the collapse of his Ponzi scheme left out of pocket.

Head of American Jewish Committee libels the United States

David Harris, the jewish head of the influential American Jewish Committee, testified on the 19th of March 2009 to the House of Representatives that the United States had a hand in the supposed deaths of hundreds of thousands of jews during the 'holocaust' in World War Two[7]. Harris was speaking in support of legislation introduced by Democratic Representative Robert Wexler of Florida, which seeks to create a special category of refugee policy, i.e. preferred status, in regards to jews fleeing Europe for asylum in the United States.

Harris states that because of '*anti-Semitic prejudice*' America refused many jews the chance to immigrate to the United States and therefore caused their deaths indirectly and that because of this the United States has a responsibility to the jewish people to aid them in any way the jewish people see fit. Harris is supporting a policy, which would give jews preferred status as refugees as opposed to others: surely this anti-gentile is as bad or worse than the discrimination that he is alleging caused the deaths of hundreds of thousands of jews. So why does David Harris support discrimination in favour of jews with an argument about the discrimination in favour of jews.

Either David Harris is a hypocrite or is an advocate of something much more sinister, but the question still remains: why jews?

Anti-Defamation League attacks Sheriff who is accused of anti-Immigrant Bias

The Jewish News of Greater Phoenix on the 20th of March 2009 reported that the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai Brith, an organisation that only recruits jewish members yet champions '*anti-discrimination*' political positions and was the subject of much controversy in 1993 when it was found to have been compiling dossiers with confidential information from security and police informants on American politicians, citizens, corporations and organisations (this was settled out of court by the ADL in 1999), has welcomed the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) and the Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund's suit against Maricopa County Sheriff's Office on the grounds of '*racial profiling*'[8].

The controversy stems from the Sheriff's use of a local law, which allows the department to arrest individuals on suspicion of breaching federal immigration law. The system, implemented through a policy of arrest suspects first and then find out if they are illegal or legal migrants, is controversial, because it takes a tough approach to the problem of undocumented illegal immigrants, which have in recently years overwhelmed Arizona and many other states. The

charge by these ‘civil rights’ organisations: is that the Sheriff’s Office is ‘*racially profiling*’ suspects.

We can answer this accusation rather simply: how is the Sheriff’s Office supposed not to ‘*racially profile*’ suspects when the illegal immigrants are to be found in Arizona are from central and south America. It is self-evident from the fact that Arizona is near Mexico and not Europe or China that almost all illegal immigrants are going to be of Mexican or Latin American origin so therefore those groups are going to be by far the most targeted by the Sheriff’s Office. This simple fact should be understandable, but apparently not for the Anti-Defamation League, its Mexican friends or the borderline Communist ACLU.

What does these organisations want the Sheriff’s Office to do: arrest a few hundred Europeans whom they know are very unlikely to in the United States illegally in order to make the numbers balance? Is this kind of act congruent with ‘*civil liberties*’ as well as not being ‘*racial profiling*’?

I very much doubt it, but never-the-less these organisations wish to force their views onto a Sheriff’s Office, which is a doing a good job in difficult circumstances to keep the flood of illegal immigrants from Mexico and Latin America at bay. So why are these organisations persecuting this Sheriff’s Office?

We suspect it is because they are ideologically oriented towards making sure that American industry turns to cheaper Mexican and Latin American labourers rather than native European labour. The question that remains is as to why these organisations are allowed to get away with such actions?

I will leave you to draw your own conclusions from the Anti-Defamation League’s actions...

Political News

The Lobby Falter by John Mearsheimer[\[9\]](#)

(Editors Note: It is not my practice to reprint articles and certainly not from copyright publications, but in this case I am making an exception. Since Professor Mearsheimer’s short article for the London Review of Books is so excellent a summation on this issue than I wish to allow you to read it for yourself. Please note for copyright purposes that Semitic Controversies is a completely free publication and exercises no interest in or claim on the copyright for this article, which belongs to the London Review of Books, but we do wish for it to more widely read: hence our republication of it here. The following is Professor Mearsheimer’s work and I have not added to or amended it in anyway.)

Many people in Washington were surprised when the Obama administration tapped Charles Freeman to chair the National Intelligence Council, the body that oversees the production of

National Intelligence Estimates: Freeman had a distinguished 30-year career as a diplomat and Defense Department official, but he has publicly criticised Israeli policy and America's special relationship with Israel, saying, for example, in a speech in 2005, that *'as long as the United States continues unconditionally to provide the subsidies and political protection that make the Israeli occupation and the high-handed and self-defeating policies it engenders possible, there is little, if any, reason to hope that anything resembling the former peace process can be resurrected.'* Words like these are rarely spoken in public in Washington, and anyone who does use them is almost certain not to get a high-level government position. But Admiral Dennis Blair, the new director of national intelligence, greatly admires Freeman: just the sort of person, he thought, to revitalise the intelligence community, which had been very politicised in the Bush years.

Predictably alarmed, the Israel lobby launched a smear campaign against Freeman, hoping that he would either quit or be fired by Obama. The opening salvo came in a blog posting by Steven Rosen, a former official of Aipac, the American Israel Public Affairs Committee, now under indictment for passing secrets to Israel. Freeman's views of the Middle East, he said, *'are what you would expect in the Saudi Foreign Ministry, with which he maintains an extremely close relationship'*. Prominent pro-Israel journalists such as Jonathan Chait and Martin Peretz of the New Republic, and Jeffrey Goldberg of the Atlantic, quickly joined the fray and Freeman was hammered in publications that consistently defend Israel, such as the National Review, the Wall Street Journal and the Weekly Standard.

The real heat, however, came from Congress, where Aipac (which describes itself as *'America's Pro-Israel Lobby'*) wields enormous power. All the Republican members of the Senate Intelligence Committee came out against Freeman, as did key Senate Democrats such as Joseph Lieberman and Charles Schumer. *'I repeatedly urged the White House to reject him,'* Schumer said, *'and I am glad they did the right thing.'* It was the same story in the House, where the charge was led by Republican Mark Kirk and Democrat Steve Israel, who pushed Blair to initiate a formal investigation of Freeman's finances. In the end, the Speaker of the House, Nancy Pelosi, declared the Freeman appointment *'beyond the pale'*. Freeman might have survived this onslaught had the White House stood by him. But Barack Obama's pandering to the Israel lobby during the campaign and his silence during the Gaza War show that this is one opponent he is not willing to challenge. True to form, he remained silent and Freeman had little choice but to withdraw.

The lobby has since gone to great lengths to deny its role in Freeman's resignation. The Aipac spokesman Josh Block said his organisation *'took no position on this matter and did not lobby the Hill on it'*. The Washington Post, whose editorial page is run by Fred Hiatt, a man staunchly committed to the special relationship, ran an editorial which claimed that blaming the lobby for Freeman's resignation was something dreamed up by *'Mr Freeman and like-minded conspiracy theorists'*.

In fact, there is abundant evidence that Aipac and other hardline supporters of Israel were deeply involved in the campaign. Block admitted that he had spoken to reporters and bloggers about Freeman and provided them with information, always on the understanding that his comments would not be attributed to him or to Aipac. Jonathan Chait, who denied that Israel was at the root

of the controversy before Freeman was toppled, wrote afterwards: *'Of course I recognise that the Israel lobby is powerful and was a key element in the pushback against Freeman, and that it is not always a force for good.'* Daniel Pipes, who runs the Middle East Forum, where Steven Rosen now works, quickly sent out an email newsletter boasting about Rosen's role in bringing Freeman down.

On 12 March, the day the Washington Post ran its editorial railing against anyone who suggested that the Israel lobby had helped topple Freeman, the paper also published a front-page story describing the central role that the lobby had played in the affair. There was also a comment piece by the veteran journalist David Broder, which opened with the words: *'The Obama administration has just suffered an embarrassing defeat at the hands of the lobbyists the president vowed to keep in their place.'*

Freeman's critics maintain that his views on Israel were not his only problem. He is said to have especially close – maybe even improper – ties to Saudi Arabia, where he previously served as American ambassador. The charge hasn't stuck, however, because there is no evidence for it. Israel's supporters also said that he had made insensitive remarks about what happened to the Chinese protesters at Tiananmen Square, but that charge, which his defenders contest, only came up because Freeman's pro-Israel critics were looking for any argument they could muster to damage his reputation.

Why does the lobby care so much about one appointment to an important, but not top leadership position? Here's one reason: Freeman would have been responsible for the production of National Intelligence Estimates. Israel and its American supporters were outraged when the National Intelligence Council concluded in November 2007 that Iran was not building nuclear weapons, and they have worked assiduously to undermine that report ever since. The lobby wants to make sure that the next estimate of Iran's nuclear capabilities reaches the opposite conclusion, and that would have been much less likely to happen with Freeman in charge. Better to have someone vetted by Aipac running the show.

An even more important reason for the lobby to drive Freeman out of his job is the weakness of the case for America's present policy towards Israel, which makes it imperative to silence or marginalise anyone who criticises the special relationship. If Freeman hadn't been punished, others would see that one could talk critically about Israel and still have a successful career in Washington. And once you get an open and free-wheeling discussion about Israel, the special relationship will be in serious trouble.

One of the most remarkable aspects of the Freeman affair was that the mainstream media paid it little attention – the New York Times, for example, did not run a single story dealing with Freeman until the day after he stepped down – while a fierce battle over the appointment took place in the blogosphere. Freeman's opponents used the internet to their advantage; that is where Rosen launched the campaign. But something happened there that would never have happened in the mainstream media: the lobby faced real opposition. Indeed, a vigorous, well-informed and highly regarded array of bloggers defended Freeman at every turn and would probably have carried the day had Congress not tipped the scales against them. In short, the internet enabled a serious debate in the United States about an issue involving Israel. The lobby has never had

much trouble keeping the New York Times and the Washington Post in line, but it has few ways to silence critics on the internet.

When pro-Israel forces clashed with a major political figure in the past, that person usually backed off. Jimmy Carter, who was smeared by the lobby after he published *Palestine: Peace Not Apartheid*, was the first prominent American to stand his ground and fight back. The lobby has been unable to silence him, and it is not for lack of trying. Freeman is following in Carter's footsteps, but with sharper elbows. After stepping down, he issued a blistering denunciation of *'unscrupulous people with a passionate attachment to the views of a political faction in a foreign country'* whose aim is *'to prevent any view other than its own from being aired'*. *'There is,'* he continued, *'a special irony in having been accused of improper regard for the opinions of foreign governments and societies by a group so clearly intent on enforcing adherence to the policies of a foreign government.'*

Freeman's remarkable statement has shot all around the world and been read by countless individuals. This isn't good for the lobby, which would have preferred to kill Freeman's appointment without leaving any fingerprints. But Freeman will continue to speak out about Israel and the lobby, and maybe some of his natural allies inside the Beltway will eventually join him. Slowly but steadily, space is being opened up in the United States to talk honestly about Israel.

Business News

Madoff's Former Clients to get IRS Assistance

The New York Times of the 19th of March 2009 has reported that the Internal Revenue Service (IRC) will be allowing those who made losses at the hands of the Jewish investment fraudster, Bernard Madoff, to claim a tax deduction based on the quantity of their losses[\[10\]](#). The plan was announced by the Jewish Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Douglas Shulman, who stated that the Madoff case was *'tragic'* and this case raised a substantial number of *'tax issues'*. The plan is ostensibly to allow those who made substantial losses to submit their tax returns without having to worry about the aftershocks that might still be felt in their finances as a result of the Madoff scandal.

What is of note to us here is that of the 13,000 Madoff clients this will only apply to the big losers, such as the banks, but most particularly the large amount of wealthy Jews and Jewish institutions who, like Maurice Greenberg with his AIG shares, tried to *'get rich quick'*. Notable examples include Yeshiva University, which reported a loss of 400 million dollars, and Elie Wiesel's foundation, which had its entire endowment all but wiped out[\[11\]](#).

Wiesel in particular is now appealing for non-Jews to re-fund his foundation to promote *'holocaust education'*, but then we must ask why Wiesel, who has admitted to the rape and

murder of German girls in the first (Yiddish) edition of his work, '*Night*' [\[12\]](#), wishes to educate Americans about the 'holocaust' since what possible real value does such education have for Americans? Surely their time would be better spent learning about the Renaissance, classical Rome or ancient Greece than the jewish 'holocaust'? The American taxpayers should allow jews, or Wiesel himself, to fund Wiesel's fund if they so wish, but should not give any of their hard-earned money to help '*holocaust education*', but rather on feeding, clothing and looking after their families at this troubling time.

What is particularly interesting about this IRS leniency is that it essentially allows those who suffered heavily at the hands of Madoff to write off large amounts of taxes, which they would have had to pay, on income that they never received. This as you will well be able to imagine is extremely open to abuse since who is to say that you wouldn't have received much more income from Madoff's Ponzi scheme than you would have actually done. Although we suspect and hope the highly professional IRS will stop some of these claims we are doubtful due to scale of the work and investigation required that the IRS will be able to stop all or even a majority of these dubious tax-exempt claims.

We can reasonably suggest that there will be a large number of wealthy jewish individuals and organisations sitting down with their accounts trying to find a loophole in this generous act in order to regain as much of their wealth as possible by declaring their losses with Madoff were higher than they were in order to gain tax-exempt status on more of their income/fortune.

What is also notable is that the Stanford investment fraud scheme, which cost investors some 8 billion dollars, will not according to the New York Times be receiving the same treatment. Why we might ask would the two schemes not receive the same treatment? The excuse quoted in the New York Times article is that with Madoff there was criminality involved and with Stanford there is no evidence of criminality being involved.

But hang on a moment: the New York Times quoted Shulman as stating then this measure was necessary due to the '*tax issues*' that were raised by the Madoff scheme collapsing for investors, and thus warranted a tax exemption. However with the similar Stanford scheme, which again collapsed leaving investors considerably out of pocket, these same '*tax issues*' are not a problem. This seems rather odd in so far as there are two Ponzi schemes both of which result in massive losses for investors, but yet one set of investors are given tax breaks, while the other set are not. We have no concrete information as to why this might, but it might be reasonably suggested to be because one set of investors (the Madoff investors) contain a large number of jews, but the other set contain far less jews and more non-jews (the Stanford investors). Since that would seem to be the only difference: however we will endeavour to bring you updates regarding this double standard in each issues as we investigate.

Ex-KB Home CEO on Fraud Charge

Bruce Karatz, the jewish former Chairman and Chief Executive of KB Home from 1986 to 2006,

has been indicted in front of a grand jury on charges of manipulating stock options the Los Angeles Times revealed on the 6th of March 2009[\[13\]](#). Karatz is accused of gaining an additional 232 million dollars to his fortune by illegally manipulating his retirement package by backdating his stock options to a date when they much lower in value. To give some perspective as to the scale of Karatz's gain on his shares the Los Angeles Times reports that he made a profit of between 1.63 and 4.56 dollars per share and when you translate that up into the tens if not hundreds of thousands of shares that Karatz owns it becomes evident just how corrupt Karatz's use of this practice was.

This is in itself a legal practice, but when granting these backdated stock options a company, such as KB Home, must account for them in an honest and open way, pay taxes on them and report the backdating to shareholders. Karatz as you might expect, along with several other key shareholders, did not do this meaning that when the backdating was publicly revealed (ten years after the practice was begun) KB Home was forced to adjust its accounts by 70 million dollars, because of Karatz's personal avarice and greed. Karatz stole from KB Home, the other shareholders and the American taxpayer, because he wanted to increase his personal fortune and simply didn't care who he hurt to do so.

To give some further perspective to Karatz's avarice and greed we need only look at his take home pay in 2005, the penultimate last year he was chairman and CEO of KB Home, was 6.3 million dollars and that year he also made an additional 150 million dollars for himself mainly using his backdated stock options for that year. It forces us to wonder just how much money Karatz actually has?

In so far as he was head of KB Home for twenty years and has had an exorbitant pay scale with huge bonuses (judging from the 150 million dollars he managed to earn in addition to his income from KB Home in 2005) so it would be reasonable to suggest he has at least 500 million dollars to his name. So what one immediately asks, as with Maurice 'Hank' Greenberg's case that we reported on earlier in this issue, why did this jewish man try to get even more money when he could have happily retired and then spent a portion of his money on helping the poor, the homeless and the hungry, especially those struggling to cope with the world wide economic depression that we now in the thrall of.

Karatz has, predictably, denied the allegations declaring through his lawyer, John Keker, as follows:

'We are disappointed that during this economic collapse the government chooses to waste its resources on backdated options, an issue that has long ago been fixed at KB Home and generally in the corporate world.'[\[14\]](#)

In this statement we can see that Karatz is seeking to create a conspiracy theory that the government is trying to use him as a scapegoat. It might seem like the prepared statement that we have just quoted sounds rational, but then we must wonder what the implications of taking it at face value are. In so far as it suggests to the reader that Karatz is being unfairly prosecuted in a matter which has been long resolved and that precious government resources and taxpayers money is being used to take revenge on some in the '*corporate world*'. Thus we see the

implication of Karatz's words being that there is a conspiracy against him personally and that he is just the victim of malicious tongues and minds in the government. Thus Karatz portrays himself as a completely innocent and upstanding businessman who is being persecuted because of the economic climate. Therefore trying to deflect any responsibility for what he did onto the US government.

It is worth noting that the matter is evidently not '*resolved with KB Home*' since Karatz has lost them 70 million dollars and has only paid 13 million dollars back to KB Home from his backdating gains of 232 million dollars. So there is quite a lot of unfinished business with Karatz since he still owes the American taxpayer and KB Home a large amount of money that he is seeking to keep for himself.

It would seem to be a reoccurring trend in so far as men and women of jewish descent seem to be particularly enthralled by avarice and greed coupled with a belief that they '*shouldn't be prosecuted*' since they '*have done nothing wrong*' and are the victims of '*persecution*' and '*conspiracies*'. Indeed: perhaps they haven't done anything wrong in their eyes, because after all they are the '*Chosen people*' and are in their own religion and culture supposedly a cut above the rest of the world.

We await the results of Karatz's trial with interest and we can only hope that justice will be done.

Agriprocessors owners maintain they are the victims of 'anti-Semitic conspiracy'

Jim Clarity, an attorney representing the jewish former owners of Agriprocessors kosher meat-packing plant in Iowa (in particular jewish Rubashkin family), which is the largest kosher meat-packing plant in the United States, has, according to the Daily Iowan of the 10th of March 2009, been trying to defend his indefensible jewish clients by claiming that they are facing anti-Semitic persecution and comparing their situation that of the jews of Poland when faced with the 'holocaust'[\[15\]](#). The jewish men who formerly owned the now bankrupt Agriprocessors are charged with a long list of offences, which include document fraud, identity theft, bank fraud, money laundering and harbouring illegal immigrants. There have been also charges of sexual and physical abuse, the non-payment of wages and the refusal of medical attention to employees.

In addition to these charges the Village Voice of 2nd of December 2008[\[16\]](#) has suggested that the Rubashkin's, right across the numerous companies they owned, engaged in anti-competitive mafia-like practices, including threats of physical violence, manipulation of the kosher certification system, collusion to prevent suppliers supplying their competitors. In addition even this Agriprocessors have been indicted for 9,000 counts of breaking the laws relating to the use of child labour. Also Agriprocessors were fined a total of 600,000 dollars for polluting Iowa's sewage system by dumping the wastewater from their slaughterhouses into the sewers and considerably increasing the burden on the taxpayer who had to pay for the lengthy and costly cleaning of the water concerned before it could be used again.

Further to this Agriprocessors was found in 2006 to have been bribing USDA inspectors with free meat and then proceeded to try and defend itself by declaring that both People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) and the USDA Secretary General was attacking them as part of an *'anti-Semitic libel about kosher slaughter being torture'* [\[17\]](#).

Clarity perpetuates this idea of yet another conspiracy against jews in his arguments that the people of the state of Iowa are *'anti-Semitic'* and that the Rubashkins will not receive a fair trial because of this *'anti-Semitic prejudice'*. One wonders how Mr. Clarity has the bare-faced cheek to suggest that the people of Iowa would not give the Rubashkins a fair trial considering that the Rubashkin's have hurt, endangered, abused and now libelled the American taxpayers of Iowa with their slanderous accusations. The people of Iowa have as much right as any other state to try the Rubashkins!

We also should consider the fact that the story of the Agriprocessors was national news a number of times during the last few years and that therefore if we are to follow Clarity's logic: the entire American people cannot give the Rubashkins a fair trial, because they are steeped in *'anti-Semitic prejudice'*. Perhaps Clarity wishes to apply for his clients to be tried in Israel, only to be acquitted on the technicality that their crimes were outside Israel jurisdiction. We suspect even if tried in Israel the Rubashkins would still be complaining about an *'anti-Semitic conspiracy'* and maintaining that they *'did nothing wrong'* and/or *'it wasn't their fault'*.

We would expect at least one member of this jewish family to stand up and say: *'Yes, we did it. We apologise to you and honestly wish to make a mends.'* However no such honest statement or commitment has been forthcoming and this jewish family has merely declared that there is an *'anti-Semitic conspiracy'* against them and that they should not be treated as any other citizen would be, because they are jews and therefore the victim of eternal injustices (even when they are the ones committing the injustices).

No: the good people of Iowa, and indeed of America, deserve justice and the Rubashkins must have justice meted out to them for their unfathomable crimes in supporting illegal immigrants, abusing the people of Iowa and corrupting state and federal officials.

The lesson here is that when you see kosher produce in the supermarket or your local shops then think of Agriprocessors and what they did to the good people of Iowa as well as that they supported the illegal immigrant invasion of America. When you buy kosher you are supporting the illegal immigrant invasion of America: so please do not buy any kosher products and support your local butchers, bakers, farmers and shopkeepers as much as possible by buying only non-kosher brands.

Mortgage Broker in 216 Million Dollar Fraud

Jewish mortgage broker, Bruce Friedman, has been charged with defrauding his investors of 216 million dollars in Los Angeles according to the *'Jewish Journal'* of the 5th of March 2009 [\[18\]](#).

Mortgage payers and investors money was diverted to fund Friedman's risky personal financial ventures and at least 17 million dollars of this money was further misdirected into supporting Friedman's luxurious lifestyle. This money was used in the words of the '*Jewish Journal*' to purchase '*luxury home, cars, vacations, jewelry, and designer clothing for himself and an alleged girlfriend.*' [\[19\]](#)

Little more by way of analysis needs to be added here, but we might again ask the question: why are so many of these financial fraudsters, who victimise the American people, abuse their trust with their mortgages, steal their children's college funds and then claim that they are being '*unreasonably persecuted*', jews? It cannot help but make you wonder: why?

Crime in the News

Hasid in New York Rape and Child Pornography case given Lenient Sentence

David Silverman, a 23 year old Hasidic jew, has been found guilty of rape, sodomy and child endangerment charges by a New York court the New York Post of the 20th of March 2009 [\[20\]](#) has reported. Silverman and two jewish friends befriended and groomed three non-jewish girls, aged 14 to 15, from Westchester County on Myspace convincing them to meet at an illegal club. Silverman and his two jewish friends then proceeded to get the three underage girls drunk and then raped them in a depraved orgy, which they filmed for their personal pleasure and to further degrade the underage girls.

We can also reasonably suggest that the film of the event was meant to act as a threat so that if the girls told the police or their parents the film would be placed on the internet to be viewed by millions resulting in extreme embarrassment for the girls and their families resulting in the complete destruction of the good reputation of both the girls and their families.

Silverman was, at the time, in a rebellious phase and had temporarily abandoned his Hasidic upbringing and had tattooed himself as well as having both his ears pierced. It is not stated whether Silverman's fellows jews were similarly attired, but we may reasonably presume that they were. Hence the girls would have been unlikely to realise that the men who had groomed them to be raped were actually jews who would later then deny having done anything wrong as if it were the most natural thing in the world.

Silverman, when confronted and accused about the rape, consistently maintained that he had not had sexual intercourse with the gentile girls as he was now a Hasidic jew and such acts are viewed as acts of impurity limiting the chances of a Hasidic jews chances of a good brokered marriage. Silverman further stated that he was too devout a jew to deal with the charges of rape and child pornography that were made against him claiming that he was just '*too holy*' to engage in such behaviour.

This extremely egotistical defence on Silverman's part combined an attempt at justifying while denying his actions in so far as by suggesting he was '*too holy*' to deal with charges and be prosecuted. Hence Silverman invokes Judaism as a rationale for both his actions and his inability to stand trial. Yet Silverman also stated that he didn't perform the actions: when we combine this with his invocation of Judaism then we come up with the following simple, but very disturbing formulation on Silverman's part:

- 1) I did not commit the acts that I am charged with.
- 2) If I did commit the acts I am charged with then these acts are justified by Judaism and because of this I am too holy to be prosecuted.

It is notable that this second formulation was only given when the police found a number of separate videos of the rape of the drunk underage girls on now supposedly '*too holy*' Silverman's computer, which he had kept as a trophy of the rapes as well to allow him to keep the girl's silent. It is also likely that Silverman in his private moments re-watched the rapes of these children for his own personal enjoyment when he was supposed to be denying himself such dubious '*pleasures*'.

Silverman's two jewish associates however have not been apprehended are intimated to be hiding in Israel protected by their families and friends from having to face trial and punishment for their actions. You might expect Israel to be actively co-operating in America's hunt for these two child rapists, but apparently co-operation from the Israeli police has not been forthcoming. We have to wonder why the United States' '*key ally*' in the Middle East won't hand over two jewish child rapists to American justice. It does make you wonder just how much of an '*ally*' Israel is: does it not?

What we have not sign, again very disturbingly, is a condemnation of Silverman from his Hasidic leaders, which would expect considering they wouldn't wish to be associated with a jewish man who had raped three underage non-jewish girls and then proceeded to keep a film of it now that he was actively involved in Hasidim once again. I will leave you to draw your own conclusions from this apparent silent consent on the part of the Hasidim towards the rape over underage gentile girls: since this speaks for itself.

However perhaps even worse than silent consent is that Silverman will only receive a light sentence of 1 to 4 years in prison, with the likelihood of reductions for time served and parole, but according to the 1995 Department of Justice study on rape cases. The average sentence for a convicted rapist was 11.8 years and the average time served was 5.8 years[\[21\]](#). Yet Silverman will be only be sentenced to a maximum of a third of the average sentence and two thirds of the average time served for the sentence!

This is an absolutely astounding figure considering that Silverman has raped three underage girls and video of the rapes, clearly showing Silverman's participation in the rapes themselves as well as the filming of them, was found in his possession. We can only suggest that the New York judiciary are giving Silverman a light sentence, because they are frightened of being accused by the Hasidic community of '*anti-Semitism*' in a similar strategy to that used by Agriprocessors

attorney, Jim Clarity, discussed earlier in this issue.

News from Israel

The Israeli Elections

It has been a tumultuous month in the state of Israel with the Israeli elections to the Israeli Parliament, the Knesset, showing a marginal victory of one seat for the Kadima party (28 seats in the Knesset), which was followed closely by the Likud party (27 seats in the Knesset). What has been talked about in most of the papers this month has not been so much whether two Jewish parties, varying only in their emphasis of which types of Jew that they will grant favours to and what their rhetoric is on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, but rather the '*surprise breakthrough*' of a viciously anti-gentile party: Yisrael Beiteinu (15 seats in the Knesset).

Due to the lack of a clear victor in the Israeli elections there was a choice for Israeli President Shimon Peres to make. That choice was who to ask to form the next Israeli government. Although Kadima technically '*won*' the Israeli election: they have less of an ability to create a coalition government since the majority of other parties who have won seats in the Knesset are on or close to the Israeli 'far right'. Yisrael Beiteinu simply are the largest of these parties such as Shas (11 seats in the Knesset), which draws its support from ultra-Orthodox and Sephardi Jews; National Union (4 seats in the Knesset), which draws its support from Israeli ultra-Nationalists and settlers (of which Yisrael Beiteinu was a part); Jewish Home (3 seats in the Knesset), which draws its support from religious Zionists; and United Torah Judaism (5 seats in the Knesset), which draws its support from religious ultra-Nationalists and religious Israeli settlers.

When we total up these figures out of the 120 seats in the Knesset then 27 seats belong to the traditional Israeli 'right', while 37 seats belong to the numerous factions of the Israeli 'far right', which adds up to 65 seats in the Knesset which means that approximately 54 percent of the Knesset members of any potential governing coalition, if Kadima and Likud do not reach a political deal, would come from members of virulently anti-gentile and often openly genocidal political parties.

On the political 'left' in addition to the 'centre left' Kadima party (28 seats in the Knesset) there is the socialistically inclined Labour party (13 seats in the Knesset), the Israeli Social Democratic party '*Meretz*' (3 seats in the Knesset), the Israeli Arab parties '*Balad*' (3 seats in the Knesset) and the United Arab List '*Ta'al*' (4 seats in the Knesset) as well as the redoubtable Israeli communist party: '*Hadash*' (4 seats in the Knesset). When we total up these figures we find that out of the 120 seats in the Knesset: 41 seats (34 percent) belong to the traditional Israeli 'left', while 7 seats (6 percent) belong to Israeli Arabs and the remaining 10 seats (8 percent) are divided between the three parties representing the various and nefarious forms of Jewish communism in Israel.

A deal between Kadima and Likud seems possible, but unlikely when we note that Kadima leader and current Israeli foreign minister the former Mossad '*house sitter*' Tzipi Livni has made part of her requirement for a coalition government that Likud accept a '*two state solution*' to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, which would go explicitly against Likud's hard-line Zionist ideology, grassroots opinion and the very principles upon which Likud rested its election campaign. It would also mean that the Israeli 'far right' would be increasingly alienated from Likud, because such a '*two state solution*' is viciously rejected by these parties who campaign for the brutal repression and sometimes for the ethnic cleansing of Palestinians (and often Arabs in general). Therefore Benjamin Netanyahu (or 'Bibi' as he is known in Israel) can realistically either choose to ally with the Israeli 'far right' or choose to compromise and join with Kadima and Labour to form a government.

Whether Netanyahu will compromise with Kadima and another party such as Labour is uncertain, but was confirmed on the 16th of March 2009 that a deal has been struck with Yisrael Beiteinu so that Avigdor Lieberman, a former Moldovan night club bouncer and minister in Ariel Sharon's 2001 coalition government whom is currently being investigated for fraud by Israeli police, could become the next Israeli foreign minister as well as deputy prime minister if no compromise deal is struck between Kadima and Likud.

The deal between Yisrael Beiteinu and Likud could result in 5 cabinet minister posts for Yisrael Beiteinu's MKs: foreign affairs, internal security, infrastructure, tourism and immigrant's integration, which are all key ministerial posts in any Israeli government. This indicates just how powerful Yisrael Beiteinu's bargaining position with Likud in fact is, because in order to Yisrael Beiteinu's co-operation as the third largest party in the Knesset could make or break the solid 'right wing' coalition that Netanyahu and Likud wish to establish at present. This power to make or break the coalition, as well as the importance of the positions extorted from Netanyahu by Lieberman also means that Lieberman has a considerable influence on policy in general suggesting that there will be an increase in hard-line rhetoric and brutal repression both of those European and American well-intended but ultimately mistaken peace activists who have gone to Israel to try to convince the Jews of Israel not to kill anything or anybody who gets in their way.

This is an interesting development in Israeli politics in so far as this breakthrough victory for the 'far right' in Israel against their traditional rivals on the 'right', Likud, indicates an increasing polarisation and the shift of Israeli society away from the façade that Israel is not a genocidal state using the holocaust industry to deflect any and all criticism to the idea of a militant Revisionist Zionist state dedicated to maintaining Israel's hegemony over the Middle East by ensuring increasingly close links with Jewish lobbyists for Israel in both North America and Europe. The idea that Jews are the victims of anti-Semitism will increasingly begin to fade and the shift to the correct perception that the Jews are the cause of anti-Semitic feeling will begin to take place. This will not take place without a fight unfortunately however since Israel's paid lobbyists and the other Jews around the world, Zionist or anti-Zionist, will cry wolf that there is a '*second holocaust*' in the air in vain attempts to divert criticism from their person by raising the phantom spectre of a proven historical nonsense.

Further to this it was announced on the 24th of March 2009 that the Labour Party, lead by Ehud

Barak, will provisionally join Netanyahu's Likud coalition with Yisrael Beiteinu and the Shas Party[22]. It has been rumoured that Barak will continue in the position of Defence Minister that he also held in the departing Kadima ruling coalition. Barak was directly responsible for the atrocities deliberately committed by Israeli soldiers in Gaza and even though the Labour party is politically inclined towards socialism: it is also quite 'right wing' in terms of defence and Israel's national pride.

It is notoriously hard to accurately predict the future, but we might reasonably suggest that what course Israel will take in the near future will be dictated by the world events surrounding the largely jewish-created economic downturn, but also by a militant ideology, which would easily result in Israel threatening Europe and North America with its nuclear weapons if it does not get its way as well as advocating that its jewish support base in North America and Europe use its influence to fight against any measure, no matter how slight, which contradicts with Israel's regional and global aspirations to be a superpower to match the common idea among jews that they are superior to gentiles are entitled to do or be anything they please regardless of the methods that they use to get to that proposed end.

In short: the world needs to do something about not only Israel, but the jewish Diaspora in general since without the jewish Diaspora and its explicit choice to help Israel either by defending its genocidal actions, supporting Israel by its general jewish advocacy, the regular complaints about the lack of '*holocaust education*', the diverting of the American taxpayers money to jewish support groups as well as then Israeli government then Israel and the jewish people would not have been able to actively campaign to use American and European soldiers to fight a war on Israel's behalf in the Middle East.

Moshe Katsav and the Rape of Tel Aviv

Former Israeli President Moshe Katsav has, in the latest twist of the saga of the rape charges laid by four jewesses that he employed while he was President of Israel, gone into hysterics once and again is suggesting that there is an active conspiracy against him inside the Israeli police, judiciary and the media. Now, while we might agree that some jews act conspiratorially, is Katsav seriously suggesting that these four jewesses suddenly made up these stories about him that were concordant enough for the attorney general of Israel in 2007, Menachem Mazuz, to state publicly that there was enough evidence to bring charges against the Israeli head of state!

After all on the 23rd of January 2007, when these rape charges were thought corroborated enough to bring charges, Katsev's lawyers stated, according to the BBC, that Katsav '*was innocent and charges would be dropped after the attorney general heard Mr Katsav's side of the story*'[23] and '*the president [Katsav] believes that everyone will see that he is the victim of false charges*'[24]. Evidently Mazuz decided that whatever excuses, threats or generous financial offer that Katsav made to him were simply not good enough and proceeded with the investigation and preparing the prosecution for the time when Katsav was no longer in office and protected by an immunity from being charged with crimes under Israeli law.

This was followed on the 29th June 2007 by Katsav's resignation as the President and Head of State of Israel after he pleaded guilty, after having made a plea bargain, on the 28th June 2007 to two charges of sexual misconduct on condition that the two rape charges were dropped and that he escapes any jail time since rape carries a maximum sentence of 16 years in prison in Israel. At the time of this development Katsav's lawyer, Zion Amir, was quoted by the BBC as suggesting that Katsav had been through enough.[\[25\]](#)

Then on the 28th April 2008, in a relatively innovative move on Katsav's part, he announced that he was abandoning the controversial plea bargain and was going to prove his innocence. The Associated Press reported that this change of heart was due to Katsav's lawyers having persuaded the former Israeli President that the Israeli authorities didn't have enough evidence to convict him of the crimes. We suspect that this sudden tout face on the part of Katsav's lawyers is due to their wish to charge their sweating client as many shekels as possible regardless of the outcome without any actual care as to whether Katsav actually has a fighting chance of being judged innocent of the charges or as to whether their client is innocent or guilty.

However Katsav's latest claim that he is not only innocent, but there is an active conspiracy against him, suggests that he is becoming increasingly unhinged and is in denial about any sexual indiscretions he may have committed. Since if there was no basis for even the minor charges in 2007 then why did Katsav agree to a plea bargain and resign in the first place?

If Katsav was innocent it would have been a simple matter to prove himself as such, but because he is very likely not innocent and is cannibalised by his fellow jews: in the form of his lawyers. Who don't care who they represent as long as they can make the maximum amount of income for that representation: similar to their kin in Europe and North America who are equally, if not more, unscrupulous and self-interested.

This absolutely deplorable behaviour also demonstrates the jewish mentality, that is represented in jews the world over, in that they refuse to take responsibility for any act they have committed and instead blame others or a conspiracy for the charge or allegation. However what the case of Moshe Katsav does show is that jews are not interested in anyone else's, even other jews, well-being, but only in the fulfilment of their own ego as found in this case by Katsav's denial of any responsibility and his suggestion of a conspiracy against him. Since if these allegations were true would tarnish his image and if he can escape responsibility his ego will be increased by either his self-portrayal as a victim or as being clever enough as to be able to have got away with rape and sexual misconduct whilst in the most senior position in the Israeli government!

In order to externalise, and be rid of, any guilt he feels Katsav suggests that there has been a conspiracy against him in order that if he is successful in his defence he can win egoistic domination over his enemies in the Israeli government by either making a return to politics on the platform of a victim of a great injustice and/or by launching a legal suit against the four jewesses and various other organisations that have supported them. We also note in passing that Katsav's predecessor in the office of President of Israel, Ezer Weizman, resigned his position after having been found to have accepted certain '*gifts*' or as we would say in more straightforward parlance: bribes.

We can only conclude on this basis that Israeli politics is extremely sleazy and corrupt with jewish politicians being prone to endemic amounts of sleaze, corruption, bribery, imagined conspiracies, rape and general sexual abuse. Another example we can cite in this regard is the potential new foreign minister and deputy Prime Minister of Israel, Avigdor Lieberman, who is under investigation by the Israeli police on suspicion of participating in fraud. No wonder Lieberman is so anxious to get into a position of public office where he cannot be prosecuted until his term is up as well as potentially try to get to investigation quashed!

We are forced to wonder just how many jews there are outside of Israel who are engaging in such activities of rape and sexual misconduct towards non-jewish and jewish female co-workers and employees. Let alone the amount of jews who are involved in various forms of fraud, bribery and corruption that goes largely unreported in the mainstream media. The question that forms on our lips is yet again: why?

American Peace Activist Critical after being Shot by Israeli Troops

On the 13th of March 2009 an American peace activist, Tristan Anderson, engaging in a peaceful demonstration against an illegal small-scale Israeli annexation of the West Bank was shot in the forehead with a tear gas canister by Israeli troops. The Israeli troops allege that stones were thrown and that this '*justifies*' their use of riot equipment on a 400 person demonstration and the resulting '*accident*'.

The Associated Press reports that Anderson is critical condition in hospital and one of Anderson's fellow peace activists, Ulrika Jensen, at the protest in the town of Naalin describes the damage as being '*large hole in the front of his head, and his brain was visible.*' [\[26\]](#) This level of damage, which is more consistent with a close range shot with such a weapon, is suggested to have occurred when Israeli troops fired tear gas canisters into the crowd of protesters from a nearby hill to disperse it

This seems quite unlikely given that tear gas canisters are often used to disperse violent crowds from such a range, but do not cause near fatal injuries such as these. It is also very unlikely that a tear gas canister shot from a hill could actually strike someone in the forehead given that it would descending from a reasonable height and would have to fired directly into the crowd (with the obvious intention to wound) to do so and then should not able to cause such damage. Since tear gas canisters are fired up and away from the main centres of crowd concentration to force crowd dispersal and avoid injuries rather than at the centre of the crowd in the manner of a grenade launcher. We can only speculate given that details regarding this event are still sketchy and more detailed information regarding the incident has not been forthcoming. However the Israeli government's explanation of how such an '*accident*' occurred seems at best unlikely and at worst an outright lie.

What makes the Israeli sequence of events less likely is that this was in an area where such

protests are very frequent and although Israel claims this is an area where '*no demonstrations are allowed*' they have not moved to take substantial action to prevent them. This suggests that Israel was well able to handle such protests in the same area on many other occasions: so how did such an '*accident*' take place in a known area of operations, which could have been sealed off if the IDF wished to do so. We however can reasonably suspect that an individual soldier, probably acting on his own initiative and personal hatred of gentiles in general, and Europeans in particular, decided to '*teach Anderson a lesson*'.

This tragic event is very similar to the murder of, the American citizen, Rachel Corrie in 2003 by an IDF soldier using a bulldozer to run over her. The jewish soldier driving claimed he '*didn't see*' Corrie, but this was later shown to not be the case. The Israeli government and the IDF however ruled and have maintained that Corrie's murder was yet another '*tragic accident*'. We have to wonder just how many '*tragic accidents*' there are going to be involving American and European peace demonstrators being killed by IDF personnel in Israel. Yet at no time have the soldiers who have murdered European and American citizens been properly disciplined by the Israelis, but rather received a slap on the wrist and sent back to active service.

Notable also is the singular lack of coverage of the incident by the media worldwide, despite being syndicated by the Associated Press, the story did not appear on any large media outlet outside Israel other than the New York Daily News^[27] and MSNBC. The story was not even mentioned on the BBC or on the BBC's website. Neither is it mentioned in/on any other English language paper/mainstream media website.

This is remarkable, because jewish supporters of Israel consistently allege that these outlets constantly '*misrepresent*' and take every opportunity to '*demonize*' Israel. Well surely if these media organisations were interested in doing that then this news story would receive widespread news coverage, but yet it has not even been mentioned in numerous English language media outlets. Perhaps, because these news outlets are not actually anti-Israel, but rather generally pro-Israel, but because of their liberal ideology feel understandably compelled to publish accounts of the reality of Israel's actions rather than a shallow and easily spotted regurgitation of the Israeli Foreign Ministry's or the IDF's media bulletins. As for example Fox News does when reporting on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict on a fairly regular basis.

So once again we can see that jews are literally inventing conspiracies where there are none. In order to satisfy the jewish egoistic need for self-importance since if you are being actively conspired against then you must be important. This is what jews crave the most: the idea that they are supremely important and are so important that in order to get rid of their importance there are active conspiracies all around the world trying to vilify jews and Israel.

It is time to hold jews, in general, accountable for their actions and not allow this double standard that jews bewail when it is against them to be maintained. No longer must we be misdirected by conspiracy theories invented out of whole cloth by jews trying to defend the indefensible!

The Modesty Police: in Iran? No: in Israel.

You've heard all about the intolerance towards uncovered women in Islamic countries and the subsequent beatings and extra-judicial measures to which they have been subjected. Indeed I suspect you have heard jews consistently talking about how Islam is a backward and barbaric religion and indeed they would be right: it is. It is also correct to state that Islam and Arab culture in general encourages barbarity and outrages towards women regardless of race and religion. However: what you haven't heard jews talk about is the jewish version of the Islamic religious militias and police who have called themselves: the modesty police or the mishmar hazniyut.

This repressive and thoroughly medieval attitude towards women is most in evidence among ultra-Orthodox jews, or as they are known in the jewish community: the haredi, where there is a long tradition of community enforced modesty (Tzniut in Hebrew) among men and women. The haredi men are well known the world over as the stereotype of the jew in that they believe it is a religious necessity, deriving from the 613 commandments (mitzvot) of the Torah (the first five books of the Old Testament), to wear all black and white clothing showing as little skin as possible combined with either a caftan or a black hat and grow long side-locks of hair, which fall like ringlets down their faces.

The haredi women like the men are expected to cover up modestly: this involves the woman covering up in a plain wide-fitting garment and usually wearing a wig (or among lax communities tying hair up in a scarf is accepted much as is normal in the Orthodox jewish tradition). They are not permitted to show any skin other than that of their hands and face sometimes even to their husbands, which is represented by the act in strict haredi circles of have sex through a hole in a sheet in order to prevent the couple thinking '*impure thoughts*' about each other during the sexual act (as well as negating the possibility of the jewish man making himself ritually impure by the accidental discharge of bodily fluids on his person). Haredi women are also given a much inferior level of status to haredi men and have to sit behind a special curtain with their children when they attend synagogue services.

In an opinion column in the Israeli newspaper, '*The Jerusalem Post*', Rabbi Yakov Horowitz writes about a recent trial involving four members of the '*Modesty Police*'[\[28\]](#). Who broke into a 31 year old jewish divorcee's home and savagely beat her, because they wanted her to move out of the neighbourhood since she was in their view '*immodest*'. We can suspect all this jewish woman did was wear clothes of a colour other than black, grey or white and/or a not so loose fitting garment or even merely show her hair without the required wig.

Such beatings are not as Horowitz is forced to admit, although indirectly, uncommon in the jewish community with Horowitz talking about instances of haredi jews beating '*women for sitting in the "wrong" sections of buses*'[\[29\]](#) and '*physically assaulting peaceful citizens who do not dress according to their standards - observant or otherwise*'[\[30\]](#). Despite this Horowitz doesn't actually disapprove of the idea of the enforcement of modesty onto jewish men and women, but only disagrees with the idea that it should involve physically beating up those who do not comply with his and the haredi community's dress code and code of conduct.

In a troubling development in the case cited we find that three of the four defendants who had beat the woman in her house were acquitted on legal technicalities. This would indicate that the Israel legal system condones this kind of treatment of women in the same vein as Sharia law in conservative and radical Islam.

There is a necessary comparison to be made between the haredi practices and those preached by conservative and radical Islam since these practices are fairly similar. Conservative and radical Islamists preach that women should wear the jelbab (a full length loose one-piece dress) and hijab (an extended headscarf allowing only the face to be exposed), while advocating a despotic system of male-based rule based on their religion. While haredi jews preach that women should wear modest kosher clothing (similar to jelbab, but without the colour) and cover their hair using wig (similar to the hijab, but less flattering to the woman since the wigs are plain and uniform). Haredi jews also confer additional regulations upon women in so far as they should only wear modest jewellery and ostensible displays of wealth of any kind are forbidden as idolatrous.

We often hear of jews complaining about the appalling treatment of women by what they call '*Islamofascism*', but which we may, less rhetorically, call conservative and radical Islam. However we do not hear these same jews, which includes nearly all those who are in the anti-Islam movement, campaigning about the brutal repression of jewish women in haredi communities both in Israel and around the world. Indeed: there is barely a word said about it outside Israel and even then such issues are rarely discussed and only brief allusions made about the secrecy and medieval nature of the haredi groups, which control entire neighbourhoods in both in Israel and in cities around the world.

Why aren't America and Europe's conservative and patriotic politicians talking about this issue as well rather than just talking about conservative and radical Islam's barbarity? Why aren't European politicians, such as a Dutch MP Geert Wilders the creator of the anti-Islam film '*Fitna*', talking and making films about this: as well as conservative and radical Islam's stance on women?

The reason for this is painfully simple: in so far as the anti-Islam movement has been co-opted by jews who have sought to associate themselves, by the use of donations, personal/intellectual flattery and personal/intellectual association, with it in order to maximise their own personal gain out of directing this movement for the defence and support of Israel and the propagandising of American and European conservatives and patriots for the jewish and Israeli causes.

Conservative and patriotic Americans must understand that the jews are as bad as, in both their religious theory and practice, the medieval attitudes and punishments towards women that conservative and radical Islamists use. The difference is that the attitudes and punishments enacted by conservative and radical Islamists are talked about in the newspapers and the mainstream media, but the media is strangely silent on these same issues when they regard jews.

The double standard inherent within this position enacted by both the media and the jews themselves is breath-taking in its audacity and astonishing in its lack of humanity. It can only leave you wondering: why?

Head of International Women Trafficking Ring sought in Tel Aviv

Israel police are hunting the head of a massive Israeli-based international trafficking and prostitution ring, Jacky Yazady, and his son Golan Yazady in Tel Aviv the Israeli newspaper 'Haaretz' has reported[\[31\]](#). Yazady and his son are thought to be ring leaders behind the recently raided ring, which is suggested to have transported thousands of women living in the former Soviet Union. The women were lured from the former Soviet Union by promises that they would work as dancers or waitresses in Israel for good wages. Once the girls had arrived in Israel they were forced into prostitution after having their passports taken away and then if they tried to escape or even if they succeeded they were subject to vicious and brutal reprisals.

Another jewish leader in the ring, Rami Saban of Moshav Magadim, is suspected to have organised a hit and run assassination of an Eastern European woman who had escaped his lecherous clutches. Saban is also thought to have brought Belorussian mercenaries to Israel to kill another Israeli international crime ring boss: Nissim Alperon.

The Israeli police have so far this year raided 71 brothels in Israel alone up from 20 last year suggesting that the recent pressure put on Israel by Russia to do something about the trade in European women used as prostitutes and sex slaves by Israeli jews has had a limited impact.

During two recent police raids in Israel more than 35 members of the internationally-operating ring have been arrested, including Saban, but we can reasonably suspect that there are many other jewish members of the ring, other than the Yazadys, at large in Israel and abroad. That it has taken this long for Israel to do something about this criminal network operating with its full knowledge inside its borders beggars belief and forces a familiar question to our lips: why?

Perhaps it is because with Israel's '*modesty police*' on the rampage: pious jewish men feel the need to use prostitutes in times when their wife and other concubines are religiously unclean in their menstruation period or as it is called in Judaism: niddah? We will leave you to draw your own conclusions about this jewish and Israeli practice and the international crime rings operating out of Israel...

A Senior Rabbi demands the Pope removes his Crucifix at the Western Wall

Rabbi Shmuel Rabinovitch, the jewish rabbi in charge of the Western Wall, on 16th of March 2009 told '*The Jerusalem Post*' in a telephone interview that Pope Benedict XVI that he will not allow him to wear a cross or a crucifix when he is to visit the Western Wall on the 12th of May 2009[\[32\]](#). Rabinovitch stated as follows:

'My position is that it is not fitting to enter the Western Wall area with religious symbols,

including a cross, I feel the same way about a Jew putting on a tallit and phylacteries and going into a church.' [\[33\]](#)

Well Rabinovitch may hold this position, but it isn't a logically consistent one. Since the cross or crucifix that a Christian wears is not an object of prayer, but is a mark of their faith. The objects that Rabinovitch cites are devices used in prayer by jews in a Synagogue and are akin to the Catholic rosary rather than the cross or crucifix worn about the neck as a mark of faith by Catholics. I would agree that a Catholic performing the Rosary inside a Synagogue would be out of place, but that is not what we are talking about here. The Pope, the leader of the largest Christian denomination in the world, is being asked to remove the symbol of his own and his Church faith, because, as Rabinovitch later reveals, *'crosses are a symbol that hurt Jewish feelings.'* [\[34\]](#)

So then it can be reasonably suggested that the jewish hatred for the cross is at the bottom of this outrageous demand made to the Pope by this self-aggrandising rabbi. How can Rabinovitch make such a demand with a straight face considering the fact that numerous Popes, when they have met with rabbis and given them audiences, have not asked rabbis to remove their yarmukes, which are the approximation of the Christian personal cross or crucifix hung around the neck. This is also not the first time that Rabinovitch has acted in such a way towards Christian clergy since in November 2007 he forbade a group of Austrian Bishops to visit the site unless they removed or hide their crosses or crucifixes (the Bishops understandably refused). Rabinovitch performed a similar action in May 2008 when he forbade a mixed group of Irish priests from both Protestant and Catholic Christian denominations from visiting the site on precisely the same pretext (the Priests also understandably refused). Therefore this rabbi's demand must stem only from his feelings of hatred towards Christianity (why would he be so strident otherwise?) as much as having *'hurt jewish feelings'*?

Well can we not say that the jews have hurt Christian feelings enough throughout history. Have not the jews participated in numerous crimes against Catholics in history?

Did not Orthodox jews, lead by their deputy mayor, in the Israeli town of Or-Yehuda, near Tel Aviv, pile up and burn hundreds of copies of the New Testament while laughing and dancing on the 20th of May 2008 [\[35\]](#)?

Have not jewish organisations constantly attacked Christian organisations? Have not jewish organisations, academics and authors libelled the Catholic Church numerous times accusing it complicity in the genocide of jews throughout history?

Have not the jews demanded that the Bible be rewritten to phase out any negative role for the jews in the Passion of Jesus Christ?

Where are the unreserved apologies, let alone the material compensation as the jews demand from the Catholic Church for her alleged historic *'crimes'*, from the jews for all these acts?

We suspect that none will ever be forth-coming and that whatever consolatory overturns the jews might make to try and stop *'public relations disasters'* that the jews do not mean what they say.

We note that Ephraim Zuroff, the chief ‘Nazi hunter’ of the Simon Wiesenthal Center, actually supported the destruction, or as he tries to phrase it ‘*disposal*’, of these copies of the New Testament when he stated:

‘It would have been preferable to find another way to dispose of the books and materials – but the main problem, the missionaries, remains.’ [\[36\]](#)

So Dr. Zuroff is actually supporting this destruction of copies of the Old Testament and is far more concerned with method of the disposal rather than the offence this has caused to Christians around the world! Can you imagine Rabinovitch’s and/or Zuroff’s reaction if Christians collected up copies of the Babylonian Talmud and then burned them in the street? The Church would never hear the end of it and jail terms would be demanded for all perpetrators, but yet when the jews engage in such an action there is no sincere apology and indeed only mumbles about ‘*the texts should have been disposed of differently*’. The double standard for jews and Christians is open for all to see and should be the subject of public outcry.

Events like this have given and will continue to give the Pope and the Catholic Church many reasons to strongly dislike them both in the past and present, but because we are Christians we have forgiven them their attacks on the Church, but can we idly sit by and let the jews demand that our Pope removes his personal crucifix to satisfy their hyper-sensitive feelings? Is it not time that the Catholic Church and our Pope said enough is enough and stood up to the jews and demanded the apologies that they have demanded the Popes and the Church to give them to us for their libels and crimes against the Church?

A Little Humour

The NJDC’s Latest Advert of the 19th of March 2009

I recently received the following email message in my mailbox and I thought it would give a chuckle to those readers who, like me, are thoroughly opposed to President Obama’s administration and are outside of the cult of personality that surrounds the President and his family. This email is from the National Democratic Jewish Council (or NDJC for short) and is soliciting donations for their coffers. As they are lobbyists by profession the NDJC exercise considerable influence on Capitol Hill although, like the Republican Jewish Congress’ (or RJC for short) influence on President George W. Bush and his policy-making, you don’t hear about them in the mainstream media very often.

The NJDC’s solicitation for my (and your) money, which I received on the 19th of March 2009, reads as follows:

‘Dear NJDC Supporter,

It is such an exciting time to be in Washington! For the first time in 14 years, the Democrats control the White House and have majorities in the House and Senate. Now is not the time to be complacent.

Our country is demanding change. After the last eight years of failed Bush administration policies, the real work needs to be done. It is crucial that an organization like the National Jewish Democratic Council (NJDC) be at the forefront demanding that solutions conform to our Jewish Democratic values. We must also act to counter Republican smears and rapidly respond to attacks within our community.

Show your support for NJDC by activating your 2009 membership. As a member of NJDC, you will receive invitations to special events and exclusive members-only information. General annual membership to NJDC is only \$50.

Due to overwhelming success, we have extended the lapel pin offer. Join or renew your membership by Friday, March 20, and receive a free limited edition commemorative NJDC Obama Inauguration lapel pin.*

Help NJDC during this critical time. Become a member today, and get your commemorative Obama pin.'

Well I am sure you are convinced that you want the United States to be influenced by 'Jewish Democratic values' after that magnificent display of greed at a time of extreme economic hardship. Unfortunately although I tried join this democratic organisation so I could get the commemorative Obama pin, it was discovered that I wasn't jewish so I was excluded on grounds of race. I was bitterly disappointed since I thought the jewish people having been through so much trial, racial discrimination and hardship would allow me to join a jewish organisation.

The NDJC have left me completely heartbroken as you can well imagine.

Entertainment News

Bob Dylan's Objectionable Odour

It has been reported by Reuters that neighbours of Robert Allen Zimmerman (or Shabtai Zisel ben Avraham), better known as Bob Dylan, in Malibu are reportedly the subject of an extraordinary menace: an outdoor toilet used by Zimmerman's security staff^[37], which is causing a thoroughly disgusting stench to waft over his neighbour's, David and Cindy Emminger, house causing them and their children understandable discomfort and disgust.

The jewish mayor of Malibu, Andrew Stern, has declared that he will do nothing about this situation suggesting that other neighbours 'aren't objecting'. We would expect the Mayor of so

prosperous a city such as Malibu would be more than happy to take up this issue, but unfortunately since Mr. Zimmerman is so very rich and so very famous as well as jewish: it is just not the done thing to ask him to spend a few hundreds dollars to install a self-contained toilet connected to the sewage system.

After all what is a rich jew to do: spend his money to help his neighbours live without gut-wrenching smells from his own outside toilet?

Don't be daft.

Lindsey Lohan and the Results of Homosexuality

It was reported in the Israeli newspaper, '*Haaretz*', on the 2nd of March 2009 that Catholic actress Lindsey Lohan is considering converting to Judaism in order to '*show her commitment*' to her jewish '*girlfriend*': Samantha Ronson[\[38\]](#). Her father commented that Lohan had explored the Church of Scientology and Cabala before deciding to investigate Judaism. However her father seems to think Cabala is a religion in and of itself when in actuality it has long been the mystical angle of Judaism practised by the most repressive jewish sects, which has been popularised by a number of renegade rabbis who have sought to make money at the cost of ruining well-meaning people's lives by popularising the doctrines to celebrities with unfortunately more money than common sense (much like the Church of Scientology as it happens).

However unfortunately this dabbling of Lohan's which we suspect derived from her homosexual dabbling, despite claims that she is '*bi-sexual*', shows that Lohan has become yet another celebrity victim who has fallen prey to a jewish individual who is after increasing their fortune. We can show this by the report that Ronson is paid a considerable amount more for her appearances as a DJ now by event organisers, because of the likelihood that Lohan will turn up and therefore it is and always has been in Ronson's great financial interest to have a relationship with a well-known celebrity such as Lohan and the fact that it is a lesbian relationship only acts as a further drawer for today's youth unfortunately corrupted by an alien or by a lack of responsible morality.

Amy Winehouse on yet another Assault Charge

The BBC has reported that Amy Winehouse, the jewish chart topping singer, has denied assaulting a fan at a charity concert in London on the 28th of September 2009 in her 17th of March 2009 court appearance[\[39\]](#) where she is charged with common assault. This is only the latest of criminal and civil charges brought against Winehouse who has been made famously for her drunken brawls, drug-fuelled antics and gutter mouth.

Notably Winehouse was late to this court appearance and when film of her attending the court was released suggesting, by virtue of Winehouse nearly walking into a large stone building several times and being completely unaware of her surroundings, that she was either drunk or had taken a concoction of illegal drugs before the court appearance.

If a defendant in a normal court case had turned up drunk or drug-addled to court then the Judge would have been well within his rights to detain them as they were not fit to stand trial. Yet this was not the case with Amy Winehouse and we must wonder why there is one rule for her and one rule for the rest of us...

It is also notable that despite Winehouse's well known and well documented antics with drugs and alcohol that the police are yet to take action against her or her suppliers. We would have thought that the British Constabulary would have sought to make an example of Winehouse in order to demonstrate to the public, who are becoming increasingly concerned about this double standard in the law, that they are tough on crime and not soft on certain individuals, like Winehouse, because they belong to special interest groups.

Notes:

- [1] <http://www.guardian.co.uk/business/2009/mar/04/aig-us-economy-business>
- [2] <http://www.examiner.com/x-268-Right-Side-Politics-Examiner~y2009m3d17-Obama-Received-a-101332-Bonus-from-AIG>
- [3] <http://jewishaz.com/issues/story.mv?090320+help>
- [4] <http://jta.org/news/article/2009/02/17/1003063/stimulus-bill-gives-1-billion-to-jewish-social-service-providers>
- [5] <http://jewishaz.com/issues/story.mv?090320+help>
- [6] <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/business/7951005.stm>
- [7] http://www.ajc.org/site/apps/nlnet/content2.aspx?c=ijITI2PHKoG&b=2818289&content_id=%7b449C17DC-5ABF-4821-8CFA-F0953896CA99%7d¬oc=1
- [8] <http://jewishaz.com/issues/story.mv?090320+adl>
- [9] http://www.lrb.co.uk/v31/n06/mear01_.html
- [10] http://www.nytimes.com/2009/03/18/business/18madoff.html?_r=1&partner=rss&emc=rss
- [11] <http://www.eliewiesel.foundation.org/madofffraudstatement.aspx>
- [12] See Naomi Seidman's 1996 article, 'Elie Wiesel and the scandal of Jewish Rage', which originally appeared in Jewish Social Studies and can be found online at the following address: <http://www.vho.org/aaargh/fran/tiroirs/tiroirEW/WieselMauriac.html>.
- [13] <http://www.latimes.com/business/la-fi-karatz6-2009mar06,0,6937523.story>
- [14] Ibid.
- [15] <http://www.dailyiowan.com/2009/03/10/Opinions/10500.html>
- [16] <http://www.villagevoice.com/2008-12-03/news/the-fall-of-the-house-of-rubashkin/>
- [17] http://www.nytimes.com/2006/03/10/national/10kosher.html?_r=4&pagewanted=all&oref=slogin&oref=slogin
- [18] http://www.jewishjournal.com/thegodblog/item/more_mini-

[madoffs_valley_jew_accused_of_massive_real_estate_fraud_20090305/](#)

[19] Ibid.

[20]http://www.nypost.com/seven/03202009/news/regionalnews/hasidic_teen_rape_perv_guilty_160475.htm

[21] Lawrence Greenfeld, 1995, 'Selected Findings Number 4: Prison Sentences and Time Served for Violence'. This is available at the following address:

<http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/pub/ascii/psatsfv.txt>.

[22] http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/middle_east/7960599.stm

[23] http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/middle_east/6291345.stm

[24] Ibid.

[25] http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/middle_east/6252340.stm

[26] <http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/29680577/>

[27] http://www.nydailynews.com/news/us_world/2009/03/14/2009-03-14_us_activist_tristan_anderson_hanging_by_.html

[28]<http://www.jpost.com/servlet/Satellite?cid=1237114854016&pagename=JPost%2FJPArticle%2FShowFull>

[29] Ibid.

[30] Ibid.

[31] <http://www.haaretz.com/hasen/spages/1069755.html>

[32]<http://www.jpost.com/servlet/Satellite?cid=1237114844980&pagename=JPost%2FJPArticle%2FShowFull>

[33] Ibid.

[34] Ibid.

[35] <http://www.cnn.com/2008/WORLD/meast/05/28/bible.burning/index.html>

[36] <http://www.theyeshivaworld.com/article.php?p=18519>

[37] <http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/29741941/?gt1=43001>

[38] <http://www.haaretz.com/hasen/spages/1067800.html>

[39] <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/england/london/7948137.stm>

Semitic Controversies (Volume 1, Number 1 [Part II])

Monday, 30 March 2009

Editor's Column

Our First Issue

The anti-Semitic movement today is at a crossroads in time, it can decide to go three different ways with its critique of jews: it can carry straight on as it has done till the present time using the same style of arguments as it did at the height of its power, it can turn to the left towards simple anti-Zionism or it can turn to the right to create a new critique of jews.

Carrying on with anti-Semitic critique in the same manner as our anti-Semitic forefathers is

simply not an option since this critique is strongly divergent from the factual literature , and uses outdated intellectual conceptions and methodologies in its critique. These have been abandoned by scholars for the weaknesses inherent within them. When our anti-Semitic forefathers wrote these original arguments then they were endorsed by a portion of scholars and were arguable facts based on the available evidence. Albeit since then new evidence has come to light, evidence which has been simply ignored or condemned out of hand by anti-Semites . This is not being true to the anti-Semitic tradition of our forefathers.

They created a critique that was both appealing to the intellectuals and the folk at large: it was intellectually credible, rooted in the evidence then available, and it used cutting-edge conceptions and methodologies. Anti-Semitism has continued using these same arguments and methods to the present day, but had our anti-Semitic forefathers done this then they would still be using the Christian anti-Semitic conception and would be denying that race was a factor in the Jewish question. We must in our opposition to the Semitic peoples look for a new way and update our thought accordingly.

However what new way remains the question: as I have said there are two general possibilities. The first of these possibilities is that anti-Semitism takes a left turn and becomes wholly absorbed in the anti-Zionist movement, but this possibility does not bode well for anti-Semitism. Since being absorbed by the anti-Zionist movement would mean that anti-Semitism, as is demonstrated by the increasingly confused logic used against the Jews by modern anti-Semites, would lose its anti-Semitic angle and simply become subsumed by anti-Zionism. This would increasingly blur the line between Jews and Zionists until such a point that it becomes merely those who are Zionists and those who are anti-Zionists , with no distinction of Jew or Gentile but rather two different positions on Israel. Within this possibility the Jews have been victorious. In so far as they are now free to change sides to the anti-Zionist position without confrontation from anti-Semitism. Since now anti-Semitism is anti-Zionism, it does not recognise the Jew as a Jew, but merely as an individual who is either Zionist or anti-Zionist. So therefore if anti-Semitism wishes to take the left turn to anti-Zionism then it will be absorbed and neutralised as an anti-thesis to the Jews.

If anti-Semitism takes the other possibility: a right turn to a new kind of anti-Semitism it would be potentially more dangerous but the gains would be greater. This right turn would recognise the roots of the anti-Semitic movement, but it would also call for and develop a new form of anti-Semitism. One which systematically goes over the thought of the past and compares the situation we have today to this older process so that it can be continuously be updated in this new online epoch.

The danger inherent in this move is simply that it would be easy for anti-Semitism, when taking this turn, to fall into internal conflict between proponents carrying on with the traditional anti-Semitic thought and the proponents of the left turn to anti-Zionism seeking to derail it. This could lead to a sustained period of infighting between the factions, which then could ,by virtue of its protracted nature, lead to anti-Semitism missing the opportunity to re-invent itself on its pathway to the right.

However, the possibilities that this right turn brings are considerable in that it will allow anti-

Semitism to split off of the many positions and interpretations that have traditionally bogged it down . An example of this is the conception that the jews are participating in an active conspiracy and the serial use of the long debunked Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion is proof of the said conspiracy. The right turn , on the other hand, will allow and encourage anti-Semitism to come up with new conceptions of the jewish problem, ones which are rooted in the science and knowledge of today rather than yesterday Instead it would develop new methodologies for commencing the founding of a school of Jewish Studies that applies a critical perspective on the subject and most important of all the chance to return to the domain of being intellectually respectable.

This, I sincerely believe is the key to anti-Semitism's future success in that rather than trying to change the name of anti-Semitism , by re-branding it as anti-Zionism or anti-Judaism, what is needed is to change the perception of anti-Semitism. This involves making an honest, non-conspiratorial and intellectually convincing case against the jews as a people. If this is accomplished then what will occur is that the jewish conception of and propaganda concerning anti-Semitism as a chimerical and irrational beast that belongs to the lunatic fringe and the dustbin of history is incorrect and that anti-Semitism is a relevant, timely and rational political position built on the available evidence and the willingness to out-wit and out-debate on the subject of jews.

I hope that the new incarnation of Semitic Controversies as a monthly forum of intellectual, although not academic, anti-Semitic thought will help to foster this right turn to a new golden age for anti-Semitic thought and that it will aid in founding the school of Jewish Studies critical of the Jews as a people.

Let our watch words be these:

'If you deal with the reality of the jew then the world will applaud your thought and actions. If you treat the jew as an evil, inhuman fantasy then the world will have justified contempt for your thought and actions.'

A Critical Look at Jewish Law

Legal Inequality between Jews and Gentiles

There are many critiques of Judaism and the Talmud on the internet, as well as in the published literature, that heavily rest on an inaccurate use of quotes without their context and the necessary examples of Judaic law to back up the intended meaning of the presentation. This kind of ill-conceived and counter-productive methodology only adds more leverage to those presenting anti-Semitic critique as wholly irrational and bigoted.

Therefore, it is within this article that I aim to provide a critical look at Judaism and the Talmud not only through its values of differentiation between jews and non-jews, but also to add

examples of jewish law together with some commentary, on certain parts, by one of the more authoritative and widely accepted authors on Judaism: Rabbi Jacob Neusner^[1].

Basic jewish law (halakah, as given by the Mishnah) divides the world in two: Israel and non-Israel, and in general the jewish law given only deals with gentiles (non-jews) when issuing controls and rules on how an israelite and Israel itself should interact with them. Let us begin by looking at a passage that defines the value of this difference:

'All Israelites have a share in the world to come, as it is said, 'Your people also shall be all righteous, they shall inherit the land forever: the branch of my planting, the work of my hands, that I may be glorified (Isa: 60:21).''^[2]

Before we look at Neusner's commentary on the above passage, I would like to quote another comment by him:

'For while the Israelite is defined as the portion of humanity that rises from the grave to eternal life, the gentile is defined solely in practical terms of how the israelite intersects with the gentile on specified occasions or in particular transactions... But to the comparable issue – What is justice for the portion of humanity excluded from life eternal and left to rot in the grave? - the law speaks only implicitly... Then of what does justice consist? How shall we explain the distinction within the genus, humanity, into two species, Israelites and gentiles?

...

In addition, a practical issue of justice in Israelite-pagan relationships flows from the distinction between life and death, Israel and the nations, and should not be missed. How shall we find justice in the present status of Israel, subordinated as it is to the gentiles? For if God rules as a sovereign over all humanity, and if the two species of humanity compete, where is the justice in the fact that one species, the gentiles, presently dominates the other, Israel? It follows that to make sense of and to justify world order the subordinated status of both species, the gentiles in the age to come and, Israel in the present age, has to be explained and the same explanation must govern both...

But when it comes to the law of the Mishnah, "Israel" is defined with the reference to the end of days; Israel is comprised of all those who will emerge victorious over death.'^[3]

It is apparent from these quotes that one of the fundamental differences in Judaism between Israel and the rest of mankind can be defined as life and death, with the jews inheriting the world and being divinely blessed to be God's elect to return to Eden, while the nations, or the non-jews, will become subordinated to God, through the actions of the jews.

Here is the commentary, by Neusner, on the initial quote from the Mishnah:

'I maintain that this passage provides a juridical, practical definition of "Israel" on which courts will act in practical ways. So one may fairly ask, exactly how does this statement that all Israel has 'a portion in the world to come' serve to define Israel? We may in response

manipulate the opening declaration, reversing (1) the subject of "all israelites" and (2) the predicate, "have a portion in the world to come" as follows: (2) "all who have a share in the world to come" are (1) "Israelites". And -simple logic requires- all who do not have a portion in the world to come logically cannot fall into the category "Israelites" as framed in that sentence.'[\[4\]](#)

Now, we have not only a working and accepted definition of what it fundamentally means, in Judaism, to belong to Israel and to not belong to Israel. We also have a rather stark impression of Judaism being centred on and expressed for its genealogically defined people with little interest in an equal setting for other people but rather, as we shall see, one of inequality with jews as the governing elite.

Let us take another passage from the Mishnah, relating to the above, in its definition of gentiles:

'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.'[\[5\]](#)

Neusner's commentary on this passage clarifies the following:

'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.'[\[6\]](#)

To further show that this is not a controversial view within Judaism but rather a commonly applied one, I will quote from another contemporary book on Judaism, aptly named *'On Judaism'*, by the highly regarded Rabbi Emanuel Feldman:

'I do believe that if, theoretically, there had never been any Judaism in the world, we would today rarely encounter this phenomena [righteous gentiles] of people who call themselves unbelievers and yet lead relatively decent and moral lives. On the contrary, we would all be devouring each other.'[\[7\]](#)

'These are legitimate descriptions of the Jewish condition. God explicitly tells us in Leviticus 20:26, va'avdil etchem; "I have separated you from among the peoples to be Mine..." Yes, it is part of God's overall plan for mankind that the Jewish people should remain separate. The fact is that to be a holy people in a world that disdains holiness means to be a separate people.'

It's interesting that the world seem to recognize this Jewish differentness intuitively. Even the assimilating Jew - who does not wear distinctively Jewish dress and does not practice anything

distinctively Jewish, who is a citizen of the world and faithfully lives by the ways of society around him - even he is nevertheless pointed to as a Jew, as someone different from "the rest of us". This makes the assimilated very unhappy, but it probably makes God very happy, because Jewish otherness is all part of His plan.' [8]

One of the weaker aspects of much 'anti-Semitic' critique of Judaism and Jews is found in the methodology used. Those who offer such critique usually either give quotes without their context and without adding the legislative and/or historical background in order to make a well-defended case. That or they use a segment of quotes and instances lodged in between their own lengthy theories and interpretations of what the given matters mean. So, it is with that intention in mind that I seek to add as little of my own theories to these matters at this point. The passages and the given commentary suffice to highlight the values of seemingly unabashed Judaic sentiment and law.

The lengthy passage that follows describes what moral order is working on behalf of the previously mentioned idea of Israel, the Jews, equates Life whereas non-Israel, the non-Jews, equates death.

I quote:

'The Holy One, blessed be He, will then say to them: 'Wherewith have you occupied yourselves?' They will reply: 'O Lord of the Universe, we have established many market-places, we have erected many baths, we have accumulated much gold and silver, and all this we did only for the sake of Israel, that they might [have leisure] for occupying themselves with the study of the Torah.' The Holy One, blessed be He, will say in reply: 'You foolish ones among peoples, all that which you have done, you have only done to satisfy your own desires.

You have established marketplaces to place courtesans therein; baths, to revel in them; [as to the distribution of] silver and gold, that is mine, as it is written: Mine is the silver and Mine is the gold, saith the Lord of Hosts; are there any among you who have been declaring this?' And 'this' is nought else than the Torah, as it is said: And this is the Law which Moses set before the children of Israel. They will then depart crushed in spirit. On the departure of the Kingdom of Rome, Persia will step forth. (Why Persia next? — Because they are next in importance. And how do we know this? — Because it is written: And behold another beast, a second like to a bear; and R. Joseph learned that this refers to the Persians, who eat and drink greedily like the bear, are fleshly like the bear, have shaggy hair like the bear, and are restless like the bear.)

The Holy One, blessed be He, will ask of them: 'Wherewith have ye occupied yourselves?'; and they will reply 'Sovereign of the Universe, we have built many bridges, we have captured many cities, we have waged many wars, and all this for the sake of Israel, that they might engage in the study of the Torah. Then the Holy One, blessed be He, will say to them: 'You foolish ones among peoples, you have built bridges in order to extract toll, you have subdued cities, so as to impose forced labour; as to waging war, I am the Lord of battles, as it is said: The Lord is a man of war; are there any amongst you who have been declaring this?' and 'this' means nought else than the Torah, as it is said: And this is the Law which Moses set before the Children of Israel. They, too' will then depart crushed in spirit. (But why should the Persians, having seen

that the Romans achieved nought, step forward at all? — They will say to themselves: 'The Romans have destroyed the Temple, whereas we have built it.' And so will every nation fare in turn.' [\[9\]](#)

As the above can appear a bit difficult to derive any sentiment from, let us see how Neusner clarifies it:

'The claim of Rome -to support Israel in Torah study- is rejected on the grounds that the Romans did not exhibit the right attitude, always a dynamic force in the theology.

...

As native categories, Rome and Persia are singled out, "all the other nations" play no role. Once more the law's theology reaches into its deepest thought on the power of intentionality, showing that what people want is what they get.

...

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.' [\[10\]](#)

Now, I am not trying to further the idea that gentiles in Judaism are completely unable to gain eternal life by God's grace. There are two ways for a gentile to be accepted as righteous by Judaism. One is for the gentile to convert, however, as we shall see, they are not regarded as equal with jews even then. The other option is to follow the seven laws of Noah. I've clarified these laws before in a previous article:

'The Seven Laws of Noah acts as a simplified extension of the essential commandments that God seeks all mankind to keep, which has since then been recognized as the only necessary laws a gentile must keep in order to gain share of Olam Haba (the hereafter).' [\[11\]](#)

What would be examples of the Noahide gentile not being served the same benefits from judaic law as the jew?

Well, if for example, a jew murders a jew or someone else: then in jewish law there will be at least two witnesses required in order for capital punishment to be meted out. Whereas if, for example, a noahide jew (a gentile follower of the seven noahide laws) murders a jew only one witness is required. I quote the relevant passage regarding this in the Babylonian Talmud:

'R. Jacob b. Aha found it written in the scholars'2 Book of Aggadah: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.' [12].

The reader might observe that the above does not specifically talk, in this context, about noachian laws, however this passage is taken from the context of Sanhedrin 56-60 where it discussed transgression and rendering of noahide laws for the noahide. However, let us quote a more accessible and easier to understand source:

'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' [13]

The Jewish law for a similar case is not equal, as is derived from the law given here:

'At the mouth of two witnesses, or three witnesses, shall he that is worthy of death be put to death; but at the mouth of one witness he shall not be put to death.' [14]

The above is a rather clear distinction between an example of laws: one standard on capital punishment set forth by Jews for Jews and another standard set forth by Jews for the Gentile community that it seeks to encompass under 'righteous living'.

Let us look at an example of legal differentiation between the convert and the 'full' Jew. I will now aim to show that, in Judaism, a Jew by birth cannot dilute his blood by marrying a mamzer, but a convert can.

'Mamzer' is basically equivalent to a Jewish person who is the offspring of a forbidden relationship between Jews, such as from adulterous or incestuous relationship, and this derogatory status was and is traditionally inherited in Judaism.

In the Old Testament: it is often translated from the Hebrew as 'bastard' though the Oral Torah comments that this is not exactly what a mamzer is meant to denote. This is traditionally derived from the Written Torah's take in Deuteronomy 23:2 and Zechariah 9.

The infamous Rabbi Maimonides, or Rambam as he is commonly known, in his authoritative codification of Jewish law, the 'Mishneh Torah', defines a mamzer as follows:

'Who is considered a mamzer as designated in the Torah? The offspring by any of the forbidden unions, except by a menstruant, whose child is considered impaired, but not a mamzer. If a man has intercourse with a woman of any of the forbidden unions, whether by force or by consent,

whether willfully or by error, the child born of that union is regarded as a mamzer, and both male and female are eternally forbidden to marry into Israel.'[\[15\]](#)

Therefore Maimonides rules that anyone who has inherited mamzerism is not allowed to marry a born jew, while a convert to Judaism is permitted to marry some born jews. A mamzer can marry a gentile bondsmaid, gentile slave or a convert to judaism, but not a born jew.

What evidence exists to this rather unequal treatment of supposedly recognized members of the jewish congregation?

In the Babylonian Talmud it is established that a proselyte may marry a mamzer or he may marry a shetuki (a potential mamzer or a jew whose ancestral lineage is in doubt):

'A proselyte, a freed slave and a halal are permitted to [marry] a priest's daughter.' This supports Rab. For Rab Judah said in Rab's name: Fit women [sc. daughters of priests] were not admonished against being married to the unfit.(see footnote 11)

R. Zera lectured in Mahuza: A proselyte may marry a mamzereth. Thereupon everyone pelted him with stones. Said Raba: Is there anyone who lectures thus in a place where proselytes abound!' [\[16\]](#)

Footnote 11 says:

'11) I.E., to those who may not marry into the priesthood. Thus, whereas a priest may not marry the daughter of a halal, freedman or proselyte, the daughter of a priest may marry one of these. This does not refer to the ordinary unfit, such as mamzerim or Nethinim.' [\[17\]](#)

Another quote, where the legality is of the decision is cited directly from the Mishnah (one of the basic sources of jewish law of halakha):

'MISHNAH. TEN GENEALOGICAL CLASSES WENT UP FROM BABYLON: PRIESTS, LEVITES, ISRAELITES, HALALIM, PROSELYTES, FREEDMEN, MAMZERIM, NETHINIM, SHETHUKI AND FOUNDLINGS.

Priests, Levites and Israelites may intermarry with each other.

Levites, Israelites, Halalim, Proselytes and freedmen may intermarry.

Proselytes and freedmen, mamzerism and nethinim, shetuki and foundlings, are all permitted may intermarry. [\[18\]](#)

More jewish law prohibiting of marriage/union with mamzer/bastards of jews is found in another tractate in the Babylonian Talmud (on both a and b folios: I have only cited the b folio below for the sake of simplicity):

'MISHNAH. BASTARDS AND NETHINIM ARE INELIGIBLE, AND THEIR

INELIGIBILITY IS FOR ALL TIME, WHETHER THEY BE MALES OR FEMALES.' [\[19\]](#)

We also see this in the online edition of the Jewish Encyclopedia under: '*Illegitimacy*'.

I quote:

'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.' [\[20\]](#)

I have now demonstrated how Judaism has traditionally established that mamzers are not to be permitted to marry a born jew. Where-as a proselyte/convert can marry some born jews and how gentiles are not, even upon entering into Israel with embrace of the Torah (i.e. converting to Judaism), considered equals to born jews in Judaism.

The inequality of mankind in Judaic thought, with the jewish people being the divinely-favoured elite, is evident in light of what I have demonstrated from the given passages aligned with the authoritative and accepted jewish interpretation of them. However in this article: I would much rather the case of these sentiments of superiority having been spoken by an accepted yet uncontroversial authority on Judaism. So let us end our discussion with a jewish defence and definition of their claim of superiority from such an authority:

'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.' [\[21\]](#)

The Mind of Reva Mann

An Analysis of a Jewish Mind

In '*The Rabbi's Daughter*' [\[22\]](#) Reva Mann has given the world a fascinating look at the jewish psychology and how jews interact with each other. Although the work itself is simply a generalised autobiography what intrigues and fascinates is that Mann, despite writing with a generous amount of hindsight, expresses her own feelings and thoughts quite explicitly. By

explicitly I mean language choice in that throughout *'The Rabbi's Daughter'* Mann discusses sexual intercourse and her thoughts concerning it and other lewd and bawdy acts. Hence *'The Rabbi's Daughter'* is not for those with a weak stomach for lewd language and is certainly not suitable for children to read. In this vein Mann gives us a perhaps unique insight into the mind of a Jewish woman who is trying to find her way in the strange modern Jewish world.

What makes Mann's book more notable than other books in this genre is that Mann is the grand daughter of the second (Ashkenazi) Chief Rabbi of Israel, Isser Yehuda Unterman, and that she has, as she describes in *'The Rabbi's daughter'*, swung between two extremes in Jewish culture: The absolute hedonists and the strictest Hassidic sects. She herself had been brought up in a modern religious Jewish household in London by her father, who was a rabbi there. This breadth of experience gives Mann's thoughts and description of thoughts and feelings a wider application and thus enables one to dispense with the usual counter-arguments regarding such autobiographies in that they only cover one aspect of what is oft-called the *'Jewish experience'*.

What I will do in this essay is analyse what Mann has written from the perspective of understanding why she has said what she has said, what it means and how we can fundamentally understand Mann as an example of Jewish nature. We use Mann thus not only as an individual analysis, but as a gateway towards beginning to understand the mentality behind the external Jewish façade, which is a hollow construct and does not stand up to rigorous investigation. Much of what you will read may seem strange and maybe slightly crazy; however, as strange and crazy as it may sound these are, to the best of my ability to understand them, the underlying thoughts and the mindset of Reva Mann.

Mann begins her story after she had decided that she wanted a *'Torah-true'* life and that her old materialistic habits in pursuit of gratification were not what she wished to engage in anymore. We find her at the beginning of her book in a Hassidic religious school for Jewish women: where she is reading the books relating to Jewish law and lore (in this case *'The Laws of Repentance'* by Maimonides or Rambam as he is better known). She particularly brings up the comparison to her past old life when she used to wear bikinis and when she first moved to Israel. She tells of us how she longs to wear her bikini again and to lose weight: since as she tells us she has put on a lot of weight due to all the sticky *'kogel'* cakes that she eats at Shabbos[23]. She compares her *'once high cheekbones'* and *'beauty'* to her *'dowdy maid'* appearance now.

It is a theme that we find consistently repeated in *'The Rabbi's Daughter'* in that Mann describes a world where even the slightest infraction against the *'laws of modesty'* is considered a very great sin. Mann throughout *'The Rabbi's Daughter'* tells us how consistently she is drawn between two worlds: that of what she knows is expected of her as a Jewess and that which her mind and body aches for. She wishes to be religious, yet she is desperate to have extremely lurid sexual experiences with a fellow Hasidic Jew. This Mann tries to mediate between latter in the book by claiming that all she wants is a holy Jewish man who *'talks dirty to her as he fucks her'*.

I've used the swear word, *'fuck'*, here very deliberately to demonstrate my point: in so far as Mann does not view sexual intercourse as a beautiful act of love, but rather as a deep materialistic sense of need, which she needs to fulfil to feel better about herself[24]. Much like how a drug addict needs their next fix: Mann needs sexual intimacy to fill the deep lack of self-

confidence that she feels in herself, which she as we shall see.

However Mann never finds this perfect jewish man since she realises that this is an impossibility for a jew cannot be both frum and sexually explicit at the same time without the one compromising the other. What Mann is doing here is straddling a very real deep cleft in the jewish soul not knowing, which way to turn.

This cleft between the life proscribed by Judaism, which is full of piety, obedience and self-denial, and the life desired deeply by the jewish racial nature, which is full of impiety, disobedience and self-gratification, is what Mann spends *'The Rabbi's Daughter'* talking about. This is immediately obvious from the first pages of *'The Rabbi's Daughter'* in so far that Mann talks of her bikini *'stuffed in the back of her closet'* and of all the sexual intercourse she used to have when she was younger. This, of course, is pure nostalgia, but it reveals an interesting point in so far that Mann had a long, primarily sexual, relationship with a gentile man she calls Chris. What is interesting about this is that Mann blames Chris for getting her into various different drugs and for the loss of her jewish *'purity'*. This is Mann projecting her own self-loathing onto Chris in so far as she does not see herself as having erred, but rather that she was lead into temptation by a gentile who she claims to have loved in the sexual sense but unable to love in the romantic and platonic senses.

This is interesting to think about because what Mann is admitting here is that she simply didn't understand how a gentile thinks and that Chris' mind was alien to her, hence, she simply could not connect to his world and nor he to hers. Therefore, Mann admits that their relationship was bound to fail precisely because he was a gentile and she was a jewess. Mann doesn't mention this reason explicitly, but rather implicitly and constantly refers back to Chris' world of art galleries, liberal intellectuals and roast dinners, which to her seemed at the time and still seem so completely alien. Yet Mann spent a number of months living with Chris trying to acclimatise herself to his alien world and she realises in the end that this was futile, because, although she doesn't explicitly say it she does implicitly infer it, they were of two different races and unable to be together precisely, because they think completely differently to each other.

We see this difference candidly when Mann is talking about her time in the Hasidic jewish school when she notes that her study partner was a gentile who was from a Welsh Catholic family and who converted to Judaism in adulthood. This convert is, as we find out later by inference, regarded as below contempt by other jews, because she is not a biological jew, and therefore is matched with a fellow male convert to Hasidic Judaism. When we see that the jewish community took great pains to match these two converts together so that their own biologically jewish stock was not *'defiled'* by gentile *'impurities'*. It becomes very clear that the criterion being used, by both Mann and the jews in general, is not religion, but rather biological origins and no matter how repentant or observant a convert you are: you will never be regarded as a real jew by jews and will be discriminated against accordingly.

We also see this discrimination and differentiation on the basis of biology in how Mann words her description of the convert's reason for converting in that Mann tells us it was because she, the convert, *'claimed'* that she felt a very close affinity to the characters in the Old Testament and that she felt as if they spoke to her. When Mann is using the word *'claim'* she is deliberately

throwing scepticism onto the converts claim to have felt great affinity for the characters of the Old Testament, because the convert, is a gentile. So Mann implicitly knows, and states this knowledge by adding the word '*claims*', that the convert couldn't understand the characters of the Old Testament in the way that Mann, as a Jewess, does, because the convert was not born a Jew.

This Jewish perception of a biological difference between Jew and Gentile, becomes the most obviously apparent when Mann describes her father's, who as an Orthodox rabbi in charge of a London congregation, reaction to discovering she had a Gentile boyfriend who she was regularly sleeping with was to simply inform her to pack her bags and leave his house. Mann even goes so far as to explicitly state the reason for her father's extreme reaction was because Chris was a Gentile. This shows us, in quite dramatic prose, how deep this split between a Gentile and a Jew is felt in Judaism, as well as in Jewish culture in general, in so far as it shows how strongly it was felt that even merely sleeping with a Gentile was a form of traitorous behaviour (because Chris by sleeping with her '*defiling her with his impurity*').

This we can illustrate by pointing to Mann's own comments about her previous history in her teenage years in so far as Mann, as she states with pride, was a quite rebellious teenager and wanted to live a '*free life*' where she would not have to play the '*good, obedient girl*' that was the rabbi's daughter. Mann did not lose her virginity by Chris, but rather she lost that several years earlier with a '*little Jewish boy*' behind the ark curtain in her father's synagogue. Mann was, in fact, found out by a member of her father's staff, but maintains that the member of staff did not tell her father.

However, given Mann's extensive testimony about her father, we can suggest that, in fact, the member of staff likely told her father what she had done but that Mann's father wasn't particularly offended, because the act was with a Jewish boy of the type he hoped Mann to marry when she was older. If it was a Gentile with whom Mann had lost her virginity behind the ark curtain then we can state that the consequences would have been extreme and well beyond simply kicking Mann out the house, but probably including a lot of hysterical shouting and the eventual removal of Mann completely from the religious Jewish community on the basis that she was now officially dead to them and her family.

We see this double standard and anti-Gentile attitude in action even more clearly later on in '*The Rabbi's Daughter*' in so far as when Mann decided it was time to go to see the Jewish '*match maker*' in the Hasidic women's school that she is attending. One of the first question's the match maker asks her is rather simple: whether she has had any sexual relations with a Gentile or not and then states quite emphatically that if this is the case then Mann cannot marry any Jew who has been *frum*-from-birth (or FFB) let alone a Jew of priestly lineage such as a Cohen. Such explicit anti-Gentile sentiment although not expressed often in '*The Rabbi's Daughter*' is never that far away from the surface.

We see a short snippet of Mann's anti-Gentile attitudes when she notes that Chris' Gentile penis with its foreskin '*tasted different*' and was not '*as good as*' a Jewish circumcised penis. The underlying message Mann gives, which might seem innocuous when quoted as disparaging comments, is that Jews are biologically superior to Gentiles. Mann also suggests later on that

intercourse with jews is a '*more spiritual experience*' and she all but claims that jews are '*better in bed*' than gentiles. This is, of course, an extremely anti-gentile statement to make, but unless we thought about it we might well not necessarily recognise that Mann is demonstrating to us, consciously or unconsciously, that jews look down upon gentiles and regard them as inferior human beings.

Mann generally seeks to distance herself from this attitude but completely fails to do so. In part: this is because she expresses no regret or remorse for her father and mother having treated her gentile boyfriend Chris so badly. Nor does Mann express any regret or sorrow over her attitude towards her relation with Chris, but rather feels sorry for herself in so far as she cannot now marry the type of jew she maintains she really wants to marry. Mann looks around to divert blame for this and finds a scapegoat in the '*counter culture*' in which she grew up implicitly blaming it for her coming into sexual contact with gentiles, Chris in particular, as well as her abuse of drugs and alcohol.

Mann's attitude to Chris is particularly telling, because she explicitly states that he was simply a man who was there for her to '*fuck*' in order to sate her incredibly jaded sexual appetite rather than as a love relationship (as she intimates he believed it to be). Thus Mann implicitly admits to the reader that she simply used Chris and played on his feelings until she was bored with him and threw him away because she wanted a new toy to play with.

These jaded sexual appetites form a consistent theme in '*The Rabbi's Daughter*' in so far as Mann relates everything she writes about to sexual intercourse in some way. If we combine this fact with the fact that Mann herself, as well as jews in general, do not understand or feel connected to gentile minds and the resulting gentile culture but rather feel alien to it all. We can explicitly state Mann's state of mind, as well as that of her fellow jews, is Freudian, i.e. the ego through the medium is sex is the basis for behaviour, in nature.

We see evidence of this in Mann's book through her denial of responsibility and culpability for anything she has herself done and instead of owning up and honestly stating that she had made a mistake, Mann tries to exonerate herself of this and denies her responsibility for what she has done by blaming scapegoats in particular gentiles (i.e. Chris, but also her old gentile school friends and the carers at her sister's mental care home), as well as notably blaming her mother for her behaviour.

Mann's consistent act of blaming her mother for her behaviour is important to note, because it provides further important evidence for Mann's Freudian mindset. In Freudian thought it is asserted that the basis of much behaviour revolves around the desire to mate with the mother or the father depending on, which gender is sexually desired by the jewish individual in question. In Mann's case we can note a strong antipathy towards her mother who she partly blames for her wanting to sneak off to '*be with the hippies*' and Mann's own resulting sexual relations with gentiles and therefore her impurity when regarded by religious jews with whom she seeks solace with. Mann particularly blames her mother's lack of care for her and her hysterical irritability, which she generously places down to her mother having a mentally handicapped child, who Mann believes her mother treated very badly and that she, Mann, was the very soul of kindness too.

Mann's attitude to her mother is heavily reflected in her portrayals of her in so far that Mann's mother is always portrayed as being jittery, prudish, vain, completely self-absorbed and materialistic. It is quite possible that her mother was indeed like this, but then we can note that Mann herself, who although throughout the work unsuccessfully tries to carve an image of herself as a disorientated, suffering child who then because of the bad lot she fell in with proceeded to be victimised all her life, is a fine example of this. We can see here that Mann is in denial over her similarities to her mother who she views, and portrays extremely negatively since she is trying to actively differentiate between herself and her mother.

This, logically, leads us on to question of why Mann is doing this. Why is Mann portraying her own mother, and presumably delivering a vengeful mental slap at the same time, in such negative terms? Since in European and European-derived society: it is considered a grossly impertinent and impolite act to vilify one's own dead relatives, especially in public. Mann crosses this reasonable social taboo without even batting an eye-lid and attacks her own mother with considerable, subtle ferocity. The reason for this is quite simple: since as Mann implicitly assumes Jews think differently to Europeans and European-derived society despite living in the same places, eating similar food and having similar general experiences in life. The only reconciliation, which can be, reasonably made between Mann's attack on her own mother and a rational explanation for actual behaviour: is the conception that Mann views her mother as a rival.

When we realise that Mann views her mother as a rival not as her friend and guardian Mann's behaviour begins to fall into place, but first we must ask who Mann is in a rivalry with her mother over? The answer to that is quite simply: Mann's father.

We see Mann's secret desire for her father manifest itself in '*The Rabbi's Daughter*' mainly as comments about how much Mann loved her father, how he always helped her out when she had got herself into various messes, how he cared for her as well as how intellectual and brilliant he was. These are perhaps what you would expect regarding a much loved father, but then when we at the various points at which Mann's mother and father appear together that Mann, becomes more harsh with her father.

This can only be explained by Mann's own secret feelings for her father in so far as if that was not the case then there is no explicit or subtle reason given or suggested as to why Mann should suddenly switch from a deep love of her father to a more critical tone. The switch to the critical tone represents Mann's subtle rebuke of her own dead father's choice in wives: in so far as Mann subtly shows that she desires to be in her mother's place.

We see this particularly in Mann's description of a Passover feast that she and her then husband, referred to as Simcha, invite her mother and father to their Israeli apartment to share in the feast. Simcha decides to consume all the specially prepared unleavened bread at the absolutely strictest Hasidic level in that he has to consume it all in four minutes. This decision results in a disgusting scene where Simcha's beard is covered in half-digested matzo and Mann's parents react badly to this. Mann describes her mother once again in wholly unfavourable terms as being prudish and feeling like she was going to be sick and regurgitate the fish that she had for lunch. However,

unlike when her father is not with her mother, Mann describes her father in similarly negative terms as looking completely sickened and cursing under his breath at his fanatical, disgusting and completely uncivilised son-in-law as well as giving Mann '*black looks*'.

This indicates that Mann is indeed looking at her father as an object of love and her mother as a rival: since here Mann's mother has been made to feel sick and thus feel very uncomfortable by Mann's husband. Hence, Mann's father has taken exception to this in blaming Mann and Mann has in her turn attacking her father for siding with her mother and not loving her instead.

We see that this not only platonic and/or romantic love in another note that Mann makes in passing in that when talking about sex again: this time again in the context of her husband, Simcha (who has not, as she repeatedly tells us, satisfied her sexually). This note is rather simply to the effect that Mann '*is reliably informed by her mother that her father and her mother enjoy an extremely passionate sexual relationship*'. This is an unusual notation to make, especially in European and European-derived culture regarding your parents, since it is a strong social taboo and children seldom can, or want, to imagine or know about their parent's love-making activities.

However, Mann has simply placed this rather lewd notation in the middle of her own autobiographical account of her life so far, which infers to us that it has some importance to her. This notation also further suggests to us that Mann is trampling over normal social taboos, because she, like her fellow jews, has a different type of thought process to the European and European-derived culture that she was brought up in for the reason of biological difference between her as a jewess and the native population.

This notation, therefore, because it is a direct jealous reference to her mother and father's sexual life combined with Mann's hostile nature towards her mother and her hostility towards her father only when she is in her mother's presence. We can conclude is an expression of Mann's own platonic, romantic and sexual love for her father, which is a forbidden fruit that she wishes to taste. Since, as Mann puts it, she longs for her father's affection, but yet this affection never comes and Mann remains disappointed in her ambitions.

In trying to please her father Mann decides that she is going to become a strict Torah observant jew after he forces her out of his house. We can see this as a reaction to her break-up with her gentile lover, Chris, which is caused by Mann defending her father to Chris when to Chris' mind her father has behaved disgracefully and in a very bigoted fashion.

Chris' perspective is immediately recognizable to us, as both reader and writer, because it is a standard liberal position that discrimination and bigotry are horrific acts that are completely unjustified and the fact that Mann would defend her father's behaviour to Chris seems to have understandably rankled with him.

That Mann chose her father over her gentile lover, whom she used, abused and then threw away, is not surprising since Mann, as a jewess, thinks differently to both Chris and ourselves. This is further added to by Mann's discovery that her father was purchasing the rights to the flat in which they lived so he could look after his jewish daughter even when she committed so gross an

act as to sleep with a non-jew. What is interesting here is that even though Mann had performed an act he could not really forgive her for Mann's father seeks to protect his daughter but tries to do so in secret.

The reason for this protection is that Mann's father loves his daughter, whether or not that goes into the fundamentally romantic and even the sexual is debatable, because we have only Mann's opinions and commentary on her life and not her father's, and wishes to make sure that when she comes to her senses and wishes to date, have sex with and marry only jews then he is in a position to step in to take her back into the religious jewish fold.

Mann's change from extreme hedonism to become in her words a '*pious, dumpy maid*' is understandable when we consider her and her father's relationship. In that Mann realises she has by her actions displeased the father that she is sexually attracted to, because of her actions to get his attention in the first place (i.e. her involvement with drugs and sexual relations with gentiles) as she was not the centre of her father's attention but rather an after thought, which came after his work with the jewish community.

What has happened to Mann is fairly simple in so far as she has tried to become the most pious, Torah-observant jew she can possibly be in order to please her father by going several steps more observant than him. This move to be a more pious jew than her father is an attempt by Mann to make up for her past indiscretions that have displeased her father by showing him how much she has changed. By doing so Mann hopes to regain the love that she believes she has lost by trying to attract his attention through doing things that aggravated and appalled him.

We see the beginning of this attempt to make up with her father after Mann has broken up with Chris and tells her parents that it is her intention to move to Israel to study to become a midwife. This is important, because it shows us the beginning of Mann's attempt to win back the fatherly love she believes she has lost. Since at this point Mann tells us she felt like she needed to be amongst her own kind in a place where there were few non-jews and that place, of course, was Israel. Mann informs of how this strategy played into her love for her father in so far as when her mother and father heard that Mann wished to make Aliyah they were willing to forgive her and help her to move to Israel so she could be amongst jews.

Mann well knew the effect that this declaration would have on her parents, because she knew the reason that she had been ejected from her father's house, as we have discussed, was because of her sexual relationship with a gentile. Therefore: Mann is, unconsciously or consciously, using this knowledge to manipulate her father into forgiving her which also influences her mother to do so, but Mann only notes on this in passing, and therefore going some way to filling Mann's need for love from her father.

As it turns out this is not what Mann's father wants of Mann and Mann states that her father and mother wished for her to marry a jewish doctor or a highly paid jewish professional. However Mann felt that she had to make up with her father was to atone for her past religiously and the best way to do that, in her perception, would be to turn into an ultra-orthodox jewess. Mann herself goes about this by entering into a Hasidic girl's school in Jerusalem and by this indicates that her thought is motivated by selfish regard for what her perception is rather than what her

father's actual perception is.

Whilst at the Hasidic Girls School we find that Mann's thoughts are not as pious as her outward appearance and apparent obedience to the strict dictates of Hasidim suggest. We see in this particular in Mann's comments at the beginning of *'The Rabbi's Daughter'* in so far as Mann continually reminisces about her previous sexual contacts as well as how she believed all men desired to *'fuck'* her. This mainly takes the form of thoughts about her former gentile lover, Chris, in so far as he is now forbidden fruit and since she cannot have him, because he is a gentile, she now desires him to desire her.

This differentiation between the outward obedience of the strict dictates of Judaism and the genetic desire for a life of absolute hedonism is, as I have said, a fundamental aspect of both Mann's own personal, and more generally jewish, mindset. The reason for this is simple: in so far as Mann, and jews in general, have a considerable need to temporarily satisfy their own lack of confidence in themselves, which derives, as we have seen with Mann, from an unsatisfied platonic, romantic and sexual love for the parent of the relevant gender.

This is counteracted by the defence mechanism of the need to be well regarded by their peers who maintain the external appearance of obedience and observance. This is simplifying the relationship between Judaism and the internal psychology of the jew considerably, but it is essentially correct to state that Judaism is a specifically devised social control mechanism to allow the jewish authorities to create a coherent society and to prevent harm coming to the creators/rulers by the actions of jewish individuals.

We see this in that some of the jewish men that Mann relates she *'dated'* as part of the jewish match maker program operated by the Hasidic school. We find, for example, that the first jewish man she *'dates'* is a formerly lapsed jew who now has taken to Hasidic Judaism. He tells Mann, to impress her with his external obedience and piety, that he has built a little contraption out of string to tie up his penis every night so as to *'not spill any of his seed'*. The encouraging of acts such as this, in Judaism, is meant to control the natural psychosexually-based instincts and needs of the jews via the process of discipline and denial, because the *'jewish god'* dictated as such (hence it is a divine commandment, which they cannot disobey). Thus the act described by Mann of the jewish male creating a small contraption to wear at night as to make sure he doesn't spill any seed is an act of self-denial (rather than self-control), which the individual jew perceives to make themselves, in the word's of the matchmaker who introduced Mann and this jew, *'more holy'*.

This holiness is sanctimonious in nature rather than pious in the true sense of the term because it is used as an attractive characteristic by the jew concerned and allows them to replace the normal ego gratification of hedonism with the ego gratification of self-denial.

This therefore means it is important to note that the individual jew, such as Mann, will relate to Judaism not as a control mechanism but as a means of gaining the self-image that they wish to project in order to win their desired parents or personality. Jews who practice Judaism do not do so, as Mann implicitly tells us, because they have a genuine pious desire, but rather, because it replaces one system of ego gratification with another. However, it also confers important

additional benefits onto the jews who choose to practice it: such as the gain of considerable, religiously based, authority over numerous other jews with the opportunities for corruption, personal advancement and hedonism that that brings with it.

Specifically with Mann we find, as we have discussed above, that she is becoming obedient to Hasidim, precisely because she wishes to repair the damage done to her reputation in her father's eyes and hence transform herself from sexual deviant and an embarrassment to an obedient and pious jewish woman who, Mann believes, her father would platonically, romantically and sexually desire (i.e. the woman her grandfather, or her father's father, desired her father to marry).

Therefore what is occurring in Mann's mind when she has these forbidden thoughts, that according to Mann come unbidden (although we can suggest these thoughts were not unwelcome: since she recalls them with a considerable degree of fondness), but is an externally obedient and pious jewish woman, is her fundamental desire to massage her deflated ego by being sexually desired by all the men in the world. This is despite her lip service to the obedient and pious jewish woman image that she has adopted to please her father.

We see this contrast, between the external presentation and the internal reality of Mann, as well as the other jews in which she comes into contact with, more generally among the jews in Mann's school when Mann states that she seduced and had a sexual relationship with a fellow female jewish student. This is, despite homosexual acts being explicitly forbidden in the Torah and considered a high crime in the standard commentaries and rabbinic literature, Mann's reason for seducing this student and why we can suspect that the student consented to be seduced and to have homosexual intercourse with Mann, is that, as she relates, she wants to feel pleasure and she wants to feel loved again. The only way Mann feels that she is loved is through sexual intercourse: this indicates to us that Mann, like jews more generally, leads a very hollow existence.

In this expression of her homosexual encounter with another jewish female Mann is seeking to claim that she is desirable to all men and all women: since she has already described frequently and at length how she feels that (all) men desire to '*fuck*' her and had hinted that (all) women do so too. This is all part of the filling of Mann's lack of confidence: by the act of having sexual intercourse with as many different people as possible (to prove to herself that she is loved and therefore desired) and the subsequent bragging/boasting about through her book fulfils a similar medium by suggesting to others that Mann is desired more than them, that they should also desire her and also the reliving of the egoistic gratification experience for Mann.

We also see a defence mechanism in Mann's writing in so far as Mann herself states as an afterthought to the recounting of this experience that it was '*alright*', because the Torah, according to Mann, only states that a '*man shall not sleep with another man*'. However, this is a weak argument since as Mann well knows and knew at the time: homosexual encounters of any kind are explicitly forbidden in halakha. What Mann is doing here is trying to use the legal letter to invalidate the spirit of the law in order to give an after the fact justification of why she engaged in this homosexual act with another jewess without admitting it was hedonistic lust on her part in order to satisfy her egoistic desires via the association of sexual intercourse and

pleasure with self-worth.

Therefore we see that Mann is in fact trying to justify her actions in order to reconcile her external appearance of being a woman of obedience and piety with the psychosexual tendencies that are inherent within her. This she does as we have said via the defence mechanism of denial of having done anything wrong, using her justification to allow her to do this, but also she blames the jewess with whom she committed the acting. Telling us that other jewesses were more squeamish than her and thought, Mann infers incorrectly, that homosexual conduct between jewish females was forbidden to them. Thus Mann seeks not only to justify her actions, but blame anyone, including other jewesses, other than herself since she does not believe that she is to blame for anything that has happened to her as I have stated above in reference to Mann's blaming of Chris and her mother.

What can we conclude from all this?

When we conclude from this the easiest way to do so would be through the medium of psychoanalysis, We can see that Mann has an intense aversion to her mother, both using her as a scapegoat and also being jealous of her because of her sexual relations with her father, and an intense attachment to her father, which can be said to be sexual in nature. We can also see that Mann does not believe that gentiles are like her in the biological and spiritual senses. As well as that they, gentiles, are, as a rule, incapable of understanding and fulfilling her needs beyond that of purely physical contact: therefore assigning them an inferior and jews a superior position in her world.

We can also conclude that Mann is purely egoistic individual who operates only as to what she perceives benefits her in the materialistic sense at any given time rather than engaging in altruistic behaviours orientated towards the future. What we can draw from this is jews operate purely in the materialistic sense and look to their own inner selves. It also explains why it is often observed that jews are always looking to find a way to put anyone else down in that they will not just say: *'Oh that looks nice of you'*, but rather say *'Oh that would like nice on your if you lost a little weight.'*

The key to understanding why jews act the way they do is to understand that each jew, like Mann, views the priorities of the world as being: Me, Myself and I, rather than a mixture of selfishness and altruism. This doesn't mean that jews do not act as a group, but rather it means that jewish culture forces their egotistical behaviour to follow artificial paths to help the jews as a group in order that the individual jew may gratify themselves with the idea that they have gained in standing, recognition and importance in the jewish community.

Denying Historical Debate

The following letter was written by Professor Deborah Lipstadt to the *'New York Times'* and published by that newspaper on the 28th February 2009. We reprint it here solely as a matter of record so that you, the reader, may read our letter in response in context.

‘Those Who Deny the Holocaust Deny History

“Vatican Calls the Apology of a Bishop Insufficient” (news article, Feb. 28) reports that the Holocaust-denying Bishop Richard Williamson has consulted with David Irving. Mr. Irving is a fitting partner for him. Strangely, Mr. Irving is described in the article as a “historian.” When he sued me for libel for calling him a Holocaust denier, the court ruled that his “falsification of the historical record was deliberate” and motivated by “ideological beliefs,” including anti-Semitism and racism. The judge called Mr. Irving’s writings on the Holocaust “misleading,” “unjustified,” a “travesty” and “unreal.” He “perverts” and “distorts.” This is not the description of a historian. It is the description of a denier.

Deborah E. Lipstadt

Washington, Feb. 28, 2009’

The Editor responds:

Denying Historical Debate

Dr. Lipstadt,

In your letter of February 28th 2009 printed in the New York Times of that date you draw attention to the fact that Bishop Williamson has consulted with David Irving. In the letter you attack Bishop Williamson as a ‘denier’: may I ask what Bishop Williamson has actually denied?

Bishop Williamson has consistently stated that he holds the historical opinion that during the Third Reich several hundred thousand jews died and that this is, by any standard, a considerable loss of human life. What the Bishop has not said did not happen is that jews did not die and that some jews were killed deliberately during this time. That would make him a ‘denier’ since he would have denied something happened at all. This should go without saying and is a fact that has not been disputed among those you, by implication, pillory in your letter along with Bishop Williamson and David Irving.

What Bishop Williamson has stated is that he is of the historical opinion that the, seemingly static, public figure of six million jews killed in the Holocaust is not accurate and he has further stated that he does not believe that the jews that were died were killed as the result of a mass gassing program. He bases this opinion on reading he has done in the Holocaust Revisionist literature: this makes his opinion based on an arguable interpretation of the facts as they exist. Bishop Williamson has also not stated that he relies on David Irving’s work, but merely that he has consulted with him. Therefore your letter begins with at least a very vague statement and at worst a deliberately misleading one, which then hypocritically contradicts your attacks on David Irving and Bishop Williamson.

Whether or not you regard Bishop Williamson’s opinions as truthful is irrelevant to the debate since you, yourself, have falsified your own research if we judge it by the standard, which you

are evidentially judging Holocaust Revisionist research. Since the adjectives that you have applied to David Irving: '*misleading*', '*unjustified*', '*travesty*', '*unreal*', '*perverts*' and '*distorts*', could equally be used to characterise your own book '*Denying the Holocaust*': some of the errors of which have been written on quite extensively in the late Journal for Historical Review^[25].

You have not to my knowledge answered these objections nor given responses regarding the issues raised. You should note that some of the errors you make in your book, '*Denying the Holocaust*', are of such a considerable nature that one cannot help, but wonder if they have been made deliberately.

Until you can show how your arguments are in fact based on arguable fact rather than broad generalisations and straw men arguments based on a lack of research: then it is not reasonable for you to complain that David Irving and Bishop Williamson's past and/or present beliefs are '*misleading*', '*unjustified*', a '*travesty*', '*unreal*', '*pervert*' and '*distort*' the historical record since you have done/are doing what you allege David Irving and Bishop Williamson to have done/are doing. However unlike both David Irving and Bishop Williamson you have not offered the usual courtesy of a defence of your views and have merely ascended to a proverbial soap box to pontificate to the readers of the New York Times.

We must wonder if you, Dr. Lipstadt, are not in fact motivated in your historical views by your own status as a Jew and that you are thus showing considerable intolerance towards those with different views to your own. How else can we reasonably account for your continued pontificating in a field of which you have been shown, to which charges again you have not rebutted, your manifest ignorance of in your book: '*Denying the Holocaust*'. If we use your logic therefore you do not deserve to be called an academic, because you have arguably committed deliberate falsifications in your own work.

Furthermore David Irving, although we note that he has subsequently retracted his views regarding the Holocaust, has to be referred to as a historian precisely because he has written a large number of historical works, that are still well-regarded, and has contributed a considerable amount of original research and interpretation to the historical debate surrounding the Third Reich. The court did indeed rule that David Irving's opinions were as you describe them, but neither affects whether his opinions, at that time, were historically correct (since what you are quoting is only the judge's opinion) and nor does it deprive David Irving of the right to be correctly called a historian by the New York Times.

Therefore Dr. Lipstadt you are the '*denier*' of both historical debate and credit: are you not?

Perhaps we might suggest Dr. Lipstadt that in future you look to your own scholarly work before attacking other people's work and claiming that they are things that they are patently not. It would also be well if you wish to write to the New York Times about these issues that you should not grandstand about your only claim to fame, i.e. the David Irving trial, so-to-speak in the historical world and write something of actual substance.

Yours truly,

Karl Radl,

Editor of Semitic Controversies Magazine,

Book Reviews

Alan Steinweis Debunks Himself

A Review of:

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

Serious studies of National Socialism are rare, but serious studies of National Socialist scholarship, especially as it relates to the most emotional topic that is associated with it and the Third Reich, the jews, are even more rare. Most studies that claim to be 'serious studies' of this topic are afflicted with the kind of suffocating and smarmy postscript that has evolved into the mythos of, i.e. the justification, the era in which we live[\[26\]](#). This Steinweis, who is the Rosenberg Professor of History and Judaic Studies at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, correctly notes is due to the automatic presumption on the part of the authors concerned that everything that was associated with National Socialist ideology was simply irrational and lacking in any substance what-so-ever.

What Steinweis in introducing the subject area does not state is that this presumption has allowed whole theoretical castles in the sky to be built around the policies and concepts that make up National Socialism. Constructs which at their best do it no justice as a credible political ideology, because they assume it has no rational basis where-as it most certainly did and does[\[27\]](#). At the worst the inventors of these constructions deliberately misrepresent the Third Reich and National Socialism making them out to be completely evil in some cases this has been taken further into the realms of demonic.

In writing a book on National Socialist scholarship regarding the jewish question Steinweis moves, as he himself notes, into an understudied area that really has not been generally covered since 1946[\[28\]](#), because of this simple presumption of irrationality. There have, as Steinweis informs us, been several specific studies of some parts of the subject area and some of the scholars who contributed to the National Socialist critique of jews in the Third Reich. However, the literature is still very sparse with much opportunity for further study.

Steinweis is certainly to be commended for writing such an accessible, and quite enjoyable, work and he is also to be commended for writing it in a relatively unemotional and factual manner, while not engaging in too much condemnation and manipulation of the facts to suit his personal bias in the issue due to his being of jewish origin. Steinweis has commendably done his research and concentrates on what he, rightly, considers to be the key scholars who created the rational anti-Semitism that Adolf Hitler had long called for as a counter to the almost purely jewish domination of the study of jews. It is noteworthy that Steinweis recognises that Adolf Hitler in

the earliest days of the N.S.D.A.P., and during his own political awakening, recognised that the traditional anti-Semitic materials such as those the anti-Semitic movement's own titans: Theodor Fritsch, Adolf Stoecker and Eduard Drumont, in addition to the traditional low to medium brow literature, which sought to condemn the jews, were not sufficient to provide a scholarly case against them. What was required was a scholarly inter-disciplinary collaboration to create what Steinweis refers to as a '*Nazi Jewish Studies*' field with its own reference literature and standard works. This is precisely what, as Steinweis records, a number of eminent scholars from a variety of different fields set out to do.

However, despite doing an excellent job of presenting the general history of anti-jewish scholarship in the Third Reich. Steinweis does not give much credit to National Socialist scholarship regarding the jewish question. Although Steinweis has certainly, as I have stated, done his research; he refuses to give credit where credit is due. Instead of a realistic and scholarly appraisal of the works of the Third Reich and whether there was a basis for their general contentions. Steinweis simply ignores the possibility that '*Nazi anti-Semitism*' may have been correct in whole or in part of its condemnation of jews. This is despite his declaration at the start of '*Studying the Jew*' that National Socialist scholarship in the Third Reich has been summarily dismissed as propaganda but should be looked at on the basis of it being scholarship rather than as '*regime propaganda*'. Hence Steinweis proceeds to commit exactly the same error he noted was unfortunate in his introduction: he simply presumes that such scholarship was '*pseudo-scientific*' and '*fallacious*' rather than make a balanced critique of such work. What is particularly notable is that Steinweis takes any opportunity to find one objection, often quite slight, to a work and to infer that this makes the work invalid in terms of scholarship. If we were to apply Steinweis' own standard here to his own work then he would be equally, if not more, fallacious than the scholars he is writing about.

An example of this can be found in his comments concerning Hans Guenther, which make up the second chapter, '*Racializing the Jew*', of '*Studying the Jew*'. Steinweis is at his most specific here in his analysis of Guenther's middle-brow study of the jews as a race[29]. Guenther cites a variety of different authors, including jews such as Maurice Fishberg[30], whom argued against the concept of race both in its application to jews and as a lens for understanding humanity. Steinweis notes that these authors disagreed with Guenther and hence Steinweis claims Guenther was being disingenuous in citing their work, the thrust of which Steinweis rightly notes disagreed with Guenther.

However what Steinweis, in his anxiousness to discredit Guenther, omits to mention is that Guenther is making very specific points and is noting that others have found specific evidence, to which he adds his own interpretation, in the light of other evidence, on. This is hardly being disingenuous or unscholarly, as Steinweis claims, but rather it is the normal practice of scholars across the many disciplines that make up academe. For example if one disagrees with the conclusions and thrust of another scholar's argument, but agrees with a specific interpretation on one point that is relevant to your own work, it is not misrepresenting the other scholar to cite that one point from their work in support of your own even if the arguments made are completely opposed to one another. Since Guenther was not suggesting that the jewish scholars in question actually supported either his interpretation or conclusion, but rather that they made a point, or a series of points, which were worth noting in terms of his own interpretation: hence Steinweis'

argument cannot be considered as valid.

However not all Steinweis' negative criticism is unjustified in that he briefly cites and discusses the work of Johann von Leers, who besides writing a lot of middle-brow works on jews in general, wrote some notable scholarly work concerning jews and criminality where he argued that jews were inherently, i.e. biologically, predisposed towards crime[31]. Steinweis correctly notes that for one particular figure[32] von Leers drew on a 1927 Polish anti-Semitic pamphlet: this is of course problematic but hardly worth of the emphasis Steinweis places on it. Steinweis himself does not cite or analyze the publication which von Leers is citing but simply dismisses it presumably because it is anti-Semitic and therefore irrational in Steinweis' eyes. We must opine that in this it is Steinweis who is being irrational and unscholarly, and not von Leers, for he has made not attempt to analyze von Leers' work but merely has sought to find something, which can be arguably objected to, in order to dismiss von Leers entire book as so much anti-Semitic rubbish.

Steinweis makes another, perhaps more cogent, general criticism of von Leers' work in that he notes that von Leers left out some figures that might have counted against his general thesis[33]. However this later criticism relies upon on a problematic understanding of von Leers' argument concerning jewish criminality. Where von Leers is arguing quite specifically that jews are fundamentally disposed towards crime, but this does not equate that jews must have more incidences of all types of crime but merely that they must show significant incidence of crime across socio-economic boundaries. This is what von Leers sets out to prove. Steinweis' objection, although valid, does not discount von Leers' thesis as Steinweis claims, but rather von Leers' thesis simply requires further clarification and the refining of the original argument. It is also important to state that von Leers' use of one bad reference does not negate his work either being scholarly or his thesis being valid. Hence it is reasonable to suggest that Steinweis is looking for a reason, however trivial, to call into question the scholarship and integrity of scholars in the Third Reich researching and writing about the jewish question.

Steinweis' negative assessment of all the academic work of the scholars who forged the interdisciplinary field of '*Nazi Jewish Studies*' has only one minor exception where he notes as to the work of Volkmar Eichstaedt. Who researched and wrote a meticulous bibliography of works, '*Bibliography on the History of the Jewish Question*'[34], relevant to the jewish question with precise cross-referencing from numerous different catalogues. Eichstaedt also notably added in an asterisk next to each author's name who was known to have been a jew by religious profession and/or by birth/lineage. He further adds in a question mark next to each authors name who may have been a jew, but whose status was indeterminate. Steinweis pays Eichstaedt the grudging compliment that this work became the standard index on the subject and was used well after the defeat and occupation of Germany as a standard reference work in the philo-Semitic study of jews.

That Steinweis doesn't see fit to actually praise any of this work is notable, because as stated above, it carries on the assumption that Steinweis distances himself from in his introduction. Steinweis himself appears to be suffering from a problem that he traduces the main scholars in the Third Reich involved in developing the field of '*Nazi Jewish Studies*' for. Steinweis notes that the specialists on the jewish question in the Third Reich attacked what they, correctly, saw

as the problem of inherent bias in the domination of the scholarly study of jews by jews. In that jews were very unlikely to produce a balanced and accurate depiction of their own history due to the racial perception and interests of the jews as a race.

Steinweis' objection to this is an ostensibly correct one: in that if the logic of racialism holds then racist thinking contradicts the assertion of the Third Reich scholars on the jewish question that their own works were in the objective spirit (since they are biased against the jews due to being of Aryan biological origin). However what Steinweis misunderstands is that different races have, and will always, think that their approach to a subject is objective when in fact in terms of racialism it is subjective. It is not that the scholars concerned were objective, because they, like their jewish counterparts, were actually writing from a subjective racial viewpoint, but rather that they felt that they were being objective, because they were looking at the issue as members of the Aryan race. Likewise the jewish scholars whom they cited thought they were objective, when they were actually racially subjective, as members of the jewish sub-racial/ethnic group.

Steinweis himself fits within this paradigm since he maintains that he is objective, but as we have pointed out above with reference to two examples, but he is not and consistently interprets issues that best suit his jewish heritage and on similar presumptions to those he criticises. Hence Steinweis' argument that there is a contradiction in terms of these claims is quite incorrect. This isn't to say that Steinweis' study is without considerable value, because it does give the reader an excellent historiographic picture of scholarly anti-jewish writing in the Third Reich, citing all the major authors and giving some background to them as well as allowing the reader to begin to engage with the literature and thought that Steinweis is describing. However Steinweis' analysis and refusal to give credit, where it is due, does not give the scholars he is discussing a fair and honest appraisal and gives the impression of 'pseudo-scholarship' that contradicts Steinweis' earlier professions to treat the scholars concerning with honesty and consideration in terms of their academic work.

It is obvious throughout Steinweis' description and analysis that there is an overt agenda present in *'Studying the Jew'*. In that in addition to describing the Third Reich studies on the jewish question. Steinweis in the case of nearly the all individuals he discusses goes onto describe the post-Third Reich careers of the scholars concerned. This is meant to, as Steinweis states in his conclusion, highlight the *'lack of justice'* and *'Nazi influence'* in post-Third Reich German scholarship. Hence becoming more fodder for the jewish guilt-industry that surrounds the Second World War and re-enforcing the notion that jews are *'victims'* and that Germany hasn't done *'enough'* to *'remove Nazi influence'*. This is the jewish agenda that *'Studying the Jew'* is riddled with and hence it must be pointed out that in reading *'Studying the Jew'* one must be wary of this further disingenuous attempt to claim that anti-Semitism has no rational basis and that jews should be *'compensated'*, because they suffered *'discrimination'* at the hands of National Socialism. The irony of course is bitter but in today's topsy-turvy world it is to be expected most of all from the cause of that state: the jews of which Steinweis is but one of many.

Hence although *'Studying the Jew'* is of value as a general historiographic guide to scholarship on, and scholars who addressed, the jewish question in the Third Reich: the work is so beset with problems as to make its analysis problematic at best and all but worthless at worst.

A French Comte's War against the Subversion of the Faith

A Review of

Vicomte Léon de Poncins, Undated, [1929], 'Freemasonry and Judaism: Secret Powers behind the Revolution', 1st Edition, A & B Books: New York.

Vicomte Léon de Poncins is a name well known in Catholic, anti-Freemasonic and anti-Semitic circles for his numerous, and often quite courageous, works on what he saw as the secret forces that were seeking to subvert society in his day and historically. His work is often cited as a reference by contemporary would-be anti-Semites, as well as serial conspiracy theorists, such as David Duke and Jeff Rense when they make assertions concerning Jews in history and in contemporary times. Four of de Poncins' many books have been translated into English and are often sold in English language nationalist and/or anti-Semitic bookshops. These are: '*Judaism and the Vatican*'[\[35\]](#), '*Freemasonry and the Vatican*'[\[36\]](#), '*State Secrets*'[\[37\]](#) and '*Freemasonry and Judaism*'. It is important to review the most of important of these[\[38\]](#) which is '*Freemasonry and Judaism*' since this is the one most cited by these would-be anti-Semites.

'*Freemasonry and Judaism: The Secret Powers behind the Revolution*'[\[39\]](#) is an English language edition[\[40\]](#) of de Poncins' 1928 book, '*Les Forces secrètes de la Révolution*'[\[41\]](#), and the new publishing house 'A & B Books' is aligned with black nationalism which indicates the steady popularity of de Poncins work over racial boundaries and between the various different racial nationalist movements that exist at present. It also brings up the very real necessity to review de Poncins' work in the light of what is known today rather than what de Poncins would have known at the time of '*Freemasonry and Judaism*'s' original writing. That said it would be out of the scope of this review to carefully analyze each and every assertion de Poncins' makes and the evidence on which he bases these assertions. Hence, we will discuss the general thesis, the component parts and some of the more important specific arguments of '*Freemasonry and Judaism*'.

The thrust of '*Freemasonry and Judaism*' is quite a simple one Poncins himself states here:

'The aim of this work is not to produce new unpublished evidence but to set out and summarize the whole question for a reader who is supposed to be ignorant of this subject.'[\[42\]](#)

Therefore it should become apparent to the reader that de Poncins' is writing for those without expertise in the intricate questions that he is addressing: the influence, or lack, of Freemasonry and/or Judaism in world affairs and more precisely how these factor into the revolutionary climate and activities that were prevalent both at the time that de Poncins was writing and for the decades up to and including that of his death in the 1970s. Thus if we see individuals citing de Poncins as an authority for some fact or another then we must tread carefully with this assertion for as de Poncins himself tells us he is not writing a precise work, rather he is generalising and writing for the interest of the average reader rather than a researcher on the subject. If a researcher on the subject was to cite '*Freemasonry and Judaism*' as an authority for some fact or another then they we must suggest that they are to be found wanting[\[43\]](#).

This isn't to say that '*Freemasonry and Judaism*' is without value, but rather that it is not meant as a work which should be professionally cited (i.e. acting as proof itself), but rather as a general introduction to the subject. For a more in depth conception of what de Poncins' argues it is necessary to read his many books in his native French since although he wrote many general introductions he also researched and wrote several works based on original research that included far more extensive, and sometimes original, documentation and in-depth discussion than he produces in his general books. For de Poncins, as I suspect he would himself readily admit, was a populariser of political and literary concepts in the best journalistic tradition. This is demonstrated very quickly in '*Freemasonry and Judaism*' since de Poncins uses only a few sources (and cites them frequently), but these sources are in-depth discussions of the subject and as de Poncins himself correctly notes: they do disagree with each other on many specific points as well as the general theory. So, in a commendable show of relative objectivity, de Poncins offers the reader the logic of the differing schools of thought, citing the authors on either side, and suggests that the reader decide for themselves what they think is the case (which we will discuss below).

De Poncins cites a variety of now relatively rare learned French and German language works[44], usually by members of the Catholic clergy and often also members of monastic orders, concerning the Freemasonic conspiracy against civilisation: whom the literature, and de Poncins in his turn, argues are revolutionary by their very nature and wish to substitute Godly order, as represented by de Poncins in the Catholic Church[45], with an atheistic rationalistic conception of the world. This would be literally revolutionary in terms of the established norms and forms of the world, especially to a ardently Catholic aristocratic conservative like de Poncins. This conception of Freemasonry as being revolutionary and of its centrality to the major revolutions in Europe is not unique to de Poncins, but rather was, as I have said, a common feature of conservative, usually Christian, discourse on history and the forces that opposed conservatism/revolutionary conservatism.

The particular revolution that Freemasonry is most identified with is the French revolution in 1789, in which it is contended, not unreasonably, that the Jacobins and the other radicals were associated with Freemasonic sects, sometimes argued to be the Illuminati of Adam Weishaupt [46] and Count Adolph Knigge[47]. De Poncins, like his conservative contemporaries, takes this argument further and suggests that because Freemasonry wishes to abolish religion, particularly Christianity, and seek a foundation of a new '*rational*'[48] and essentially atheistic society. That you can make a direct connexion between the forces that de Poncins argues were behind both the French revolution of 1789 and the forces that were behind the Bolshevik and Marxist revolutions from 1917-1919. In particular de Poncins cites several sources, which allege that Béla Kohn[49], a leading figure in the communist take-over in Hungary[50], and other leading communists and socialists involved in the take-over were members of Freemasonic lodges in Hungary and in fact planned the take-over of Hungary in these lodges.

I cannot find any evidence of this being the case outside of de Poncins' work[51] and the anti-Semitic/anti-communist literature in general, but it is of note that the Hungarian government after the overthrow of the communist coup did outlaw Freemasonry and seize its documents in relation to the communist coup. This means that the Hungarian government, whether it was

correct or incorrect in this belief, certainly believed that Freemasonry was involved with the communist party in some way.

However de Poncins does not note that his earlier citations[52] as to the support of the Freemasons lodges for the new communist government may have been in fact the reason for such suppression, rather than the Masonic lodges having been the origin of the communist take-over as it suggested by Jouin who de Poncins quotes. Hence, even with this knowledge and the citations de Poncins makes from Jouin's book we cannot substantiate or dispose of this accusation, but rather must we leave it as an avenue for further specialist research.

The citation of Jouin's work in general, and in the case of the Hungarian communist coup of 1919 in particular, is the logical bridge that de Poncins uses to combine his arguments concerning Freemasonry being a revolutionary force with his other fundamental argument, which dominates the second section of '*Freemasonry and Judaism*', that the jews are, like Freemasons (and in fact dominate, or are allied with, it), a revolutionary force. The particular bridge offered in the case of the Hungarian communist coup is the assertion that 90% of Freemasons in Hungary were jews. Now certainly while the communist coup of 1919 had a significant amount of jews in its higher echelons, and can be argued to be one of the most jewish-dominated of the communist revolutions/coups, there seems to be no actual evidence of the percentage of Hungarian Freemasons who were jews or of partial jewish ancestry[53] and the assertion of 90 percent seems perhaps a little too high: although in the absence of evidence to the contrary we must suspend judgment of his argument until conclusive evidence, which supports, partially supports or disposes of this assertion can be located. Hence we cannot assert that de Poncins is right or not, but it does seem that some of the figures he is citing in his arguments are perhaps a little unrealistic or unbelievable to contemporary scholarship (although they were a common occurrence in political and intellectual discourse at the time both Jouin and de Poncins were writing).

De Poncins then stops to consider an important question of which revolutionary force, given in de Poncins' thesis that they are working together, is the primary issue. His discussions on this point are brief[54] but to the point. De Poncins correctly summarizes that there were, and are, two major different schools of thought[55] in terms of the relationship between Freemasonry and the jews. De Poncins also usefully informs us, which of the major authors he cites advocate which theory. These are put quite simply in de Poncins' own words:

'That the Jews have entirely created masonry in order to corrupt the nations of Christian civilisation and to propagate behind this veil the general revolution which is to bring about the domination of Israel. It is simply a tool and a means in the hands of the Jews.' [56]

And:

'Freemasonry was a good and sound institution in principle, but revolutionary agitators, principally Jews, taking advantage of its organization as a secret society, penetrated it little by little.

They have corrupted it and turned it from its moral and philanthropic aim in order to employ it

for revolutionary purposes.’[57]

It is certainly praiseworthy that de Poncins mentions these different theories and doesn’t try to direct his reader along one of the two major theories (although he makes it known that he personally favours the second), but rather suggests that the reader make up his or her own mind concerning, which theory best suits the facts of the situation as they are known to them.

In terms of the two theories there is a problem with both of them in that they assume that jewish power is by nature conspiratorial rather than a result of the jewish racial condition[58]. This presumption was a very common one at the time of de Poncins (and the authors he cites) time of writing[59] and again we cannot blame de Poncins, or the authors he cites, for it. However crucially this perspective misses out that jews are not a conspiracy in the traditional European conceptions of it, but rather are a series of extremely egoistic individuals with considerable inferiority complexes who identify their fellow jews/jewesses with the relevant parent and hence feel they desperately have to do the best for/protect their kin (asking and answering the question: what is best for jews, as a substitute for the question: what is best for my jewish mother and father).

This is what I argue is the truth of the jewish question and we can see how these two theories fall down in the light of this, because they presume that the jews have consciously manipulated Freemasonry into being revolutionary in character, but yet if what de Poncins argues earlier in *‘Freemasonry and Judaism’* is true, i.e. that Freemasonry is by its general character revolutionary, because it is rationalistic and atheistic, then it cannot have been consciously manipulated by jews.

The non-revolutionary character of English freemasonry, as argued by Nesta Webster among others,[60] is hence easily explained by de Poncins’ own earlier clarification that Freemasonry, became politicised as the 18th century wore on. Therefore we may argue reasonably that actually continental Freemasonry became politicized and English Freemasonry did not.

There is little reason to suppose jews were actively involved in this politicization either, considering that England (and later Great Britain) was living in a time of great increasing jewish power within its borders[61] and especially among its merchants who would have been drawn to revolutionary rationalistic movements far more than aristocrats who had no bars to their social mobility (which Freemasonry if it became politicised could potentially sweep away).

If the first thesis, that Freemasonry is the creation of the jews, is true then we come on the problem of a lack of evidence for early jewish involvement in Freemasonry and indeed the Masonic constitution of the Grand Lodge, the first Masonic institution, in 1717 seems to have involved very few jews since it was the brainchild of Jean Desaguliers rather than a jewish or pre-dominantly jewish cabal. Although it has been argued that there is a *‘Hebrew Manuscript’*, of one *‘Joseph Levy’*, which Desaguliers allegedly stole and then became the *‘Father of Modern Masonry’* with[62]. I have not seen any substantial evidence for this accusation although this assertion of Freemasonry’s jewish origins remains both unproven and un-refuted until conclusive evidence is brought forth to prove, partially prove or disprove the assertion.

This thesis also encounters the problem that it takes the claims of the Masons themselves, that they were and are descended from the traditions of original Hebrews, at face value, rather than looking at their claims in context of the need in a secret society to create a mythos for that society to act as the social adhesive between the members of the fraternity. There were of course fairly few mystical traditions to draw on 1717 in comparison with the many different traditions, often created from whole cloth, that are propounded today. It is thus far more rational to presume that the Masonic tradition was created precisely to create this mythos to service as a social adhesive, rather than to assume that the Masons are a predominately jewish organisation created by jews who we should believe are telling their truth about their jewish origins. For why, if it is a jewish secret society, would Freemasonry claim to be descended from the Hebrews of the Bible? Surely if it were a jewish revolutionary organisation it would seek to distance itself from its jewish heritage and select a European tradition, such as the Greek Gods and Goddesses for example, to create its mythos out of.

Although we can't, as in the former case, dismiss this thesis entirely due to a lack of substantial evidence to prove, partially prove or disprove it we can; however, suggest that it seems unlikely given what is known about Freemasonry and how jews would likely operate as a conspiracy if they operated as such.

Hence although '*Freemasonry and Judaism*' is a very interesting book and was in its time both factually arguable and timely: it has not aged well due to more information now being available from better sources than de Poncins, and those he cites, had at their disposal. Its focus on the combination of Freemasonry and the jews as the twin arms of a great conspiracy against Christian civilisation is perhaps its downfall in that during the Second World War. Freemasonry, which we should not simply dismiss, as the religiously sceptical do, as a force in world politics, was all, but destroyed as a political force by the Reich Security Main Office, and laudably so, who rounded up the members of the Masonic fraternities and confiscated their possessions and written records. Hence the conception of the Freemasons and jews as the twin arms of a conspiracy that de Poncins argues, while cogent at the time of writing, is not useful in today's world where Freemasonry has been relegated to a decaying club that is desperately trying to regain its former power and glory.

'*Freemasonry and Judaism*' also, unfortunately, as a work tends to take focus off of the jewish question and split it, necessarily, between the two agencies that de Poncins terms '*secret powers behind the revolution*'. Hence to the reader today it might seem to indicate that they should concern themselves with both Freemasonry and jews: this inevitably leads some otherwise intellectually honest individuals into the highways and byways of the lunatic literature accusing the nebulous and ephemeral '*Illuminati*' of complicity in all, or most of, the wrongs of the world as they perceive them.

The focus on jews must be maintained for although they are certainly not the whole cause of all ills in the world: they are, I would argue, often directly and/or indirectly involved in producing them due to their need, both in terms of secular and religious jews, to '*repair the world*'. If we dissipate research into other power blocs, real or imagined, that are already well-covered then it weakens our research effort to cognitively understand and map the jewish question today as well as historically. This is important for without this research effort modern anti-Semitic propaganda

and intellectual work will not come to the fore and anti-Semitism will stay in its comfort zone of 19th and early 20th century anti-Semitic cognitive frameworks and understanding. Therefore anti-Semitism will remain ineffective and a fringe intellectual movement and no serious anti-Semite can possibly wish this: can they?

Letters and Correspondence

We are happy to publish, and as required respond to, all letters we receive. However before publishing your letters: we will always ask your permission to do so and unless otherwise requested your name will not be published.

If you would like to write or draw cartoons for Semitic Controversies or wish to submit your own written work and/or cartoons for inclusion in an issue of Semitic Controversies then please feel free to do so. Please be assured that we guarantee your anonymity and only the Editor will know your email address and will not leak any information to any other individual or group.

Please send all correspondence and submissions to Semitic.Controversies@googlemail.com.

Our Next Issue

The next issue of Semitic Controversies will be published on the 12th of April 2009.

Notes

[1] Jacob Neusner is the author of over a thousand books, scholarly articles and book chapters on Judaism and is regarded as something of a 'Dean', i.e. a ruling authority, in the academic study of Judaism.

[2] Mishnah, Tractate Sanhedrin, 10:1

[3] Jacob Neusner, 2004, 'Making God's Word Work: A Guide to the Mishnah', 1st Edition, Continuum: New York, pp. 64-65

[4] Ibid.

[5] Mishnah, Tractate Aboda Zarah, 2:1

[6] Neusner, Op. Cit., p. 74.

[7] Emanuel Feldman, 1998, 'On Judaism: Conversations on being Jewish in Today's World', 2nd Edition, Shaar Press: New York, p. 247

[8] Ibid, p.259

[9] Babylonian Talmud, Tractate Aboda Zarah, 2a – 2b

[10] Neusner, Op. Cit., pp. 76-77.

[11] <http://semiticcontroversies.blogspot.com/2008/08/lubavitch-debacle.html> [Accessed: 28/03/2009].

[12] Babylonian Talmud, Tractate Sanhedrin, 57b

[13] <http://jewishencyclopedia.com/view.jsp?artid=113&letter=L> [Accessed: 28/03/2009].

[14] Deuteronomy, 17:6

[15] Mishneh Torah, Laws of Forbidden Relations, 15.

[16] Babylonian Talmud, Tractate Kiddushin, 73.

- [17] Ibid.
- [18] Babylonian Talmud, Tractate Kiddushin, 69a.
- [19] Babylonian Talmud, Tractate Yebamoth, 78b.
- [20] <http://www.jewishencyclopedia.com/view.jsp?artid=98&letter=I> [Accessed: 28/03/2009].
- [21] Feldman, Op. Cit., pp. 269-270
- [22] Reva Mann, 2008, 'The Rabbi's Daughter: A true story of sex, drugs and orthodoxy', 2nd Edition, Hodder & Stoughton: London.
- [23] The Jewish Sabbath.
- [24] Much of 'The Rabbi's Daughter' can be essentially summed as Reva Mann feeling very sorry for herself and trying to divert blame away from her person and onto others. It is notable that throughout the entire book, Mann, does not take personal blame for anything, but always tries to shift that blame onto others.
- [25] http://www.ihr.org/jhr/v13/v13n6p28_Okeefe.html [Accessed: 28/03/2009].
- [26] The same can be said for the popular view of the Second World War, which ascribed as a 'German war of aggression' and that Britain was clueless as to the 'evils and irrationality' of 'Nazism' only 'standing her ground' many years after popular postscript maintains it should have. Of course: this, as with many a popular conception in the current era, is almost entirely poppycock built around a slim and selective propaganda foundation. The actual facts of the lead up to and the beginning of hostilities are essentially the inverse of the popular version of events with a campaign of propaganda of such a scale as to be on the scale of the Roman demonization of the Germanic and Gallic tribes and comparable in extent to modern 'holocaust' propaganda combined with an aggressively hostile diplomatic game played by France and Great Britain, with the support of the Roosevelt administration, ending in these powers giving a blank cheque guarantee to Poland to do 'what thou wilt', which presaged the attempted genocide of those perceived to be of Germanic stock in Western Poland by murderous Slavic mobs.
- [27] For if Marxism must be admitted as a credible ideology then so must National Socialism: the reason the former is considered as a credible alternative and the latter is considered an irrational aberration is due to their alleged treatment of Jews. Who dominate, and have dominated, Anglo-American culture for the last century and who have turned all their energies into opposing critique of Jews and arguing that the Jews being critiqued for their involvement in anything equates anti-Semitism.
- [28] This study was by Max Weinreich in his 1946, 'Hitler's Professors: The Part of Scholarship in Hitler's Crimes against the Jewish People', 1st Edition, YIVO: New York.
- [29] Hans Guenther, 1930, 'Rassenkunde des Juedischen Volkes', 1st Edition, Lehmann: Munich.
- [30] Guenther cites Fishberg's then well known work on the physical anthropology and physiology of the Jews, that was heavily influenced by Franz Boas whose measurements have been recently discovered to have been falsified (although neither Fishberg or Guenther could have known this): 'Jews, Race and Environment' [2006, [1911], 1st Edition, Transaction: New York].
- [31] Johann von Leers, 1944, 'Die Verbrechernatur der Juden', 1st Edition, Hochmuth: Berlin.
- [32] This was concerning the domination of the prostitution trade in Poland by Jews.
- [33] These figures related to violent crime.
- [34] Volkmar Eichstaedt, 1938, 'Bibliographie zur Geschichte der Judenfrage: 1750-1848', Vol. I, 1st Edition, Hanseatische Verlagsanstalt: Hamburg.
- [35] Vicomte Léon de Poncins, Trans: Timothy Tindal-Robertson, 1967, 'Judaism and the

Vatican: An Attempt at Spiritual Subversion', 1st Edition, The Britons: London.

[36] Vicomte Léon de Poncins, Trans: Timothy Tindal-Robertson, 1968, 'Freemasonry and the Vatican: A Struggle for Recognition', 1st Edition, The Britons: London.

[37] Vicomte Léon de Poncins, Trans: Timothy Tindal-Robertson, 1988, 'State Secrets: A Documentation of the Secret Revolutionary Mainspring Governing Anglo-American Politics', 2nd Edition, The Britons: London.

[38] The two most important for anti-Semites are, of course, 'Freemasonry and Judaism' and 'Judaism and the Vatican', but the later is barely known and rarely cited today. While the former is well known and often cited by anti-Semites.

[39] Léon de Poncins, Trans: Anon., Undated, [1929], 'Freemasonry and Judaism: Secret Powers behind the Revolution', 1st Edition, A & B Books: New York.

[40] Timothy Tindal-Robertson is the translator of 'State Secrets', 'Freemasonry and the Vatican' and 'Judaism and the Vatican' into English, but the original translation of 'The Secret Powers behind the Revolution', which became 'Freemasonry and Judaism: The Secret Powers behind the Revolution' was performed in 1929 rather than in 1968-1975 when Tindal-Robertson translated de Poncins' other works likely at the behest of 'The Britons' publishing house (who published his translations). Since I have been unable to find an original edition I am unaware of who the original translator was, but it does seem that 'The Britons' although operating in 1929 and already famous as an anti-Semitic publishing house were not the publishers of this original translation (although it is referred to in their catalogue it is not listed under their imprint).

[41] Vicomte Léon de Poncins, 1928, 'Les Forces secrètes de la Révolution', 1st Edition, Brossard: Paris.

[42] De Poncins, 'Freemasonry and Judaism', Op. Cit., p. 13

[43] Michael Santomauro writing for 'Ziopedia.org', which has been reproduced by David Duke on his website (on 11/08/2006), commits this mistake when he cites the translation of de Poncins', 'Freemasonry and Judaism', in the earlier edition for quotes from Jewish economist Werner Sombart. Santomauro is specifically citing the quotes from de Poncins who is using a French translation of Sombart's German work and then the translation of de Poncins' text has translated the translation. I have not checked the original German work, although I have read the usual English translation of it, but it is careless at best to cite a translation of a translation and expect it to hold evidential water without having checked the original text. This can be found at the following address: http://www.davidduke.com/general/what-about-jews-who-think-the-same-or-worse-as-mel-gibson_850.html [Accessed: 29/12/2008].

[44] These works however would have been readily accessible to the bulk of the French population when de Poncins wrote 'Freemasonry and Judaism' both in public and private libraries as well as from patriotic and/or Catholic booksellers. Thus the references that seem esoteric and obscure to our time were in fact standard nationalist/Catholic literature in de Poncins' time, which reinforces my earlier point that de Poncins was writing to introduce the subject to the neophyte and not to write a learned treatise on it. Hence quoting de Poncins in this work as an authority is rather like citing a short popular book on Adolf Hitler and then using that as your authority as to why you don't Adolf Hitler i.e. it is nonsensical. For more information about some of the authors whom de Poncins cites, as well as the situation which he was writing about, please see Pierre Birnbaum's, Trans: Jane Marie Todd, 1996, 'The Jews of the Republic: A Political History of State Jews in France from Gambetta to Vichy', 1st Edition, Stanford University Press: Stanford.

[45] It is not always the case that it is presumed to be simply the Catholic Church, but rather

Christianity as a whole that is under threat. De Poncins focuses on the Catholic Church as he was himself a devout Catholic and because France was and is a traditionally Catholic country. English Protestant clergymen writing at the same time as their French Catholic for example used much the same conception. This was re-enforced in the case of Catholicism by numerous Papal Bulls condemning Freemasonry. A list and discussion of the most important Papal Bulls concerning Freemasonry can be found at the following address:

<http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/09771a.htm> [Accessed: 29/12/2008].

[46] Adam Weishaupt was himself allegedly of Jewish origin and his surname arguably indicates his Jewish origins.

[47] Knigge was an aristocratic German Freemason who has been argued to have been the real driving force behind the Order of Perfectibilists better known as the Illuminati.

[48] 'Rational' here must be stated to be the 17th/18th century idyll of the 'liberal, rational gentleman' rather it, as Revilo Oliver characterised it in his 1965 speech 'Can Liberals be Educated?', is an irrational 'belief in the wonders of science'. It presumes that the world can be endlessly improved through an increase in what its proponents believe is rational and is worsened through what they believe is 'superstition': i.e. it is an essentially atheistic religious belief that prefigures the religiously sceptical (i.e. sceptics who act in such a manner as to infer that their scepticism is actually their religion and not the result of what they themselves believe to be 'rational cognition') of today.

[49] A Hungarian mixed Jew (i.e. *mischlinge*), whose mother was a gentile and whose father was a Jew of the tribe of the Kohanim (hence in *halakha*/*halacha* [Jewish law] he would be considered a full Jew and also a potential priest for the Third Temple in Jerusalem). Kohn, or as he styled himself Kun, himself, and also notably the Jewish socialist/communist Joseph Pogany (who later became a leading communist agitator in the United States of America), escaped after the fall of the Soviet Republic in Hungary and took a leading role in the Comintern, specifically being involved in communist agitation in Germany at the behest of his sponsor the Jewish communist Grigory Zinoviev, until he was arrested in Stalin's purges in 1937 and executed in either 1937 or 1939.

[50] Often called the '133 Days': a useful and informative summary, although coloured with the horror earnestly and understandably felt about the atrocities of the 'Red Guard' and the 'Lenin Boys' had committed, of this can be found at the following address:

http://www.jrbooksonline.com/HTML-docs/Outlaws_Diary_Appendix.htm.

[51] De Poncins, on pp. 72-76 of 'Freemasonry and Judaism' (Op. Cit.), cites the summary of 'secret papers' found in Hungarian Masonic lodges provided by Monsignor Jouin on p. 120 in vol. 3 of his 5 volume, 1919-1927, work 'Le peril Judeo-maconnique', but without either Jouin's original work and/or the 'secret papers' concerned it is impossible to give a judgement concerning this argument.

[52] De Poncins, 'Freemasonry and Judaism', Op. Cit., pp. 68-72

[53] It is unclear what precise definition of who is and who is not a Jew. Jouin is using since both racial and religious definitions were common in anti-Semitic religious work at the time: although I suspect Jouin may be using a combination of both I cannot confirm this.

[54] De Poncins, 'Freemasonry and Judaism', Op. Cit., pp. 100-107

[55] I have seen it asserted that Freemasons in fact control the Jews, but I have not seen any literature assert this and it would seem this assertion has more to do with the fanciful idea that the Illuminati are the primary force in terms of 'secret powers' behind the events in the world.

[56] De Poncins, 'Freemasonry and Judaism', Op. Cit., p. 101

[57] Ibid.

[58] De Poncins gives a lengthy exposition of his jewish conspiracy argument on pp. 183-237, but since this is mostly short snippets on various organisations, which is not complete and misses out a number of major organisations, it not within the scope of this review to perform a laborious and lengthy correction to de Poncins' list and short exposition on each.

[59] Since it is a subjective racial conception of how an Aryan or Slav would have to operate in order to achieve the same results and power gained by the jews. These racial conceptions differ between the two races, but their generality is the same: hence why I am condensing them together for explanatory purposes.

[60] See Nesta Webster's, 1924, 'Secret Societies and Subversive Movements', 1st Edition, Boswell: London, pp. 294-326

[61] For more information on this please see Albert Hyamson's, 1951, 'The Sephardim of England: A History of the Spanish and Portuguese Jewish Community 1492-1951', 1st Edition, Methuen: London.

[62] This has been argued perhaps most extensively in the material that can be found at the following address: <http://www.biblebelievers.org.au/masonry1.htm> [Accessed: 05/01/2009].