

Semitic Controversies

2011 Issue

(First half of 2011 – From January to June)

Edited by Karl Radl

<http://semiticcontroversies.blogspot.com/>

Contents

Moshe Katsav the Rapist

Jewish Communist Espionage in the United States according to Whittaker Chambers

Jewish Influence in the Communist Party of America 1919-1926

In Brief: The Trotsky Quote

No Comment Necessary (30/04/2011)

Is Jan Irvin on Mushrooms?

No Comment Necessary (01/05/2011)

No Comment Necessary (02/05/2011)

Rabbi Dov Lior and the ‘Inferiority of the Gentiles’

No Comment Necessary (04/05/2011)

Of Skeptics, Skepticism and anti-Semitism

Strabo on the Jews

No Comment Necessary (06/05/2011)

Rabbinical Council of Europe admits to the Kosher Food Tax

Being a Thorn in Victor’s Side

Would David Cameron prosecute Israeli War Criminals?

Two Ordinary Jews confirm the existence of the Kosher Food Tax

No Comment Necessary (08/05/2011)

In Brief: Does the Wiesenthal Center support Scientology?

The First anti-Semite: Philostratus and the Jews

Rabbi Lazer Brody: 'Hashem will Slaughter the Goyim'

Savage Poetry: Martial on the Jews

Was Che Guevara an anti-Semite?

Ex Nihilo Nihil Fit: The Consequence of Negro Scholars

No Comment Necessary (12/05/2011)

Walk for Hate: The Anti-Defamation League tries to fleece the Goyim

In Brief: Delin Colòn tries to be a Historian

Lampooning the Jew: The Depiction of the Jews in Juvenal's 'Satires'

Suetonius on the Jews

The Emperor Claudius on the Jews

Some Thoughts on Ilan Pappé

And now for something completely different...

From the Archive: Edouard Drumont's 'Les Juifs Contre la France'

Shoah or Ritual Murder?

Fried Hasid

The Jew as Untermensch: Celsus the Epicurean on the Jews

Yet another Kosher Communist: Amy Levy

An Overbearing Lawyer and a Kiddy Fiddler Accountant: Wallace Bock and Irving Kamsler

Reader Mail (26/05/2011)

In Brief: Job Cuts for the Gentiles and £2 Million for Auschwitz

Ernesta Drinker Bullitt: 'The Jews hate the Germans, Poles and Russians'

Israel steals from the United States yet again...

Rabbis, Informers and Paedophiles

The Neo-Platonic Jew-Hater: Porphyry of Tyre on the Jews (Part I)

In Brief: Strabo and Female Jewish Circumcision

Erich Bischoff contra Hermann Strack: A Forgotten Chapter in anti-Semitic History

The Adventures of 'Foreskin Man'

In Brief: An Early Origin for Dzhughashvili equating 'Son of a Jew'

The Socialist History Society obsesses over Jews (again)

In Brief: Karl Liebknecht not a Jew?

A Jew gets stereotypical about Jewesses: Anthony Weiner's Faux Pas

Two old anti-Einstein Opinions

Jewish Sexual Predators: John Henry Mackay and Benedict Friedlaender

Lies, Damned Lies and Stephen Jay Gould

Stone the Bitch!

Rabbi Nachum Shifren: 'Serve the Jews or Die'

An Alleged Jewish Holocaust in 1918

In Brief: Why the term 'Anti-Semitism'?

Throwing the Jew down the Well

A 'Vile Nazi': Moi?

Moshe Katsav the Rapist

Tuesday, 4 January 2011

As you may have read recently ex-Israeli President Moshe Katsav has just been convicted of being a [serial] rapist by an Israeli court in Tel Aviv. The rapes and general sexual harassment took place during Katsav's term in office between 2000 and 2007, which indicates to us the sheer scale of Katsav's criminal activities. What is particularly interesting to us is an article written by the Jewish Telegraphic Association (or JTA for short) writer Dina Kraft entitled 'Katsav rape conviction hailed as watershed moment', which has been published in several major Jewish media organs in the United States. (1)

First of all Kraft points out that Katsav's Freudian habits were not limited to one particular Jewess but rather span numerous victims who no doubt are going to be demanding compensation from just about anyone they can vaguely link to Katsav. Kraft even goes as far as to suggest that this sexual abuse was widely known about by Israeli politicians and the media in general: she implies; of course, that a massive cover-up took place but also tries to excuse this typically immoral behaviour by claiming that male Jews see it as part of the perks of their government positions to sexually harass and even rape the Jewish (no word about the non-Jewish) females employed there.

Kraft even claims; by way of indirect apology for Katsav's actions, that Israel is a '*nation in arms*' with a '*machismo*' bent, but this is a little much given that Israel maybe a country with a lot of ostensive military power but as has often been remarked by military analysts the performance of its troops on the ground leaves quite a lot to be desired in spite of the image projected by its propagandists at home and abroad. That said as Shahak and Mezvinsky have observed Israelis have engaged in more than their fair share of atrocities against civilians and then proceeded to try and claim that Jews are special and therefore don't have to abide by the same code as mere mortals. (2) This is also the essence of much of Finkelstein's critique of Israel's use of the '*holocaust*' as a shield and a weapon to silence its enemies. (3)

Secondly Kraft argues that the conviction of Katsav is a landmark in Israeli society, because this is essentially the first time that one of the inevitably corrupt Israeli high officials has actually been successfully prosecuted for even the most basic of crimes. Corruption is; of course, an epidemic in Israel even more so than in the People's Republic of China as unlike the Chinese the Jews are almost completely egocentric and have little to no conception of the good of the group and tend to only pay lip service to their stated principles. Another example of this is the ongoing case against the former; and supposedly moderate, Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Olmert who is currently in the process of being tried for multiple white collar crimes revolving around his personal finances, corporate connections and abuse of public funds.

Is there any other country in the world where corruption is endemic but yet we are told so little about it in the West? While of course the so-called '*Israel Lobby*' drones on about how wonderful Israel and how much it is contributing to the world in general (anyone think about the implications of that argument so often used by Zionists and its context in Judaism).

If Kraft is correct and this does mark a watershed in Israeli society then we can expect to see a raft of cases brought against Israeli public figures for everything from rape to various white collar crimes or worse. However I think we can reasonably remark that this isn't exactly likely to occur if what Kraft suggests is true: since the political and media powers that kept silent about Katsav until formal allegations began to be made aren't going to go out of their way to open their closets for all their skeletons to be exposed.

The only thing about this whole case that does seem to me to be remarkable is the fact that Katsav didn't try to use either the '*holocaust*' or '*anti-Semitism*' as a defence for raping and sexually harassing the female members of the tribe...

References

(1)

http://www.jewishjournal.com/israel/article/katsav_rape_conviction_hailed_as_watershed_moment_20110103/ [Last Accessed: 04/01/2011]

(2) Israel Shahak, Norton Mezvinsky, 1999, '*Jewish Fundamentalism in Israel*', 1st Edition, Pluto: London

(3) Norman Finkelstein, 2001, '*The Holocaust Industry: Reflections on the Exploitation of Jewish Suffering*', 2nd Edition, Verso: New York

Jewish Communist Espionage in the United States according to Whittaker Chambers

Saturday, 8 January 2011

Whittaker Chambers; former Communist, probable homosexual (1) and convert to Christianity, was the man at the centre of the two Alger Hiss trials which lead to the uncovering of several considerable Soviet espionage apparatuses operating in the United States government from the 1920s to the late 1940s. (2) Chambers is interesting to us in that he wrote his experiences and thoughts down in two large volumes; '*Witness*' (3) and '*Cold Friday*', (4) however since the latter is largely a recap of the former with some updated information we shall take our information from the former.

'*Witness*' being autobiographical in nature simply names names; although in some places Chambers notes that he has substituted the individual's real name for an assumed one for various different reasons (usually to do with not hurting them for activities they have long past ceased to engage in), but from those Chambers does name we get a decidedly Jewish flavour.

At this point many a detractor and opponent of anti-Semitism will wish to reflexively claim that Chambers was an anti-Semite and a general '*Jew hater*'. However this is obviously incorrect as Chambers' own wife; Esther Shemitz, was Jewish and he spends a large portion of '*Witness*' paying direct or indirect homage to her. Shemitz also seems to have been a Communist; or at the very least a Marxist, for most of her life (5) as indeed was her brother. (6) Chambers also does not name (as a general rule) obviously Jewish individuals to have been Jewish and he really does

seem to have been rather blind to the fact that many of his '*comrades*' in the underground were members of the tribe. This is; of course, somewhat to be expected but never-the-less it is surprising that Chambers did not mention this obvious aspect of the underground. Perhaps he was conscious of his own wife's jewishness and the effect such revelations might have on the political situation in America with an anti-Communist frenzy in the offing or perhaps Chambers really was oblivious to the origins of those around him. It is difficult to which is the more likely, but on balance this author would tend to lean towards the former possibility rather than the latter. (7)

As it would be beyond this scope of this article to go into the very significant jewish involvement in Communism in the United States the structure that I have adopted is to list the jewish individuals concerned along with their principle role and activities in the Soviet underground and/or the official Communist party according to Chambers as an informed source. This is both for ease of reference and to allow any doubting Thomas' to easily check Chambers' own statements from my references.

James Allen (nee Sol Auerbach)

Foreign Affairs Correspondent for the '*Daily Worker*' (Chambers, '*Witness*', Op. Cit., pp. 241-242)

Chief Editor of '*International Publishers*' (Chambers, '*Witness*', Op. Cit., pp. 240-242)

Boris Bazarov (Chambers knew him as Boris Bykov)

Head of GRU (Soviet Military Intelligence) in United States from 1935-1937 (Chambers, '*Witness*', Op. Cit., pp. 439; 443) Chambers explicitly states he was jewish.

Alexander Bittelman

Member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the United States of America (Chambers, '*Witness*', Op. Cit., p. 206)

Benjamin Gitlow

Socialist Member of New York State Legislator (Chambers, '*Witness*', Op. Cit., p. 203)

Member of the Communist Party of the United States of America

Michael Gold (nee Itzik Granich)

Editor of the '*New Masses*' (Chambers, '*Witness*', Op. Cit., p. 264)

Felix Inslerman

Photographer for and Member of Washington D.C. Soviet Spy Ring (Chambers, '*Witness*', Op. Cit., pp. 41; 423)

Samuel Kaufman

Judge of the First Hiss trial (Chambers, *‘Witness’*, Op. Cit., p. 670)

Nat Kaplan

Foreign Affairs Editor of the *‘Daily Worker’* (Chambers, *‘Witness’*, Op. Cit., p. 258)

Soviet –trained agent born in America (Chambers, *‘Witness’*, Op. Cit., p. 258)

Paula Levine

Member of Paris Soviet Spy Ring (Chambers, *‘Witness’*, Op. Cit., p. 290)

Fled to Soviet Russia in 1933 (Chambers, *‘Witness’*, Op. Cit., p. 290)

New York apartment used as Communist underground safe house (Chambers, *‘Witness’*, Op. Cit., p. 290)

Maxim Lieber

Member of Washington D.C. Soviet Spy Ring (Chambers, *‘Witness’*, Op. Cit., p. 44)

Created Soviet spy rings in Great Britain and Japan (Chambers, *‘Witness’*, Op. Cit., pp. 44; 355; 367; 388; 437)

Jay Lovestone (nee Jacob Liebstein)

National Secretary of the Communist Party of the United States of America until 1929 (Chambers, *‘Witness’*, Op. Cit., p. 206)

Eugene Lyons

American Correspondent of TASS (the official Soviet News Service) until 1928 when joined UP as correspondent in Moscow (Chambers, *‘Witness’*, Op. Cit., p. 366)

Abe Magill

Correspondent for the *‘Daily Worker’* (Chambers, *‘Witness’*, Op. Cit., p. 240)

Ben Mandel (known to Chambers as Bert Miller)

Business Manager of the *‘Daily Worker’* (Chambers, *‘Witness’*, Op. Cit., p. 226)

Later Research Director of the House Committee on Un-American Activities America (Chambers, *‘Witness’*, Op. Cit., pp. 207; 536; 558; 600)

George Mink

Head of Communist Party’s Seamen’s Association (Chambers, *‘Witness’*, Op. Cit., p. 302)

Nephew of Solomon Lozovsky (Chambers recalls him as George Lozovsky) jewish head of the

Profintern (Chambers, *'Witness'*, Op. Cit., p. 303)

During the Spanish Civil war Mink was responsible for the murder of numerous anti-Communists and anti-Stalinists in Republican prisons (Chambers, *'Witness'*, Op. Cit., p. 303)

Josef Peters (known to Chambers as Alexander Goldberger)

Head of the National Underground of the Communist Party of the United States of America (Chambers, *'Witness'*, Op. Cit., p. 32)

Replaced as Head of the National Underground of the Communist Party of the United States of America by Rudy Baker (nee Rudolph Blum); who was also jewish, in 1938.

Joseph Pogany (nee Josef Schwartz)

Comintern Representative to the Communist Party of the United States of America (Chambers, *'Witness'*, Op. Cit., pp. 214; 246-247)

Was former Commissar for War in the Hungarian Soviet Government of Bela Kuhn (also jewish) (Chambers, *'Witness'*, Op. Cit., p. 246)

Juliet Stuart Poyntz

Member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the United States of America until 1937 (Chambers, *'Witness'*, Op. Cit., p. 36)

Member of the National Underground of the Communist Party of the United States of America (Chambers, *'Witness'*, Op. Cit., p. 36)

Murdered; by the GRU (Soviet Military Intelligence), in 1937, because of her potential break with the Communist party over Stalin's purges in the Soviet Union (Chambers, *'Witness'*, Op. Cit., p. 36)

Phillip Rosenblatt

Dentist and Member of the Washington D.C. Soviet Spy Ring (Chambers, *'Witness'*, Op. Cit., pp. 237; 435-436)

Assisted in espionage against the US Army (Chambers, *'Witness'*, Op. Cit., p. 319)

Meyer Schapiro

Professor of Fine Arts at Columbia University (Chambers, *'Witness'*, Op. Cit., p. 193)

Member of the Washington D.C. Soviet Spy Ring (Chambers, *'Witness'*, Op. Cit., pp. 193; 415-416)

Helped in attempt to set up a London spy ring (Chambers, *'Witness'*, Op. Cit., p. 376)

Sam Shoyet

Member of the National Underground of the Communist Party of the United States of America (Chambers, *'Witness'*, Op. Cit., p. 244)

Member of Washington D.C. and Tokyo Soviet Spy Rings (Chambers, *'Witness'*, Op. Cit., p.

245)

Member of Paris Soviet Spy Ring (Chambers, *‘Witness’*, Op. Cit., p. 311)

Abraham George Silverman

Research Director of the Railroad Retirement Board (Chambers, *‘Witness’*, Op. Cit., p. 27)

Economic Advisor and Chief of Analysis and Plans to the Assistant Chief of the Air Staff (Chambers, *‘Witness’*, Op. Cit., p. 60)

Active Source to and Member of the Washington D.C. Soviet Spy Ring (Chambers, *‘Witness’*, Op. Cit., pp. 40; 416)

Secretly paid dues to the Communist Party (Chambers, *‘Witness’*, Op. Cit., p. 380)

Aided in the recruitment and placing of Soviet spies into positions of the authority in the US government. (Chambers, *‘Witness’*, Op. Cit., p. 40)

Alexander Trachtenberg

Chief Executive Officer of *‘International Publishers’* (Chambers, *‘Witness’*, Op. Cit., pp. 242; 264)

Member of the Central Control Commission of the Communist Party of the United States of America (Chambers, *‘Witness’*, Op. Cit., p. 242)

Head of Cultural Activities of the Communist Party of the United States of America (Chambers, *‘Witness’*, Op. Cit., p. 264)

Alexander Ulanovsky

Chief of the GRU (Soviet Military Intelligence) in the United States between 1931 and 1934 (Chambers, *‘Witness’*, Op. Cit., p. 264)

William Weinstone

New York/New Jersey District Organiser of the Communist Party of the United States of America (Chambers, *‘Witness’*, Op. Cit., p. 230)

Harry Dexter White (nee Weit)

Assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury (Chambers, *‘Witness’*, Op. Cit., p. 27)

Head of World Bank (Chambers, *‘Witness’*, Op. Cit., p. 500)

Active Source to the Washington D.C. Soviet Spy Ring (Chambers, *‘Witness’*, Op. Cit., pp. 334; 370; 383-384; 405; 416; 420-422; 429; 544)

Came up with a new monetary structure for the Soviet Union (Chambers, *‘Witness’*, Op. Cit., p. 430)

References

(1) David Johnson, 2004, *‘The Lavender Scare: The Cold War Persecution of Gays and Lesbians in the Federal Government’*, 1st Edition, University of Chicago Press: Chicago, p. 33;

- Whittaker Chambers, 1952, *'Witness'*, 1st Edition, Random House: New York, p. 206
- (2) There is a considerable literature on this subject, but for a succinct overview please see John Hayes, 1996, *'Red Scare or Red Menace? American Communism and Anticommunism in the Cold War Era'*, 1st Edition, Ivan R. Dee: Chicago and Harvey Klehr, John Earl Haynes, Fridrikh Igorevich Firsov, 1995, *'The Secret World of American Communism'*, 1st Edition, Yale University Press: New Haven
- (3) Whittaker Chambers, 1952, *'Witness'*, 1st Edition, Random House: New York
- (4) Whittaker Chambers, 1964, *'Cold Friday'*, 1st Edition, Random House: New York
- (5) Chambers, *'Witness'*, Op. Cit., p. 25
- (6) Ibid, p. 48
- (7) Similar accounts; which ignore the Jewishness of much of those they describe, can be found in two autobiographies of former high-ranking underground communists, which are Jan Valtin, 1941, *'Out of the Night'*, 1st Edition, Alliance Book Corporation: New York and Louis Budenz, 1950, *'Men Without Faces: The Communist Conspiracy in the U.S.A'*, 1st Edition, Harper & Brothers: New York.

Jewish Influence in the Communist Party of America 1919-1926

Sunday, 9 January 2011

One of the most frequent arguments used by anti-Semites historically as well as currently is that Jews were inordinately involved in Bolshevism in the Soviet Union and in fact were involved well out of proportion to their numbers in terms of population. What has often been overlooked when making this argument; which although often massively overstated is often remarked on by historians of the Bolshevik revolution and the Soviet Union in general, (1) is the significant involvement of Jews in the formation of the Communist Party of America in the crucial early years of 1919 to 1926 when it began to grow as an organised and conspiratorial force which eventually ran numerous spy and espionage networks for the Soviet Union as well as its own above and under ground parties. (2)

In the below list I have outlined; as far as I can, the influence of Jews in terms of position and their relative numbers in the key positions that they occupied in the various formative parties and periods of the Communist Party of America. The most complete list I have been able to find was that offered by the Marxist Internet Archive (or MIA) which I have; with some reluctance, used to create this listing. (3)

The problems offered by this listing; and Communist history in general, are several:

Firstly due to the conspiratorial, subversive and generally paranoid nature of Communists internationally at this time; and the Communist Party of America were not an exception to the rule, pseudonyms were usually used in official and unofficial correspondence and documents so that it requires a large amount of backtracking and historical detective work to comprehend who is who in the documents concerned. This was exacerbated in the Communist Party of America by the raid at Bridgman on the 22nd of August 1922 (4) and leads to the situation; which has occurred in the MIA list, whereby we know the ethnic identity of an individual leader (due to

whom they were representing usually) but we do not know their actual name.

Secondly parties of the far left; Marxist and non-Marxist, have historically tended to be extremely factious in nature and this has lead (and still leads to) numerous factional breaks and the creation of majority and minority groups within the parties themselves. This; in the case of the Communist Party of America, lead to numerous splinter groups, arguments, dissolutions, reformations and unity coalitions, which to a reader unacquainted with the tendencies of the far left can be seem utterly disconcerting and even confusing at times. Part of the reason that I opted to use the MIA list was due to the fact that it offered it in an easy to understand format so that the reader could check what I had said against the MIA master list.

Thirdly the tides of influence and power within the Communist Party of America (and the far left in general) are notoriously difficult to chart and we can only largely guess and extrapolate from events what the power shifts were and on what basis they came about. This can make relative numbers somewhat deceptive, but for the sake of clarity we should state the reader will notice that several jewish individuals were largely in power throughout the 1919 to 1926 period in the Communist Party of America. Jay Lovestone in particular deserves mention as he was an extremely influential jewish figure inside the Communist Party of America and was only removed due to his support for Bukharin against Stalin in the power struggles inside the Bolshevik Party in Russia. In fact had Bukharin won the power struggle then Lovestone would have become the leader of the Communist Party of America as opposed to Stalin's chosen acolyte: William Z. Foster. (5)

If we bear this slight caveat in mind that numbers do not necessarily equate power although they do give us a fair approximation of it. We can begin to see a pattern in the following list of jewish officials in the Communist Party of America from 1919 to 1926:

1919 Communist Labour Party of America

National Executive Committee: No jews out of six members. Two jews (Finkelberg and Benjamin Gitlow) out of five alternative members as of January 1920.

Editorial Board: One jew (Ludwig Lore) out of three members.

Labor Committee: One jew (Benjamin Gitlow) out of five members.

1920 Communist Party of America

International Delegates: No jews out of four members. Three jews (Daniel Elbaum, Alexander Bittelman and Jay Lovestone) out of four alternative members.

Additional Executive Committee Members: Five jews (Alexander Bittelman, Maximilian Cohen, Daniel Elbaum, Jay Lovestone and Rose Pastor Stokes) out of eight members. Three jews (Rose Pastor Stokes, Meyer Lunin and Morris Kushinsky) out of six alternative Additional Executive Committee Members.

Language Federation Secretaries: One jew (an unnamed jewish individual) out of seven members.

Executive Council (after January 20th 1920): Three jews (Maximilian Cohen, Jay Lovestone and Alexander Bittelman) out of seven members.

Executive Secretary (after July 20th 1920): Louis Shapiro

Central Executive Committee (at the end of 1920): Four jews (Maximilian Cohen, Louis Shapiro and two unnamed jewish individuals) out of nine members.

Editor of Party Publications (at the end of 1920): Maximilian Cohen

Language Federation Secretaries (at the end of 1920): One jew (Morris Kushinsky) out of six members.

Assistant Secretary (after February 20th 1921): Louis Shapiro

Editorial Committee (after February 20th 1921): One jew (Louis Shapiro) out of three members.

District Organizers: Two jews (George Ashkenazi and one unnamed jewish individual) out of six members.

1921 (Unified) Communist Party of America

Executive Secretaries (from May 31st 1921 to April 1923): Two jews (William Weinstone and Jay Lovestone) out of five appointees.

Central Executive Committee Members (from May 31st 1921): Three jews (William Weinstone, Jay Lovestone and George Ashkenazi) out of eleven members.

Central Executive Committee Members (from December 1921): Four jews (William Weinstone, Jay Lovestone, Meyer Lunin and Alexander Bittelman) out of ten members.

Central Executive Committee Members (from April 17th 1922): Two jews (Jay Lovestone and Alexander Bittelman) out of ten members.

Secretariat (from January 26th 1923): One jew (John Pepper aka Jozsef Schwartz) out of three members.

Executive Council (from January 26th 1923): Five jews (Israel Amter, Benjamin Gitlow, Ludwig Lore, Jay Lovestone and John Pepper) out of seventeen members.

1923 Workers Party of America

Executive Council: Three jews (Alexander Bittelman, Ludwig Lore and Moissaye Olgin) out of

eleven members.

Central Executive Committee: Eight jews (Israel Amter, Alexander Bittelman, Jay Lovestone, Moissaye Olgin, John Pepper, Rose Pastor Stokes, Alexander Trachtenberg and William Weinstone) out of twenty-five members.

1924 Workers Party of America

Representative to Comintern (ECCI): Israel Amter

Central Executive Committee Members: Six jews (Alexander Bittelman, Benjamin Gitlow, Ludwig Lore, Jay Lovestone, John Pepper and Martin Abern) out of thirteen members.

Political Committee: Two jews (Jay Lovestone and John Pepper) out of seven members.

Organization Committee: Two jews (Martin Abern and John Pepper) out of five members.

Secretariat: One jew (John Pepper) out of three members.

Education Committee: One jew (Alexander Bittelman) out of three members.

Daily Worker Management Committee (as of May 1924): One jew (Moritz Loeb) out of five members.

1925-1926 Workers (Communist) Party

Central Executive Committee Members: Six jews (Martin Abern, Philip Aronberg, Jacob Stachel, Benjamin Gitlow, Jay Lovestone and William Weinstone) out of twenty members.

We can see from this list that as time went on the number of jews in positions of influence in power both increased and solidified with numerous jews; notably Alexander Bittelman, Jay Lovestone, William Weinstone, Ludwig Lore, Benjamin Gitlow and John Pepper, becoming exceptionally powerful and long-lasting in positions of power within the Communist Party of America. It is worth noting that while we have these members of enduring power we also have a considerable turnover of jewish individuals within the officials of the Communist Party of America with there being a particularly high general representation in the Central Executive Committees.

It is worth noting that when jews are represented at the highest levels of the Communist Party of America that they tend to be so in significant and disproportionate numbers. We see for example in the Central Executive Committee of 1923 to 1924 that the amount of jews is fifty percent of the total number of members and this is obviously wholly disproportionate to the amount of jews in America at this time.

Opponents and detractors of anti-Semitism may try to explain away such notable disproportionate involvement as this, but their arguments are usually based more on begging the

question (asking why it is significant in the first place) rather than actually providing a reasonable thesis for why it is the case. The idea that the jews were oppressed is a common argument of type, but this ignores the fact that if we consider the jews to have been oppressed then we cannot specifically answer why they should turn to the Communist Party of America in significant and disproportionate numbers and the equally oppressed Germans, Swedes, Irish, Italians and others should not turn to the Communist Party of America. Let alone of course rise to the top of the Communist Party of America which jews certainly did disproportionately and in significant numbers as this list illustrates.

This is yet to be reasonably explained by opponents of anti-Semitism and has tended to be attacked as '*baseless conjecture*' by some: the tendency has been to show that jews were significantly and disproportionately involved in far left wing politics in the United States throughout its long and nefarious history and not to look at the two pieces of information together. In so far as if the Communist Party of America was an openly subversive and revolutionary organisation and the jews; as a group, were significantly and disproportionately represented in its leadership then we can only conclude that jews acted the part of a hostile elite in the Communist Party of America much as Kevin MacDonald has argued they did in early Soviet Russia. (6)

References

- (1) On this point please see Benjamin Pinkus, 1988, '*The Jews of the Soviet Union: The History of a National Minority*', 1st Edition, Cambridge University Press: New York and Erich Haberer, 2004, '*Jews and Revolution in Nineteenth-Century Russia*', 2nd Edition, Cambridge University Press: New York.
- (2) On this point please see Harvey Klehr, John Earl Haynes, Fridrikh Igorevich Firsov, 1995, '*The Secret World of American Communism*', 1st Edition, Yale University Press: New Haven.
- (3) <http://www.marxists.org/history/usa/eam/cpa/cpaofficials.html> [Last Accessed: 04/01/2011]
- (4) A very useful and readily available contemporary account of just what was found in this raid can be found in R. M. Whitney, 1924, '*Reds in America*', 1st Edition, The Beckwith Press: New York (reprinted in abridged form; largely removing the mention of jews, in 1970 by Western Islands: Belmont [a John Birch Society affiliated imprint]).
- (5) For more on Jay Lovestone please see Ted Morgan, 1999, '*A Covert Life: Jay Lovestone, Communist, anti-Communist and Spymaster*', 1st Edition, Random House: New York.
- (6) This list should be seen in the conjunction with the numerous jews involved in spying and espionage activities in the United States who were directly and indirectly named by Whittaker Chambers, 1952, '*Witness*', 1st Edition, Random House: New York and Louis Budenz, 1950, '*Men Without Faces: The Communist Conspiracy in the U.S.A*', 1st Edition, Harper & Brothers: New York.

In Brief: The Trotsky Quote

Saturday, 30 April 2011

Recently there has been an upsurge in the use of a particular quote that has been attributed to the

leading jewish Bolshevik Leon Trotsky. (1) This quote is as follows:

'We must turn Russia into a desert populated by white negroes upon whom we shall impose a tyranny such as the most terrible Eastern despots never dreamt of. The only difference is that this will be a left-wing tyranny, not a right-wing tyranny. It will be a red tyranny and not a white one.'

We mean the word 'red' literally, because we shall shed such floods of blood as will make all the human losses suffered in the capitalist wars quake and pale by comparison. The biggest bankers across the ocean will work in the closest possible contact with us. If we win the revolution, we shall establish the power of Zionism upon the wreckage of the revolution's funeral, and we shall become a power before which the whole world will sink to its knees. We shall show what real power is. By means of terror and bloodbaths, we shall reduce the Russian intelligentsia to a state of complete stupefaction and idiocy and to an animal existence... At the moment, our young men in their leather jackets, who are the sons of watchmakers from Odessa, Orsha, Gomel and Vinnitsa, know how to hate everything Russian! What pleasure they take in physically destroying the Russian intelligentsia - officers, academics and writers!' (2)

We should first remark that this quote is obviously very similar to what I have termed the Selenkov quotation; which I have previously discussed, that runs as follows:

'We must create a climate of anti-nationalism and anti-racialism amongst Whites. We must reduce patriotism and pride of race to meaningless abstractions and make racialism a dirty word.' (3)

In my discussion of the Selenkov quotation I pointed out that there was no reason to regard it as genuine as the wording makes no sense from an avowedly Marxist-Leninist perspective and to claim a Bolshevik leader would talk in a fashion more akin to the radical right than their own radical left language was nonsensical unless the quotation could be substantiated evidentially. We can see that this supposed Trotsky quotation suffers from the same basic problem in that it uses the language of the radical right rather than the radical left, which stems from the apparent inability of the originator(s) to use Marxist-Leninist phraseology and replacing this way of thinking and arguing with how their own ideology (in this case something to do with the Russian far right) interprets what Marxism-Leninism is really saying.

For example the Trotsky quotation makes the considerable mistake of claiming; in effect, that Trotsky was a Zionist when Marxism-Leninism and Zionism were (often violently) competing ideologies among the jews in Russia and the early Soviet Union; in which Trotsky played a not inconsiderable role, went so far as to provide a counter to the Zionist tendency by assigning jews their own oblast or autonomous region. Indeed Trotsky spent a considerable portion of his early career fighting and speaking against Zionism as a competing self-solution to the jewish question!

The Trotsky quotation also makes the mistake of asserting that Trotsky knew that the Bolshevik revolution would fail and that in its wake he would somehow create a new; and largely undefined, Zionist state, which by implication rule the Russian people as cattle. This is utterly undermined by Trotsky's own behaviour after his removal from power and exile from the Soviet

Union under Stalin's auspices. After all if Trotsky had been planning something along these lines then he should have immediately repudiated some of his professed beliefs and then go on to join the flourishing Zionist movement rather than founding his own breakaway Bolshevik faction: the Fourth International. Indeed Trotsky spent the remainder of his life until his assassination writing and arguing for another Bolshevik revolution in what he perceived to be the spirit of Lenin rather than that of Stalin (i.e. the doctrine of '*permanent revolution*' as opposed to '*socialism in one country*'). (4)

We should also note that the Trotsky quotation gives us a quite obvious clue to the fact that it is probably entirely made-up in so far as it asserts that its young acolytes should '*know how to hate everything Russian*'. This is not something that a Marxist-Leninist would say: given that although national identity is technically irrelevant in Marxism-Leninism it is however of importance to the infant revolution not to preach such doctrines as they would work directly against the feelings of the Russian people as maybe simply demonstrated by pointing out that in 1941: Stalin was able and had to call; after 24 years of Bolshevism, on nationalist and religious sentiment in order to get the recruits he needed for the Red Army.

Now if Trotsky was so absurdly silly as to argue that such sentiment was irrelevant at some undefined; but likely very early, point during the Soviet Union then he would not have succeeded in convincing those around him to fight as they did. After all the single most important component of Marxist-Leninist cadre is to '*do anything to further the interests of the revolution*' and causing massive opposition is hardly furthering the interests of the revolution!

However to a Russian nationalist then it would be a point of ideology that both Bolsheviks and jews hated everything Russian; a-la the Protocols of Zion, (5) and sought to destroy it as a matter of priority with the implication that everything Russian is the be all and end all of importance.

We can confirm this probable authorship by pointing out that according to Stepin the quotation came from the first edition of '*Russkoye Slovo*' (a copy of which I have been unable to locate) although a similar publication; '*Novoye Russkoye Slovo*', was an American anti-Bolshevik Russian émigré periodical that began life in 1910. (6)

We can deduce from this that '*Russkoye Slovo*' was either an émigré or indigenous Russian periodical with strong anti-revolutionary and anti-jewish tendencies; as to whether it was anti-Judaism or anti-Semitic we have no clue but the former is the more likely, that was probably in operation before 1910. However that presents us with a considerable problem in that Trotsky was not of any particular prominence in the revolutionary movement in Russia before 1917 and if we are to believe the quotation's accuracy and the necessary deductions we have made about the originating publication then the publication itself was either very lucky or had considerable knowledge of how things would turn out. When we consider how secure the Tsarist regime seemed before the strain of war told on its population from 1916 to 1917 facilitating the February and October revolutions then we can only suggest that either the periodical had prophetic ability or the periodical did not exist.

Perhaps the best reason we can argue that the periodical did not exist is the more likely of the two situations is that with Trotsky being an obscure figure in the revolutionary movement and

the Tsarist government seeming very secure: the periodical; which remember was likely published before 1910, would not have known that Trotsky was to become a major figure and that therefore any utterances he would have made would have been those of an obscure and rather marginal jewish revolutionary who had been effectively neutralised by the Tsarist secret police. So why on earth would the '*Russkoye Slovo*' given such space to utterances from a marginal jewish revolutionary that are not even confirmable and would be surpassed by the claims and arguments of the readily available revolutionary émigré publications such as the '*Iskra*'.

So why give a revolutionary nobody such prominence in the first issue?

The answer is obvious: because it did not exist in the first place and the quote was manufactured after Trotsky had risen to prominence by his opponents.

Interestingly; by way of an addendum, a 1937 American anti-Semitic publication; '*Trotsky and the Jews behind the Russian Revolution*', allegedly cryptically authored by '*a former Russian Commissar*' tries to do something similar when it asserts; contrary to the biographers of Trotsky and Lenin, that Lenin '*fronted*' from Trotsky who was the éminence grise of the Bolshevik movement. (7) The author of this occasionally clever diatribe against the overrepresentation of jews in the Russian Socialist movement in general makes a similar mistake to the author of Trotsky quotation when he talks about his supposed '*insider knowledge*' of Trotsky in that he never once makes anything like a statement that one would attribute to someone who had had strong Marxist beliefs; which to be a Commissar one would have to have been, and often speaks with a strongly Orthodox Christian tone (8) more common to the Russian radical right (9) than to a repentant ex-Marxist. (10) This informs that this kind of writing; i.e. ascribing things to Trotsky which were patently not anything to do with, were common among the radical right at this time and the reason they ascribed them for Trotsky was that he was the most prominent of the jewish Bolsheviks; although later Lenin's jewish origins were discovered he was generally considered a Russian at the time, much as German anti-Communists and anti-Semites focused on the activities of Karl Radek in connection with the jewish-dominated nascent KPD. (11)

References

- (1) There are numerous biographies of Trotsky but perhaps the best of the pack are Isaac Deutscher, Ronald Segal and Robert Service's offerings as each offers a different and somewhat credible perspective on him.
- (2) As cited in Vladimir Stepin, 1993, '*The Nature of Zionism*', which has been made available in English translation at the following address: <http://radioislam.org/zionism/>.
- (3) <http://semiticcontroversies.blogspot.com/2008/10/in-brief-selenkov-quotation.html>
- (4) The ideological differences between Trotsky and Stalin have been rather overplayed in the literature on Marxism-Leninism as it has been conclusively shown that Stalin did believe in the doctrine of permanent revolution, but rather was more realistic about it than Trotsky was in that he wanted to build up the '*forces of revolution*' rather than simply expect the 'proletariat' to join the masses of the Red Army when the latter invaded as both Lenin and Trotsky did. On this point please see Ernst Topitsch, A. Taylor (Trans.), 1987, '*Stalin's War: A Radical New Theory of the Origins of the Second World War*', 1st Edition, St. Martin's Press: New York, pp. 11-62 and John

Mosier, 2010, *'Deathride: Hitler vs. Stalin: The Eastern Front, 1941-1945'*, 1st Edition, Simon & Schuster: New York, pp. 57-115.

(5) To quote part of Protocol 15 with a similar message: *'The principle guarantee of stability of rule is to confirm the aureole of power, and this aureole is attained only by such a majestic inflexibility of might as shall carry on its face the emblems of inviolability from mystical causes from the choice of God. Such was, until recent times, the Russian aristocracy, the one and only serious foe we had in the world, without counting the Papacy.'* (p. 193 in the 1934 'Defender' expanded edition of the Marsden translation). This obviously also assigns a similar role to Russia as the 'main bulwark' and 'intellectual centre' of the world against Bolshevism and the jews in much the same way as the Trotsky quotation does.

(6) http://rbth.ru/articles/2010/05/13/novoye_russkoye_slovo_100_years.html [Last Accessed: 09/01/2011]

(7) Anon., 1997, [1937], *'Trotsky and the Jews behind the Russian Revolution'*, 1st Edition, CPA Book Publisher: Boring, pp. 8-9

(8) Ibid, p. 13

(9) See for example Michael Kellogg, 2005, *'The Russian Roots of Nazism: White Emigres and the Making of National Socialism 1917-1945'*, 1st Edition, Cambridge University Press: New York, pp. 30-46

(10) For example compare to Freda Utley, 1940, *'The Dream We Lost: Soviet Russia Then and Now'*, 1st Edition, John Day: New York.

(11) For example see Nigel Jones, 2004, *'A Brief History of the Birth of the Nazis'*, 2nd Edition, Robinson: London, p. 61

No Comment Necessary (30/04/2011)

Saturday, 30 April 2011

'Just as G-d hardened Pharaoh's heart, so too, today, He is throwing dust into the eyes of our enemies, blinding them, dulling their senses, and leading them down a dead-end road - leading, not to Israel's destruction, rather to their own obliteration. This does not mean, under any circumstances, that we will have an easy time of it. Far from it. Dead end roads aren't necessarily short, and they can be quite bumpy. But the chances of another Arab state on our eastern border, created with Israel's blessings, have hit the lowest level they've been at in years.

It won't be easy, but we will prevent creation of a Palestinian state. G-d is watching over us. G-d is protecting us, even from ourselves. Thank G-d!' (1)

- David Wilder (Spokesman for the Hebron Jewish Community)

'No more promises for concessions and gestures if they drop their unilateral approach, but rather a clear and direct threat that their unilateral steps will be met by some unilateral steps of our own. But not merely declaratory unilateral steps, like the one they are planning, but some very practical ones – such as our annexation, with all that that entails, of all or parts of Judea and Samaria... We have many tools at our disposal... and we must be less restrained in using them.' (2)

- **Danny Dayan** (Chairman of the Yesha Council of Jewish Communities in Judea and Samaria)

'Today, Hashem is signaling to our holy Jewish soldiers and to the holy people in Eretz Yisrael that we should sit back, while our enemies kill each other.'

[...]

As the winds of war increase in intensity, and the rhetoric increases in belligerence, we will witness a mass exodus of people whose souls are not meant to be here. Arabs (both Moslem and Christian), Christians of all sorts, non-believers, and in general people who do not possess an irrational love for Eretz Yisrael will suddenly find reasons not to be here.' (3)

- **Rav Nachman Kahana** of Manhigut Yehudit

'Let us not discount the possibility that this thing could actually pass. Imagine if that happens: Jewish parents who undertake the ancient rite of brit milah in San Francisco would be subject to fines. Mohels could be sent to prison.' (4)

- **JWeekly Editorial**

'The Rabbinical Centre of Europe worries that non-Jews could be turned off by meat with the proposed labelling, causing a financial drain for the kosher industry.'

When a shechita slaughter goes wrong, making the meat not kosher, a slaughterhouse will still sell the steak or chicken filet to a non-Jewish market without a kosher label.

Without that non-Jewish business, the Rabbinical Centre of Europe fears that slaughterhouses would hike their prices, which would in turn force the kosher industry to increase its own prices for Jewish customers.' (5)

- **Ynet News**

References

(1) <http://www.israelnationalnews.com/News/News.aspx/143782> [Last accessed: 30/04/2011]

(2) <http://www.israelnationalnews.com/News/News.aspx/143782> [Last accessed: 30/04/2011]

(3) <http://jewishleadership.blogspot.com/2011/04/rav-nachman-kahana-on-parashat-kedoshim.html> [Last accessed: 30/04/2011]

(4) <http://www.jweekly.com/article/full/61599/ban-on-circumcision-is-way-over-the-line/> [Last accessed: 30/04/2011]

(5) <http://www.ynetnews.com/articles/0,7340,L-4059855,00.html> [Last accessed: 30/04/2011]

Is Jan Irvin on Mushrooms?

Sunday, 1 May 2011

I have recently acquired the 'book'; I somewhat object to calling it that as it contains lots of white space and almost 30 pages of pure pictures which seem to be there for no reason other than to be filler, by Jan Irvin called *'The Holy Mushroom'*. (1) It purports to be a '*critical re-evaluation*' of the Wasson and Allegro controversy over the use and role of hallucinogenic mushrooms; particularly *amanita muscaria* (or fly-agaric), in '*Judeo-Christianity*'. In reality the book is a somewhat enlightening source reader; with not particularly stimulating or even critical commentary, (2) on that contentious and obviously deeply personal debate over the origins of Christianity. (3)

It unfortunately has little to do with Judaism other than a number of brief mentions of the theory that the (Jewish) author of Genesis was out of his mind on; proverbial, magic mushrooms at the time that he dreamt up that weird book which; at the best of times, makes very little sense even in Christian theology which has tried; at least, to rationally explain it, while Jews; particularly of a Kabbalistic persuasion, seek to mystify it yet further by punning and allusion, which is something Allegro himself mentions in his path-breaking *'The Sacred Mushroom and the Cross'*. (4)

The book itself is rather unfortunately put together with a rather difficult to read format, which relies heavily on quotation without enough detailed and on-point analysis. Rather Irvin has a nasty habit of not really explaining his points in detail as well as not referring to necessary sources when making counter-assertions.

For example: Irvin tells us that Allegro was of Anglo-French origin (5) and certainly not the Italian Jew that Wasson alleges him to have been (one suspects his source is Judith Anne Brown's brilliant biography of Allegro [she is Allegro's much loved daughter]), but neglects to tell us on what basis he makes this counter-assertion which is about as useful as Wasson's un-evidenced claim that Irvin reproduces twice in two different source documents. (6) What Irvin thinks he is proving wrong is beyond me, but it won't convince anyone with an ounce of criticality that is for sure.

Interestingly Irvin doesn't follow up on the point that Wasson; to my mind, makes in that Wasson alleges that Allegro was appointed to the Dead Scrolls team because he was a Jew. He also claims that the '*£30,000*' that Wasson claimed Allegro was paid is beyond the boundaries of his research, with which claim I take the strongest possible objection as it is obviously of paramount importance to clear Allegro's name of this apparent slander; which Irvin implies it to have been, but Irvin simply runs away from it for reasons that I find inexplicable and infuriating.

Another strange habit of Irvin's is his referencing, which seems to suffer from a kind of inferiority complex in that he obsessively uses the '*et al*' that scholars use to indicate more than two or three authors; preventing needless writing of long lists of names, of a piece of work for

more than one author. I have no idea who taught Irvin to do this or whether he decided to do it himself, but it makes the reading experience even worse for it smacks of a dilettante trying to ape a scholar and is decidedly annoying. This proverbial egoistic blimp of unearned scholarly standing probably relates to the publication of Irvin and Hoffman's article on the Wasson controversy in the *Journal of Higher Criticism* in 2006, but this is conjecture on my part given Irvin's obsessive citation of this article in general without re-explaining the details. (7)

Somewhat stranger is the reference which reads '*Shroom*, 2007' (8) and for which there is no corresponding author listed in the bibliography. Now '*Shroom*'; slang for mushroom, is a rather odd thing to put in as a 'reference' so we must presume it is a simple mistake on Irvin's part, but one does get the picture of just how careless Irvin is if he leaves a reference reading '*Shroom*' in a book then we can hardly take him particularly seriously.

I think you get the picture: Irvin promises much but his book is really a very damp squib and the only particularly useful part of it is the source documentation that has been reproduced from Wasson and Allegro; which at least shows that Irvin did some research, but I am forced to wonder how Professors Rush, Ruck and Whitehead could praise a book with so many painful issues that should have been ironed out in first draft but have apparently not even been noticed.

This could have been a brilliantly executed piece of work to re-open the debate, but it has turned out to be something that one scrapes off the intellectual boot rather than a deadly boomerang against scholarly convention in support of Allegro's thesis (which has deep and I would say positive implications for anti-Semitism's case against jewry).

In short: don't purchase this book read the *Journal of Higher Criticism* article instead. It is far more illuminating. (9)

References

(1) Jan Irvin, 2008, '*The Holy Mushroom: Evidence of Mushrooms in Judeo-Christianity*', 1st Edition, Gnostic Media: United States

(2) This is perhaps a slightly harsh criticism as I am a supporter of Allegro's original interpretation, but I cannot help but find Irvin's moribund commentary rather annoying at the best of times as it seeks to remove Allegro wholly from blame for the failure of this thesis to gain widespread acceptance, which may have been novel but had Allegro stood up more effectively for it then his opponents; Wasson included, would have not had the field day they did have misinterpreting his work.

(3) Even the idea that their religious belief is the result of drug-induced visions being written down is of course enough to send the overly-religious into proverbial spasms and lead; as it did with Allegro, to nonsensical abuse and invented arguments being thrown at you.

(4) John Allegro, 1970, '*The Sacred Mushroom and the Cross*', 1st Edition, Hodder & Stoughton: London, pp. 19-28

(5) Irvin, p. 88

(6) Ibid, p. 83; 86

(7) I should add that the article is well-worth reading as it offers a powerful counter-argument to Wasson, which makes '*The Holy Mushroom*' all the more of an oddity unless Hoffman was the

real driver behind the research and writing of the 2006 article while Irvin was more along for the scholarly ride.

(8) Irvin, p. 93

(9) This is available at the following address: <http://www.egodeath.com/WassonEdenTree.htm>
[Last Accessed: 17/04/2011]

No Comment Necessary (01/05/2011)

Sunday, 1 May 2011

'Israel may be forgiven for failing to realize the current fiscal woes of the United States. After all, US military aid to Israel not only sailed unscathed through this month's passage of the 2011 budget, but reached the record level of \$3 billion.' (1)

- Josh Ruebner (National Advocacy Director of the US Campaign to End the Israeli Occupation)

'The battle between a New York Orthodox Jewish community and its neighbors over the local public school system took a drastic turn in late April as the school board's Orthodox president resigned amid corruption allegations, and a federal official confirmed a civil rights investigation into the district.

While the corruption allegations against the board president relate to his alleged conduct in another elected office, the rapid-fire developments come after months of growing tensions between the Orthodox-dominated board of Rockland County's East Ramapo Central School District and the district's non-Orthodox residents.

[...]

Oscar Cohen, a local NAACP member acting as spokesman for the Spring Valley NAACP, would not comment on the nature of the complaint his group submitted to the DOE.

[...]

The recently resigned school board president, Nathan Rothschild, was a particular proponent of that takeover plan. Though Rothschild told the Forward in January that he did not plan to run again for school board, his April 14 resignation came sooner than expected. The following day, he appeared in U.S. District Court in White Plains, N.Y., on felony mail fraud charges.

The charges stem from Rothschild's time as an elected commissioner of the Monsey Fire District. According to court documents, Rothschild allegedly settled a personal debt by setting up a real estate deal between the fire district and someone to whom he owed money. Neither the creditor nor the amount of the debt is specified in court documents, and a spokesman for the U.S. Attorney for the Southern District of New York declined to elaborate.

[...]

Also running for Rothschild's seat is Yehuda Weissmandl, a Rockland County property developer who faced criticism over a road that was mysteriously cleared through a fence between the Hillcrest School's playing fields and the Hasidic town of New Square, which abuts the school's back fence. Weissmandl, who was overseeing construction in the area at the time, said the fence had been knocked over by a tree.

The appearance of the road set off a firestorm, as the sale of the building had not yet been approved.' (2)

- The Jewish Daily Forward

'On the European level, the pro-Israel lobby is by far not yet so well organized as in the United States. Over the years it has, nevertheless, grown in both size and strength, "a phenomenon that has gone unnoticed by most of the mainstream media". The different Israel lobby groups in Brussels are "European Friends of Israel", "Transatlantic Institute", set up by the American Jewish Committee (AJC), "B'Nai B'rith", and "European Jewish Congress (EJC). These lobby organizations have strong links to the nationally based Israel lobbies in the European capitals. The strongest "Israel Lobbies" are found in France and Great Britain. These lobbies have only received scant attention from the mainstream media, "because journalists and editors work within a culture of censorship", writes Cronin. "Most of this censorship is self-censorship motivated by fear that newspapers which criticize the pro-Israel lobby will be branded anti-Semitic." In general terms, the author's findings and conclusions about Israel lobbies in Europe hold also true for Germany.' (3)

- Dr. Ludwig Watzal

'To Mike Abramowitz, the Shoah was one shoah too many.

That's why the former Washington Post reporter now heads the Committee on Conscience, established by the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum. His mission: alert the world to emerging crimes against humanity, wherever they may take place.

With the lessons of the Holocaust never far from his thoughts, on his radar today are places such as Darfur and the Congo, where atrocities continue unabated.

[...]

One region the committee does not focus on much is the Middle East. Though Israel is often accused of committing genocide against the Palestinians, Abramowitz says that is a "total misuse of the word."' (4)

- JWeekly News

"The attacks by some within the Jewish community, whether they consider themselves members

of the Reform Movement or those beyond the Reform Movement, on the character and reputation of Rabbi Jacobs are harmful to the spirit of unity and common cause that unites the Jewish people," said Abraham H. Foxman, ADL National Director. "There are enough enemies for us to fight against, and this is no time for the community to be divided. We should fight our enemies, not our differences."

[...]

"At a time when there are existential threats in abundance against the state of Israel and the Jewish people, we can ill-afford to have our community divided over who will comprise the next generation of leaders," said Mr. Foxman. "It is shameful that some are seeking to divide us at a time when Israel needs the American Jewish community's undivided attention and support more than ever." (5)

- The Anti-Defamation League of B'nai Brith

References

- (1) <http://electronicintifada.net/content/costs-arming-israel-can-no-longer-be-ignored/9873> [Last Accessed: 01/05/2011]
- (2) <http://forward.com/articles/137312/> [Last Accessed: 01/05/2011]
- (3) http://www.palestinechronicle.com/view_article_details.php?id=16827 [Last Accessed: 01/05/2011]
- (4) <http://www.jweekly.com/article/full/61626/world-needs-to-get-proactive-on-genocide-says-museum-exec/> [Last Accessed: 01/05/2011]
- (5) http://www.adl.org/PresRele/Mise_00/6028_00.htm [Last Accessed: 01/05/2011]

No Comment Necessary (02/05/2011)

Monday, 2 May 2011

'Four transports. Five [gas chamber (KR)] selections. An operation under full anaesthesia in a forced labour camp. He was taken from the Lodz Ghetto to Auschwitz-Birkenau and he survived. He immigrated to Israel. Fought in the War of Independence and was wounded in the war of 1956. He does not leave Israel and never boards a plane. He does not embark upon a tour of his roots. He always says that: 'I have seen enough of old Europe'. He is the most ardent Zionist I know. He does not open doors because the Gestapo may come. He listens to the news every hour. He does not forget and he does not forgive [the Germans/non-Jews (KR)]. My father remembers it all.' (1)

- Chen Kotes-Bar in Ma'ariv

'We, the Jewish people, were victims of racism, persecution and discrimination, but we never neglected the commandment to respect every person. Because every person, according to our tradition, is created in the image of God. Even in a darkened world we aspired, and will aspire

to be a light unto the non-Jews.

This is the significance of the State of Israel: To physically defend our people, and morally defend our tradition. Every citizen of Israel, regardless of religion or race knows that Israel is, and will be the most anti-racist country in the world.

Israel is the historical commemoration to the victims of the Holocaust. ' (2)

- Israeli President Shimon Peres

'One of the little-discussed effects of the economic recession on the Jewish community is that more rabbis in the later stages of their careers are finding themselves out of work.

And that's causing a good deal of bitterness and concern in the rabbinic community about the dwindling, and changing nature, of the profession.

"We're seeing the end of the rabbinate as we know it," a 56-year-old Reform rabbi insisted, noting that congregations today are looking for "comfort," not challenges. "The intellectual tradition of the pulpit has died," said the rabbi, who asked not to be named out of concern for the prospects for his next job search. ' (3)

- Gary Rosenblatt of The Jewish Week of New York

'I am dismayed by [the Jewish (KR)] individuals who claim to be proficient at treatments for which they have not been trained. A specialist or an expert should have post-Masters training with certification and proper supervision to assess, diagnose, and institute appropriate treatment vehicles for clients and their families suffering from sexual, Internet and other addictions.

I would also hope they have verification from rabbonim certifying they have the appropriate training and background to treat people in such sensitive areas. ' (4)

- Zeva Citronenbaum in a letter to The Jewish Press

'He quoted Dov Lior, the rabbi of Kiryat Arava, an illegal settlement near Hebron, who according to media reports told a conference organized to discuss how to get non-Jews in mandatory Palestine to leave the country for the sake of Jewish immigrants who had no roots in Palestine: "Today there is a lot of land in Saudi Arabia and in Libya, too. There is a lot of land in other places. Send them there." As scholar Khalid Amayreh reminds us, it was Lior, who in 1994 praised arch-terrorist Baruch Goldstein for massacring 29 Arab worshipers at the Ibrahimi Mosque in downtown Hebron, said peace in the Holy Land was out of the question because the Arabs wouldn't allow Jews to usurp the land. ' (5)

- Franklin Lamb

References

- (1) <http://www.nrg.co.il/online/1/ART2/237/021.html?hp=1&cat=402&loc=7> (in Hebrew: the English translation is my own) [Last Accessed: 02/05/2011]
- (2) http://www.mfa.gov.il/MFA/Anti-Semitism+and+the+Holocaust/Documents+and+communiques/Opening_ceremony_Holocaust_Remembrance_Day__1-May-2011.htm (The English translation from the original Hebrew is from the Israel Ministry of Foreign Affairs: I have altered it slightly to indicate actual meaning e.g. '*the non-Jews*' rather than the more neutral '*the nations*' as meant by Peres' use of נכרי). I should add that when Peres says that every person is created in the image of God; according to Judaism (of any stripe), it does not follow that they are all equal as that itself would be an explicit denial of the very premise of the status of the jews as a holy/chosen people that is fundamental basis of Judaism as a religion without which it simply ceases to be. [Last Accessed: 02/05/2011]
- (3) http://www.thejewishweek.com/editorial_opinion/gary_rosenblatt/where_have_all_rabbis_gone [Last Accessed: 02/05/2011]
- (4) <http://www.jewishpress.com/pageroute.do/48098> [Last Accessed: 02/05/2011]
- (5) http://www.palestinechronicle.com/view_article_details.php?id=16831 [Last Accessed: 02/05/2011]

Rabbi Dov Lior and the 'Inferiority of the Gentiles'

Monday, 2 May 2011

My attention was recently directed to; by anti-Zionist jew Richard Silverstein's reference to them (1), some comments earlier this year by the Chief Rabbi of Hebron; Dov Lior, on the issue of non-jews. (2) To be sure Rabbi Lior represents an extreme interpretation as he is part of the Israeli religious ultra-nationalist right, but we should note that what he argues; and he is a fully-accredited halakhic authority, could not be done without a reasonable basis in Judaism.

Kobi Nahshoni; for example, summarises his comments at a '*women's health conference*' at a fertility clinic (the Puah Institute) as a '*conservative stance*', which might surprise some readers given what Rabbi Lior is quoted as saying. To wit:

'If the father is not Jewish, what character traits could he have? Traits of cruelty, of barbarism! These are not traits that characterise the people of Israel.' (3)

Now aside from my disagreement with Rabbi Lior about the traits of non-jews in general (and I am no friend of other races including Rabbi Lior's own) and Rabbi Lior's silly use of an oxymoron (as '*Israel*' is Judaism refers to the jewish people as a biological entity [including apostates] not a place [the name of which is merely incidental and was almost '*Zion*' which would have been much more appropriate in terms of Judaism]). If a non-jew had said that (changing '*jewish*' to '*a gentile*' and '*the people of Israel*' to '*the nations*') then we can fairly assume that both Rabbi Lior and Nahshoni would have gone apoplectic and spent a few days; if not years, screaming about '*anti-Semitism*' (oy vey!), but instead Rabbi Lior's jewish

supremacist comments are merely styled '*conservative*'.

If Rabbi Lior is '*conservative*' then quite frankly I am not sure I even want to know what '*extreme*'; according to Nahshoni, would be! (4) Advocating sticking the gentiles into gas chambers perhaps? (5)

That said we can find anti-gentile comments easily enough in quite a few mainstream rabbinical works (6) and there have long been a host of such assertions coming out of Israel's radicalised and highly religious rabbinate. They also have a long pedigree in Jewish literature if one agrees with Elliot Horowitz's argument that the festival of Purim; celebrating the hanging of Haman and his sons and the massacre of thousands of gentiles (Persians) by the Jews for daring to want their country controlled by Persians not Jews, (7) has long been a source of provoked and unprovoked attacks by Jews on gentiles throughout the ages. (8)

Horowitz's argument to me is convincing as he covers all the bases and marshals an impressive array of evidence (from the writings of Maimonides on the issue of Amalek's survival to the work of the modern Jewish Holocaust-obsessed artist Arthur Syzk) that his controversial position; which is an intellectual breath of fresh air, is well founded and he even goes as far as to argue that host desecrations (explicitly) and ritual murders (implicitly) are the product of such phenomena. (9) When they have long been treated by Jewish and non-Jewish publicists and scholars as being mere figments of the diseased imagination of gentiles (although that said many of the non-Jews; such as Herman Strack, who have argued this have done so from ulterior motives [in Strack's case to convert Jews to the '*light of Christianity*'] and the motives of a Jew to assert such cases are nonsense is painfully obvious to any thinking person).

Rabbi Lior's comments; and Nahshoni's styling them as merely '*conservative*', is then in this light odious in the extreme in that it suggests that while some rabbis are so liberal as to prefer a known non-Jew's sperm to an unknown Jew's sperm (i.e. preferring to create a Mamzer (10) rather than a Foundling (11) both of which are regarded as lower biological classes in Judaism). Rabbi Lior is merely conservative in arguing that neither a Foundling or Mamzer is good enough for sterile Jewish couples and that the only way forward is to adopt children from known Jewish families.

Nahshoni understandably does not specify the meaning here; nor does Rabbi Lior in his recorded comments, but it would be interesting to know whether Rabbi Lior would place any further rules on this in terms of the other biological castes in Judaism. Could a sterile Jewish couple adopt a child of the Kohanim (the priestly class) or Levites (the helpers in the Temple) which are the two superior classes to the mere Israelite class that Rabbi Lior is presumably referring to? For that matter would a sterile Jewish couple of the Kohanim be able to adopt a Levite or an Israelite (as although they are all considered of Israel: they are of a lesser biological purity)? Inquiring minds would like to know Rabbi Lior!

Rabbi Lior's cause for concern is made very clear when he is quoted as stating that the problem with artificial insemination (by Jewish semen) is that there is the potential for it to be '*confused*' and/or '*mixed up*', which Rabbi Lior seems to suggest would make an automatic Foundling with a strong potential for a Mamzer as well.

This issue obscures some of the logic behind what Rabbi Lior is saying in so far as he is basing his assertion; that the '*mixing up*' is likely, on the idea of the '*evil inclination*' in Judaism of which gentiles are stated to be far more likely to be subject to as they regarded as being something between jews and beasts (hence their designation haAdam [mankind] as opposed to the superior Adam [man] i.e. jews). (12) Gentiles are also considered by jews to be on the same level as 'am ha-aretz (ignoramus) (13) and can be exploited as such (14) but are not considered ritually clean. (15) This is what Rabbi Lior means when he says that those who are of uncertain parentage [read mixed or purely gentile parentage] are not '*100% normal*' and are likely to become '*criminals*' in so far as non-jewish parentage; for Rabbi Lior, naturally means that a child is likely to become evil because he or she is far more subject to the '*evil inclination*' that apparently widely afflicts gentiles but not jews.

In essence what Rabbi Lior is trying to say is what the Baseler Rav said quite explicitly:

'Nobody can deny that we are a people. We are one through descent, blood and race. We have never mingled with our nations and have kept our blood pure. All of us are descendents of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob.' (16)

So therefore what Rabbi Lior is thinking is that the jews are a holy people and that the gentiles as lesser beings, (17) but the possibility that the clinic might employ a jew or gentile (both subject to the '*evil inclination*' but in differing degrees) who might then '*mix up*' the semen producing impure jews who are thought to be pure meaning in effect that the jew is mislabelled as say Israelite when in fact they should be a Mamzer, which has drastic affects given that this status dictates your position in the jewish community and who you can legally marry in Judaism.

Is Rabbi Lior's position halakhic?

You can bet your life it is!

The difference between him and other; more liberal, Rabbis is one of preference not of opposition. Rabbi Lior thinks that jewish blood shouldn't be polluted with evil gentile sperm (hence why he advocates the adoption of jewish babies by sterile jewish parents), while other Rabbis think it is preferable to give sterile jewish couple's Mamzers rather than allow Foundlings to make the blood of Israel '*impure*' as the Baseler Rav implicitly feared.

References

(1) http://www.richardsilverstein.com/tikun_olam/2011/01/12/israeli-orthodox-rabbi-to-infertile-jewish-couples-goyish-sperm-leads-to-criminality-barbarism/ [Last Accessed: 23/04/2011]

(2) <http://www.ynetnews.com/Ext/Comp/ArticleLayout/CdaArticlePrintPreview/1,2506,L-4006385,00.html> [Last Accessed: 23/04/2011]

(3) Ibid.

(4) I am reminded of the comments on Israeli rabbinic extremism in Israel Shahak, Norton Mezvinsky, 1999, '*Jewish Fundamentalism in Israel*', 1st Edition, Pluto Press: London, pp. 2-4

(5) One automatically thinks here of the revealing comments by Reform jew Peter Gay to the effect that the jews; as a whole, after the war wanted to murder the Germans (but now Hashem's

little darlings have decided to ‘forgive’ most of the Germans [as long as they keep giving them their nice taxes and the odd free arms cache]) (Peter Gay, 1978, *Freud, Jews and Other Germans: Masters and Victims in Modernist Culture*, 1st Edition, Oxford University Press: New York, pp. x-xi) and indeed were unleashed by the Allies in places with just this result (Leon de Poncins, Timothy Tindal-Robinson (Trans.), 1975, *State Secrets: A Documentation of the Secret Revolutionary Mainspring governing Anglo-American Politics*, 1st Edition, Britons: London, pp. 138-149).

(6) For example Maimonides’ *Moreh Nevukhim*, 3:51, which I quote as follows: *‘The people who are abroad* are all those who have no religion, neither one based on speculation nor one received by tradition. Such are the extreme Turks that wander about in the north, the Kushites who live in the south, and those in our country who are like these. I consider these as irrational beings, and not as human beings; they are below mankind, but above monkeys, since they have the form and shape of man, and a mental faculty above a monkey.’* *This should be taken to mean gentiles as the reference to the *‘people who are abroad’* is a veiled reference to *‘the nations’* meaning the gentiles or non-jews. The wide nature of Rambam’s comments on gentiles should be understood in that he attacks Negroes (Kushites), Europeans (the extreme Turks of the North) and the Arabs (those in our country [North Africa as Maimonides lived in Egypt at the time]). This in contrast to Hoffman who claims (on the strength of Shlomo Pines’ academic translation [which disagrees with me only in the identification of the *‘extreme Turks’* which I think is a polite way of saying *‘Europeans’* given the context (I’ve quoted from the Friedlander translation rather than using my own as it enables the average reader to check it if they so wish)]) they are merely directed against negroes (Michael Hoffman II, 2000, *Judaism’s Strange Gods*, 1st Edition, Independent History and Research Company: Coeur d’Alene, pp. 65-66) when they are obviously directed against both negroes and Arabs (the last bit Hoffman simply leaves out), while I include Europeans in that per my reading of the Hebrew text (which is a translation from the original Arabic) and its context.

(7) For more information please see the Book of Esther in the Old Testament as the festival of Purim is based on celebrating and given thanks for that chilling story of Jewish vengeance.

(8) Elliot Horowitz, 2007, *Reckless Rites: Purim and the Legacy of Jewish Violence*, 1st Edition, Princeton University Press: Princeton, pp. 149-167

(9) Ibid, pp. 172-174; 194-196

(10) Literally *‘Bastard’* i.e. a Jew who is the product of an unnatural union (incest, rape, child molestation, unmarried parents, having a non-Jewish parent etc).

(11) A Jew whose ancestry is uncertain hence the separate biological class.

(12) Jacob Neusner, 2004, *Making God’s Word Work: A Guide to the Mishnah*, 1st Edition, Continuum: New York, p. 74

(13) Solomon Ganzfried, *Kitzur Schulchan Aruch*, 124:13

(14) For example Jews are allowed to take interest from non-Jews but not Jews. Ibid, 106:7 and 90:1-23 which clarifies the pronouncements in 65:23-28 which forbid usurious interest but not interest relating to non-Jews (a similar discussion can be seen in 28:11).

(15) For example: Ibid, 28:8 & 10

(16) Arthur Cohn, Emile Marmorstein (Trans.), Jenny Marmorstein (Trans.), 1972, *Of Israel’s Teachings and Destiny: Sermons, Studies and Essays*, 1st Edition, Ahron Press: New York, p. 79

(17) Or as Chaim Bermant put it: *‘The difference between the Orthodox Jew, the non-Orthodox Jew and the gentile is that one is a miserable sinner, the other a cheerful sinner, and the third*

doesn't even know that he has gone wrong. And therein we touch on the concept of the Chosen.'
Chaim Bermant, 1979, *'The Jews'*, 2nd Edition, Sphere: London, p. 19

No Comment Necessary (04/05/2011)

Wednesday, 4 May 2011

'We can remember that the world was and potentially is a dangerous place for the Jews, with the Holocaust being the perennial reminder of the words of the prophet, Bilaam: "They (Israel) are a people who lives apart." We make pilgrimage to Auschwitz and Yad Vashem to help commemorate and sustain this memory. They tell the story and command us, "Never to forget."' (1)

- Donniel Hartman (President of the Shalom Hartman Institute)

'Anthony Loewenstein in his blog has referred to New Zealand's Prime Minister as "Jewish" in a clear ethnic slur in commenting about Key's support of Hosni Mubarak and a 'conservative' policy by the Kiwis on Egypt. Given that that Keys, whose mother was Jewish, is an agnostic and an occasional church goer, Loewenstein is way out of line.

Unless one thinks that there is a biological cause and effect relation between Key's ancestry and his foreign policy it is an irrelevant, facetious and insulting remark, particularly since as far as I know, there is no relationship between Key's mother's religion and NZ's foreign policy. It is true that Key is acknowledged by the NZ Jewish community and Israeli press as a friend of Israel, but Loewenstein has engaged in the same tactic as the extreme right when they talk about Key—that being a Jew is prima facie evidence of a particular 'loyalty'. Never mind that Malcolm Fraser's mother also had a Jewish background.' (2)

- Larry Stillman in a Letter to J-Wire

'Whoever likes Arabs should be given payback by God.

[...]

For heaven's sakes, another incident in which two Arabs stabbed two girls!! This didn't happen abroad, but here near our house! Sons of whores!!!!' (3)

- Shani Sevilia (Israeli Border Policewoman)

'What's more, assimilation has reached such frightening numbers in the United States that it is referred to as the "quiet Holocaust."

[...]

In addition to the above, we can say that the shock of these tragic events caused a sense of added responsibility regarding the study of Torah. Because so many Jews were willing to literally give their lives for the Torah, the generations that followed felt a great desire to attain new heights of strengthened Jewish identity. Now the value of Torah study was understood, now it was clear why they hate us.' (4)

- Rabbi Eliezer Melammed

'National Union party Chairman MK Yaakov ("Ketzaleh") Katz pushed the envelope of official ambiguity Monday regarding Israel's offensive nuclear capabilities. MK Katz said that Israel has the ability to destroy enemies like Iran and Syria "in a second's time."

The statement is most likely a reference to military nuclear capabilities, which Israel has never officially admitted to possessing. Speaking at a session of a Knesset lobby dedicated to teaching the lessons of the Holocaust, the fiery, Biblically-bearded MK Katz said the greatest revenge against the Germans, who desired to annihilate the Jewish people, is the Jewish nation's fertility and natural growth.' (5)

- Israel National News

References

- (1) http://hartman.org.il/Opinion_C_View_Eng.asp?Article_Id=665 [Last Accessed: 04/05/2011]
- (2) <http://www.jwire.com.au/letters/anthony-loewensteins-ethnic-slur-against-nzs-prime-minister/14959> [Last Accessed: 04/05/2011]
- (3) <http://www.haaretz.com/print-edition/news/policewoman-charged-with-assaulting-palestinian-posted-anti-arab-comments-on-facebook-1.359713> [Last Accessed: 04/05/2011]
- (4) <http://www.israelnationalnews.com/Articles/Article.aspx/10193> [Last Accessed: 04/05/2011]
- (5) <http://www.israelnationalnews.com/News/News.aspx/143845> [Last Accessed: 04/05/2011]

Of Skeptics, Skepticism and anti-Semitism

Wednesday, 4 May 2011

Many opponents of anti-Semitism; over the last 150 years, have; rightly or wrongly, labelled themselves as skeptics and have argued that anti-Semitism is ipso facto irrational because it can allegedly offer no categorical proof of its assertions regarding the jews. This trend has been particularly relevant in recent years with the rise of a new; more sophisticated, breed of philo-Semite who labels themselves as a '*skeptic*', while professing the most credulous beliefs. As someone who has been an avowed adherent of the skeptical method; in the actual as opposed to the rhetorical sense of the term, and came to anti-Semitism as the result of a detailed study of jewry I think it wise to offer some comment on the myth and reality of skeptics as a group as it is they who have often opposed; and continue to oppose, anti-Semitism.

Skepticism is based on the scientific methodology in that one does not simply believe because of what seems to be but rather one rigorously tests a given position with all the material and intellectual tools that one has available and continues to do ad infinitum. Now many so-called skeptics often interpret this to mean that their subjective viewpoint is wholly objective and will decide; regardless of evidence and often their own stated logic, a position that their own ideological position is opposed to asserting that it *'lacks evidence'* or utilize logical fiddlesticks to attack it. This is possible because those who claim to adhere to skepticism are; as a rule of thumb, far better educated than many of their opponents and thus are able to appear to make proverbial mincemeat out of their opponents by claiming anything from something being *'off topic'* (after bringing the topic up themselves) to using a negative case (and essentially absurd/nihilistic logic) to claim that if no evidence; set on an upwards moving goalpost, is forthcoming immediately they will consider themselves victorious.

Skeptics themselves have a tendency to see themselves as *'enlightened'* with the rest of the world as being *'in darkness'*; much as many religious and political groups do, and this results in a ironic attachment on the part of many skeptics to myths that prevent them; in the truest form of the methodology, considering alternative positions particularly those that they pejoratively associate with *'Woo'*. *'Woo'* for those unacquainted with the term derives from the notion that the non-skeptic looks at events and does not question them, but rather thinks something is or has been proven because they have heard reports, read a single tome on it and/or have seen it themselves. Skeptics as a rule tend to throw just about everything they dislike; rationally or irrationally, into this box, which includes such disparate items as revealed religion, conspiracy theories, paranormal research, non-mainstream science, mentally-ill people who think they have special powers and academic theories they personally disagree with.

Skeptics have a tendency; although to be equitable not all of them do so, to simply dismiss an idea just because it seems to them at first glance to be utterly absurd and then having made up their mind before hand that it is false they go out of their way to prove it is. A classic example is with revealed religion: skeptics have a nasty habit of making fun of religious people/believers in revealed religion and at various Skeptic conferences you will see not a little *'religion bashing'* and if you pay attention to skeptic boards such as the *'James Randi Educational Forum'* (or JREF as it is better known in the skeptic community) you will see it in about a quarter to half the threads (at a guesstimate) that provoke long discussions.

One could point out that if Godwin's law in reverse applies to *'White Nationalist'* boards such as Stormfront (i.e. that as a discussion grows longer the probability of a comparison involving jews approaches one) it also applies to skeptic boards such as JREF in modified form i.e. that as a discussion grows longer the probability of a comparison involving *'Woo'* approaches one. Of course Godwin's law actually has nothing to do with the used comparison per se, but rather is about losing a sense of proportion in an argument (as much as that can reasonably apply) and using an emotive and nonsensical comparison as an intellectual get out of jail free card. One can use Nazis, jews or Woo: as all three are the ultimate evil in all three different viewpoints while each viewpoint; and specifically each believer in that viewpoint, view what they believe as ultimately good (and if only the world writ large would listen to them).

Skeptics might not like being called on their own perceived law and having it applied to their beliefs, but it is quite valid to do so given that the group and forum dynamics are essentially the same but with different targets and socio-linguistic structures dependent on the group's dynamics, experiences and underlying assumptions.

In essence then skeptics as a rule are those who believe in general orthodoxy; although they might be somewhat heterodox on some points they will as a rule claim that everyone else is being quite irrational and not them, and see those opposed to fundamental and/or commonly-believed myths, scientific positions and/or purport beliefs generally perceived as contrary to their own as dangerous to society. Skeptics will; as a rule, usually try to dress up their criticism of other groups up in a '*scientific*' guise and attack them on just about any point they can possibly find; often quite rabidly, although what separates skeptics from other groups who do this; for example Zionists, is the high prevalence of postgraduate and specialist education, which means they are often; as a rule, better educated and prepared for a debate than their erstwhile opponents.

This is in many ways the strength and weakness of skepticism in that it provides them with the ability and the expertise to criticise the 9/11 '*Truth Movement*' in detail and also to take on the oddballs who believe in UFOs, crop circles, the Illuminati, satanic baby snatching and so on. However that said these same individuals and groups criticise the more prevalent and at least somewhat scientific ideas regarding the paranormal that don't match their own complete disbelief. Then you go into the far more reasonable ideas of racialism, anti-Semitism, historical revisionism and so forth and the skeptics go bananas dismissing these positions as everything from '*quackery*' and '*lunacy*' to a '*Nazi attempt to whitewash the past*' (which is incidentally a conspiracy theory that its proponents seem to have conveniently forgotten is such when they spend a good deal of their time attacking things both as such and waxing lyrical about their own '*rationality*').

In essence my point is that skeptics tend towards selective interpretation and intellectual myopia when it comes to reasonable ideas that they don't want to be true so they just assert they aren't and will accept any and all proof to help in that assertion. One thread that was supposedly a scientific critique of revisionist chemist and historian Germar Rudolf's on one forum for example didn't contain anything of the kind, but spent approximately two years calling Rudolf names for daring to satirize the German legal system's approach to '*holocaust*' evidence and declaring that was enough to discredit anything and everything Rudolf has ever written because he was supposedly '*dishonest*'. One wonders where such '*skeptics*' get off intellectually... well other than intellectual never-never-land of course.

The example does however demonstrate that in spite of their rhetorical declamations to the skeptical method most self-proclaimed skeptics are anything but: rather they are what the skeptic community in general calls '*pseudo-skeptics*' i.e. those professing to follow the skeptic method, but in fact using it as a propagandistic cover for their own preconceived ideas. One could even point out that many screaming about '*pseudo-skepticism*' on skeptic boards are actually '*pseudo-skeptics*' as if one looks at those who scream the loudest about it the more one forms the general opinion that these individuals and groups are hardly courageous, trepid and objective investigators but rather highly partisan individuals with a preconceived agenda who parade it under the mask of the skeptical method in the same vein as do the '*pseudo-skeptics*'.

This poisonous intellectual myopia ironically leaves skeptics open to gradual manipulation by those with similar intellectual equipment with the ability and means to manipulate; as well as suppress, data and information as well as general opinion. In fact if I was a conspirator I would see in the skeptics the obvious antidote to my opponents as with a relatively small investment both of resources one could turn this superficially intellectual formidable community into a critical '*amen corner*' protecting the conspiracy of which I was a part by the simple virtue that skeptics once inculcated into believing something that is apparently orthodox and with superficial intellectual support would form a formidable and eloquent intellectual defensive screen.

Skeptics don't seem to realise this, but you could; per an evolutionary view of society, see them as the intellectual defenders of orthodoxy against the unorthodox until such time as orthodoxy shifts and with it most of the skeptic community leaving those '*pseudo-skeptics*' who have a deep-seated interest in the former intellectual position behind decrying the changed line in the same was the Third International's member parties left behind numerous individuals when their line periodically shifted in accordance to the ECCI's (the Comintern) dictates from Moscow.

Of course skeptics as a rule rarely apply their own logic to themselves and fail to see that they too play an evolutionary role in society of which they are necessarily part. That said skeptics should take a long review of what they believe and why they believe it for without challenging the most fundamental ideas that you hold you can never even begin to realise the intellectual ideal that is the skeptical methodology.

I sincerely believe that if skeptics as a rule did this then they would come to a position akin to anti-Semitism and racialism; of whatever variety, and find that their comfort zone that had been unchallenged for so long was rather more simply an excuse for them to be intellectually lazy rather than intellectually skeptical.

Strabo on the Jews

Thursday, 5 May 2011

Strabo; the ancient Greek founder of geography, is perhaps one of the best known of all ancient writers, but he is also one of the least read. Strabo is well known to anti-Semites, because of the famous passage in his '*Geography*' that condemns the Jews; writ large, as a nation of thieves and robbers. To wit:

'Here it was, according to certain writers of myths, that Andromeda was exposed to the sea-monster; for the place is situated at a rather high elevation — so high, it is said, that Jerusalem, the metropolis of the Judaeans, is visible from it; and indeed the Judaeans have used this place as a seaport when they have gone down as far as the sea; but the seaports of robbers are obviously only robbers' dens.' (1)

An alternative translation of this passage however provides valuable context to this well-known

passage when it states the following:

'It is sufficiently elevated; it is said to command a view of Jerusalem, the capital of the Jews, who, when they descended to the sea, used this place as a naval arsenal. But the arsenals of robbers are the haunts of robbers. Carmel, and the forest, belonged to the Jews.' (2)

This alternative translation tells us that Strabo's meaning here is not that the jews are a nation of robbers in the sense that they will each individually go and steal your food, but they are rather a nation of robbers in the sense that they will go and steal your land and squat on it.

This is confirmed by a slightly later comment of Strabo's when he states:

'In the interval is Gadaris, which the Jews have appropriated to themselves, then Azotus and Ascalon.' (3)

So what Strabo is telling us in this passage; which clarifies the former; more famous, passage, is that the jews have occupied the lands of their neighbours and now see them as part of their holy inheritance, which Strabo later informs us is the case when he asserts (4) that Moshe selected the location for Jerusalem on the basis that it was largely land without value, proceeded to teach the jews that he was the chosen of God and then set his rather simple (5) followers to squat upon other people's land. (6)

This imperialistic ambition of the jews; to conquer by guile or force, the lands of others is confirmed by a comment appended to the famous quote in some translations of it. To wit:

'The district was so populous that the neighbouring village Iamneia, and the settlements around, could furnish forty thousand soldiers.' (7)

It might be argued here that Strabo is merely using a military analogy to express the populousness of an area and that is indeed a viable interpretation, but it what it leaves unanswered is why Strabo in this case uses a military analogy to express populousness rather than say the amount of food consumed or the crowded nature of settlements etc. No the military analogy must be taken as analogous with Strabo's own later comments (8) which indicates that he saw the jews as undertaking both a demographic and military war of conquest against their neighbours as otherwise a military analogy would be rather vacuous.

This military adventurism had inevitably lead to the original jewish population becoming mixed in with various others and Strabo specifically mentions the Indumeans, Egyptians, Arabs and Phoenicians as being ethnic sub-groups that had been partially or wholly subdued in the area of Judea; especially the hinterland of Jerusalem, by the jews as part of their policy of conquest. (9)

Strabo attributes; as did many classical authors (10), to the jews an Egyptian origin; based off the tales and traditions which went on to form the Book of Exodus, and thus attributed to the jews an antiquity that is hardly deserved and whose main prop of support is the Egyptian historian Manetho that we know principally through the writings of the Hellenized subversive jewish historian Josephus' *'Against Apion'*. (11) However he also hints that the jews are a hodgepodge

of different Semitic groups when he notes that there are many different things believed about the Temple of Jerusalem, but that the Egyptian ethnic sub-group is probably the origin of the present jews indicating that although he ascribes to an original Egyptian origin: he does not see the Egyptian ethnic sub-group as their only origin due to the '*mixing*' of ethnic sub-groups in Judea. (12)

Strabo goes on to outline the role of Moses; whom he refers to as an Egyptian Priest (13), in the formation of the jewish people. Strabo goes on to describes something of what he asserts that jewish tradition; as this time, tells us of Moses' actual beliefs and he focuses; understandably, on the fact that Moses believed in a God which was not represented by idols but rather was invisible and everywhere. It is tempting to point out that given his supposed antiquity Moses could have potentially have been a priest of Akhnaten's cult of the solar disc at Amarna who was driven out with his die-hard followers when the traditional Egyptian priestly class re-asserted itself.

This theory is not new; having first been asserted by the infamous jew Sigmund Freud in his '*Moses and Monotheism*', and has been much debated since and this author inclines towards it as it would explain much of the parallels between Atenist religion and early Judaism as well as more importantly why the ancestors of the jews allegedly fled Egypt with all their booty in hand (which has two other explanations one of which is equally cogent). That said significant and original objections to this theory have been stated by Egyptologists based on the study of what somewhat scanty evidence we have about Atenism from archaeology and source material, but in spite of this their arguments are still somewhat at a loss to cogently explain the odd rise of monotheism; not the most natural of intellectual evolutions from animism or polytheism, among the Semitic near east without some kind of external stimulus that could have been given by an Atenist Moses. (14)

Strabo's description of Moses asserts him to be a kind of religious innovator and it is tempting to ascribe to Strabo some sympathy with what he understood of Mosaic religion; which was based on his comments probably not a great deal, but to do so would; I think, be unfounded as Strabo more than likely saw the jews as an unusual cult with a wide following that he found interesting enough to describe to his readers in his '*Geography*'.

Strabo does however make one particular comment of note regarding the jews who were to be permitted to sleep in the Temple '*where they might dream both for themselves and others*' (15), which is both potentially damning and suggestive in regard to the origins of much of the Old Testament as an accurate historical record.

The two most likely interpretations suggested by this particular comment are firstly that what Strabo is talking about is the beginnings of the jewish priestly class and the fact that they per Strabo's earlier comments were merely dreaming about their future conquest of the world. This is perhaps the more flattering interpretation; although one can rather suspect that jews would kvetch about it, but the second is far more damning and suggestive in that it was the custom in the ancient world to induce; prophetic and otherwise, '*dreams*' with hallucinogenic drugs; most notably the amanita muscaria mushroom (16), which would directly suggestive that a lot of jewish ideas about the divine come from their ancestors interest in and use of hallucinogenic drugs (which would certainly be ironic considering the long-time jewish claim that the Christian

Messiah Jesus [or Joshua bar Joseph if we want to get technical] was either a madman or a drug-user (17)) and indeed this very point has been argued persuasively by Wasson as long ago as 1968 (and has yet to receive a cogent opposing response from scholars of Judaism and/or Jewish history). (18)

One is forced to wonder: are hallucinogenic drugs kosher or treif?

These two explanations are not mutually exclusive and either or both could be true: in fact we may suggest that both instances are most likely to be true as one of the presumptions on which Judaism has come to be based; Tikkun Olam (usually translated as *'healing the world'* although; as with many translations, it does not do the actual meaning justice), assumes that the Jews; as a biological group (for Judaism; in spite of the assertions of certain popular handbooks on it, is based on the notion of a biological Israel descended from Abraham not the Christian notion of a spiritual Israel), have to rule the world in order to turn it to the worship of Hashem (who they view; rightly or wrongly, as the one true God) and in order to achieve this; as Strabo himself implies, the Jews at that time thought to conquer and subdue neighbouring territory. Indeed the Jews; as a group, tried to do just this during their several revolts against Rome that so annoyed the very tolerant and patient Romans; leading to Jewish historians demonizing them, that they enacted an almost unique policy in the history of the Empire: remove the Jews from their apparent homeland and ban their religion completely within it.

Strabo's next comment on Moses is even more revealing as it suggests that not only did Moses allow and encourage the use of hallucinogenic drugs by the attendants/priests/oracles/prophets of his *'temple'* to induce visions but that Moses actively recruited new adherents with these very same hallucinogenic drugs. This might sound absurd but Strabo's words are clear:

'By such doctrine Moses persuaded a large body of right-minded persons to accompany him to the place where Jerusalem now stands.' (19)

One might argue that this is merely a reference to the section of text before which does contain the mention of Moses' unusual belief system and his attempts to propagate it, (20) but what suggests that this is not the whole truth is that this statement is directly after the presence of a passage that can most reasonably be explained to be an allusion to hallucinogenic drug usage by senior figures inside Judaism in Moses' time. We do not here seek to argue that hallucinogenic drugs were the only way Moses recruited followers, (21) but we would be remiss if we did not point out that it is likely that Moses did engage in such activity if Strabo's account is correct on this point which we have little reason to doubt in spite of the scholarly abuse hurled at classical authors for *'not being acquainted with the Torah'* among other things, but such scholars do not seem to realise (or perhaps don't want to admit) that classical authors on Jews and Judaism are more likely to be reliable than the historical claims of the much revised Torah and Tanakh (which have over the last hundred years been called into serious doubt if not outright rejection).

Indeed this interpretation of a partially drug-induced origin of Judaism is later confirmed by Strabo's comments that *'he taught that their defence was in their sacred things and the Divinity'* (22) as opposed to their defence being *'in arms'*, which would suggest that Moses; if what Strabo asserts is correct, placed his trust not so much in arms but the allure of his ideas, the magnetism

of his personality and potentially in the lure of pleasure in the form of hallucinogenic drugs to secure and expand his influence in the region. This general interpretation is further confirmed by Strabo's own point that his religion would not be '*a burden*' to those who adopted it (23): the interpretation of which is difficult at best in terms of a simple religious allure in so far as Moses' cult of Hashem (or YHWH if we want to again get technical) is unlikely to not have had some ritual burdens which the more orthodox interpretation would suggest, but the more unorthodox interpretation seems to this author more likely to have been the case in so far as the '*burden*' referred to should potentially be understood to be the lack of '*burden*' felt by users of narcotics when they get their first and subsequent '*fixes*'. (24)

This is once again further supported by Strabo's clarification of the form that Moses' governance took when he asserts that he '*established no ordinary kind of government. All the nations around willingly united themselves to him, allured by his discourses and promises.*' (25)

How are we to explain this assertion; if Strabo is correct to make it, without a physical/material incentive such as either pleasurable experience or gold/silver/trading opportunities?

I ask this rhetorical question as an intellectual device to point to the fact that Strabo earlier in the same passage tells us that Moses had chosen an uncontested and barren spot on which to build his cultic kingdom, but yet suddenly Moses is able to gain the support of '*all the nations*' around him willingly. Either he was a very remarkable man or he had something unique to offer: such as hallucinogenic drugs.

That said we may counter that if the Book of Exodus in the Torah is correct it could actually answer this conundrum in that we are told in that Moses and his rag-tag band of followers had taken much of the wealth of Egypt with them when they departed (which necessitated the army that Pharaoh sent after them and which was promptly drowned on command by Moses' blood-thirsty God). If Moses indeed had the wealth of Egypt at his disposal it would account for his sway over the local tribes and their willingness to follow him as he could pay them well for their services and enrich their ruling elite in the process. It would also remove the necessity of such an unorthodox explanation as the use of hallucinogenic drugs in foreign policy and seducing the aboriginal tribal leadership, but it does not rule it out as a possibility if a more unlikely one than simple gold and silver but more likely than novel religious ideas and a cult of personality.

It is interesting to note that Strabo's point that Moses created a government '*like no other*' (26) does suggest that Moses was indeed a cultic figure who ruled by a mix of ruthless rooting out of opposition, religious fanaticism, access to large reserves of wealth and an all-pervasive cult of personality. Strabo's note indicates this as a theocracy would have been rather out of place in the Middle East at this time and other ancient and classical civilizations tended to have religion as an arm of the state rather than be ruled by their religious leaders (although like the Spartans they could be heavily influenced by them).

This interpretation can be confirmed by the next section of Strabo's comments on Moses' governance which is that the Jews after Moses were ruled over by priests and tyrants. (27) Strabo also notes that these later Jewish leaders were '*superstitious*' and were categorically different from Moses and those leaders immediately following him. This would suggest that there was

something very different about Moses and the early jewish religious leadership compared to the better known later jewish religious leadership. Indeed Strabo implies a distinct difference when he declares that these later rulers were primarily the robbers he describes earlier (28) when he points out that their '*tyrannical government produced robbery*' as the '*rebels*'; i.e. the jews, '*plundered both their own and neighbouring countries*'. (29) Strabo specifically mentions both Syria and Phoenician as being the principle external targets for this jewish avarice and imperialism, which he compares unfavourably with the '*willing nations*' who allied with Moses.

Perhaps the likeliest explanation for this can be found in the fact that Moses' reserves of wealth had by this later period dried up and having situated Jerusalem and its hinterland on '*barren*' land Moses had made it impossible for the first bandit jewish state to survive without launching wars of conquest against its aboriginal neighbours. Indeed Strabo explicitly tells us that these wars; and associated robbery, were not undertaken for the profit of the jews writ large, but rather for the jewish elite who no doubt desired to replenish the depleted reserves of wealth that had caused their state to come into existence in the first place. Or perhaps more simply they might have desired to conquer the world for their invisible, omnipotent and overtly genocidal God that he; through them, could '*repair the world*' with a sea of non-jewish blood and the ruling elite could have a shiksa or two for themselves as disposable concubines in payment for their trouble.

So end Strabo's interesting comments on the jews and so does this somewhat unorthodox analysis. I have advanced many unusual and even heterodox ideas/theories in the course of this short article, but they are meant to stress that when dealing with jews we should be open to novel interpretations which open up the discussion of the jewish question to both orthodox and unorthodox scholarly analyses. For too long anti-Semitism has been hide-bound within a nineteenth century intellectual framework and it is well past time that it entered the twenty-first century as a radical new intellectual and political alternative.

References

- (1) Strab. 16.2.28
- (2) Ibid.
- (3) Ibid. 16.2.29
- (4) Ibid. 16.2.37
- (5) Ibid. 16.2.37; 38. Strabo suggests this was the case when he asserts that Moses did not want his followers to be '*burdened*' by '*absurd practices*' and '*great expense*', which we may take to mean he sought out the most gullible to follow him (and even then they were sufficiently lacking in gullibility to take his claim to have received divine laws without at least some written proof). This is confirmed when Strabo clarifies himself by pointing out that Moses sought to '*allure*' people to him by '*discourses and promises*', which for somebody with relatively little power is a minor miracle unless he had specifically targeted the most gullible of the locals much like his later fellow Semitic parallel: the 'Prophet' Mohammed.
- (6) The parallel between the founding of the land of Judea and the modern Israel is both obvious and striking in that both were groups who had no substantive claim to the territory in the first place, both used systematic violence and coercion to achieve their objectives and both followed an explicitly messianic ideology lead by leaders who conceived themselves as prophets and combined their '*prophetic*' abilities with apocalyptic pronouncements. For example compare

Strabo's account of the jews to the recent analysis of the Zionist movement in Ilan Pappé, 2007, *'The Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine'*, 1st Edition, One World: London.

(7) Strab. 16.2.28

(8) Such as that found in Ibid. 16.2.29 where Strabo notes that the jews have *'appropriated'*; i.e. conquered by guile or force, some territory bordering that which they had previously captured. It is also suggested in 16.2.34 by Strabo that the jews engaged in guile and *'sedition'* to achieve their objectives in this case of the Indumeans in order to win them temporarily over to their side so they can continue their imperialistic dreams.

(9) Ibid. 16.2.34

(10) Tacitus in his *'Histories'* and Diodorus Siculus in his *'The Library of History'* (notably in 1.28 and 1.55) for example assume an Egyptian origin for the jews as did later; more polemical, classical writers such as Celsus and (the Emperor) Julian who used the myth of the ancient nature of Judaic worship as part of the basis for their attacks on Christianity. It is also noteworthy that Suetonius in Tib. 36 mentions both the Egyptian and Judaic cults together as poisons to Roman society that had to be suppressed by the authorities because of their growing influence and exhortations to subversions and degeneracy on the part of their adherents. This is also confirmed by his later comments about the subversive nature of the jews in Claud. 25.

(11) Fortunately in recent times there has been an increasing and healthy skepticism regarding the veracity of this classical jewish historian who has for so long been the basis for the jewish claims to antiquity and the central prop in supporting such weird intellectual aberrations as Christian Zionism because he; it has claimed, mentions Jesus. That said in spite of his lack of veracity Josephus is an unused resource among anti-Semites; a fact recognised by the late great Dr. William Pierce, as Josephus' principal two works *'Jewish Antiquities'* and *'The Jewish War'* were two of the very few books written by a jewish author stocked by his National Vanguard imprint and bookstore.

(12) This is strongly supported by recent genetic studies that have indicated that the jews and their Palestinian foes are actually genetic cousins even in the case of such phenotypically dissimilar groups as Ashkenazi jews and the darker breed of Palestinian Arabs. This is in spite of weird claims dating from the 1940s and 1950s among anti-Semites that the Ashkenazim are descended from the Khazarian Khanate, which have been thoroughly debunked by Brook who appears to have been misquoted (in regards to emphasis) by Michael Hoffman II, 2000, *'Judaism's Strange Gods'*, 1st Edition, The Independent History and Research Company: Coeur d'Alene, p. 110, but can be corrected by quoting Brook's 2nd Edition of *'The Jews of Khazaria'* (Hoffman quotes the first edition so I am giving him something of the benefit of the doubt):

'Existing evidence, taken as a whole, demonstrates that while Eastern European Jews are descended both from the Jews of the ancient Middle East and from various non-Jewish peoples (including Slavs and possibly Khazars), the Israelite element constitutes the majority of their ancestry.' (Kevin Alan Brook, 2006, *'The Jews of Khazaria'*, 2nd Edition, Rowman & Littlefield: New York, p. 234)

(13) Strab. 16.2.35

(14) For a brief outline of the Amarna period in Egypt please Jacobus van Dijk, 2003, *'The Amarna Period and the Later New Kingdom'* in Ian Shaw (Ed.), 2003, *'The Oxford History of Ancient Egypt'*, 2nd Edition, Oxford University Press: New York, pp. 269-281. As to Strabo's allusion to Africans in Strab. 16.2.35 it should be noted that this refers to Africa as meant to the classical world not; as Afro-centrists would have it, as a reference to Negroes.

(15) Ibid. 16.2.35. We should understand the *'Temple'* here to be metaphorical and not a direct

allusion to the Temple at Jerusalem.

(16) The most famous use of this hypothesis is to be found in John Allegro's; brilliant but much derided, 1970, *The Sacred Mushroom and the Cross: A Study of the Nature and Origins of Christianity within the Fertility Cults of the Ancient Near East*, 1st Edition, Hodder & Stoughton: London. An extended defence and in many ways brutal demolition of Allegro's critics can be found in Michael Hoffman's 2006 article; *Wasson and Allegro on the Tree of Knowledge as Amanita*, in the Journal of Higher Criticism, which maybe found at the following address: http://www.egodeath.com/WassonEdenTree.htm#_Toc135889181.

(17) Jews have repeatedly had trouble about their ancestor's (and their own) comments about the Christian Messiah most notably in the various disputations between Christian theologians and jewish rabbis that were organised in Europe in the Middle Ages. For example see Hyam Maccoby (Ed. and Trans.), 1993, *Judaism on Trial: Jewish-Christian Disputations in the Middle Ages*, 2nd Edition, The Littman Library of Jewish Civilization: London and Daniel Lasker, 1977, *Jewish Philosophical Polemics against Christianity in the Middle Ages*, 1st Edition, Ktav: New York.

(18) R. Gordon Wasson, 1968, *Soma: The Divine Mushroom of Immortality*, 1st Edition, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich: New York, p. 221. Wasson responded to some of his critics in his later 1971 second edition, which includes; in summation, his response to Brough, which may independently be found in R. Gordon Wasson, 1971, *Soma and the Fly-Agaric*, Ethno-Mycological Studies, Monograph No. 2, Botanical Museum of Harvard University: Cambridge.

(19) Strab. 16.2.36

(20) Strab. 16.2.35

(21) There are clear historical precedents for this in the later cult of the Assassins who were recruited by using various drugs and subterfuges and in essence tricked; as Moses may have done, into believing that the leader of cult held the keys to the gate of Eden itself. It is not much of an intellectual stretch to see Moses as the leader of a small and fairly radical cult based on his will and personality rather than the more usual hagiographic vision of him as a principal founder of three of the major world religions. A similar interpretation is offered in Dan Merkur, 2000, *The Mystery of Manna: The Psychedelic Sacrament of the Bible*, 1st Edition, Park Stress Press: Rochester.

(22) Strab. 16.2.36

(23) Ibid.

(24) Indeed Strabo's comment that Moses did not encourage *'absurd practices'* could be held to tentatively support this in so far as such practices would have been fairly normal in Strabo's day. The problem with this interpretation of this particular passage is that it uses a value judgement on Strabo's own possible meaning, but as we do not know the level of Strabo's knowledge of the use of hallucinogenic drugs in the various oracles it would be unwise to assert positively that he was aware of this. For the uses of hallucinogenic drugs in the Greek oracles see R. Gordon Wasson, Carl Ruck, Albert Hofmann, 1978, *The Road to Eleusis: Unveiling the Secret of the Mysteries*, 1st Edition, Harcourt Brace: New York and Carl Ruck, Clark Heinrich, Blaise Staples, 2000, *The Apples of Apollo: Pagan and Christian Mysteries of the Eucharist*, 1st Edition, Carolina Academic Press: North Carolina.

(25) Strab. 16.2.36

(26) Ibid.

(27) Ibid. 16.2.37

(28) Ibid. 16.2.28

(29) Ibid. 16.2.37

No Comment Necessary (06/05/2011)

Friday, 6 May 2011

'An "unprecedented" gold hoard of rare American coins, buried by a German Jewish man in Hackney, has been dug up and will now be returned to his family.

Retired accountant Max Sulzbacher, whose late father, Martin, hid the gold, said he was "surprised but delighted by the discovery, which has come to light almost 70 years after the coins were buried." Max, 81, who lives in Jerusalem, plans to use the sale of the coins to reward the finders and to restore his family's gravestones in the Jewish cemetery in Enfield.

Martin Sulzbacher fled to Britain from Nazi Germany in the late 1930s and put the 80 "Double Eagle" \$20 coins, which date back to 1854, in a City of London safe. ' (1)

- The Jewish Chronicle

'We receive well over 1,000 reports each year from members of our community, most of whom live in large and vibrant centres of Jewish life, but others are literally the only Jew in their village. Many of them have details of antisemitic incidents, or extremist activities, and all are treated with total respect and confidentiality.

Partnering with Maccabi GB, our Streetwise programme reaches approximately 10,000 Jewish children annually. On campus, we partner the Union of Jewish Students, producing joint booklets on coping with antisemitism, assisting victims of antisemitism and extremism, and helping make representations to campus authorities.

Then there is the range of communal organisations with whom we are in constant communication and regular working partnership on all of our issues. Foremost are the Board of Deputies and regional representative councils but there are many others, working within and beyond the community. Every relationship is based upon CST's expertise and reliability; as demonstrated beyond all doubt by the scrutiny our facts, figures and analyses have been regularly subjected to by independent MPs, Home Office experts, Police criminologists, European Union officials, and journalists. ' (2)

- Gerald Ronson (Chairman of the Community Security Trust)

'Top city banker Eric Daniels has helped raise £45,000 for Jewish Care by being the guest speaker at a business breakfast event. ' (3)

- Something Jewish

'We have not learned the lesson of the Holocaust. The attempt to buy quiet by ignoring the tragic

situation of those who find themselves on the front lines always leads to widespread tragedy. The destruction of Gush Katif was preceded by the destruction of the home of Livnat Ozeri, widow of Nati Ozeri, may G-d avenge his blood, who was murdered in his Hebron home by an Arab terrorist. Just two short months after the murder, the widow and her five small children were driven out of their home by Israel's police on a cold, rainy night, and dumped on a sidewalk in Jerusalem. Their home was destroyed. The faith-based public by and large ignored the outrage.

Avoiding the facts and shirking responsibility for our war against the murderers of Jews only tightens the international noose around Israel's neck. When the IDF insists that the murder of Jews in Shechem is nothing more than an unfortunate mishap that does not require it to hunt down the murderers - the lives of Jews in Tel Aviv are in danger.' (4)

- Moshe Feiglin (Israeli Politician and leader of the Manhigut Yehudit faction of the ruling Likud party)

'The fifth AIEF Education Seminar for Christian Leaders returned March 28 after a week in Israel comprised of excellent briefings including journalists, social services leaders, and both Israeli and Palestinian policy makers.

[...]

Three prominent national leaders participated in the trip and all members returned with a new understanding of the complicated issues Israel faces each day.' (5)

- The American Israel Public Affairs Committee

References

- (1) <http://www.thejc.com/news/uk-news/48309/dad-buried-%C2%A380k-gold-hackney-back-yard> [Last Accessed: 05/05/2011]
- (2) <http://www.thejc.com/comment-and-debate/comment/48281/cst-represents-all-jews> [Last Accessed: 05/05/2011]
- (3) http://www.somethingjewish.co.uk/articles/2914_banker_helps_charity.htm [Last Accessed: 05/05/2011]
- (4) http://www.jewishisrael.org/eng_contents/articles/71/articleA7109.html [Last Accessed: 05/05/2011]
- (5) <http://www.aipac.org/1680.asp#44463> [Last Accessed: 05/05/2011]

Rabbinical Council of Europe admits to the Kosher Food Tax

Friday, 6 May 2011

Ynet News; the right-wing Israeli news website, is reporting that the European Parliament is currently considering whether or not to pass into a law a bill that would mean that corporations would have to label their meat products with an indication of how the meat was slaughtered. (1)

This has caused a number of rabbinical authorities; who make their living off '*accrediting*' others to produce kosher food products and those who sell them on (to unsuspecting gentiles), to go into denunciation mode and declare that this yet another sign of '*anti-Semitism*'.

The points of interest in this story are threefold to my mind:

A) The claim; made by Rabbi Arye Goldberg, that Shechita (the kashrut method of slaughtering an animal) is one of the most '*humane*' there is.

B) The assertion; made by the Rabbinical Centre of Europe, that the cost of kosher meat for jews is effectively subsidised by unknowing gentile buyers of meat products.

C) The assertion; again made by Rabbi Arye Goldberg, that the kosher industry; which I believe is the best way to describe it, bank rolls jewish institutions throughout Europe.

The first point of interest to us Rabbi Goldberg's un-evidenced assertion that Shechita is one of the most humane methods of animal slaughter known to man (forgive the slight pun). Now what is interesting to note here is that the Ynet article goes into some brief details of other common methods of slaughtering animals for food from electric shocks to bolt guns, but what is interesting is what it doesn't mention in relation to Shechita. In that it involves cutting an animals throat [which is the only point Ynet mentions and quickly moves on] (while it is still alive and traditionally while it is held down with the ritual slaughterer sawing through its throat) and the Rabbi supervising the slaughtering chanting/singing prescribed prayers while the treif blood spurts out on the floor and the food animal dies slowly (and presumably fairly painfully).

Now I don't know about you, but I would much rather get by heart stopped by a massive electric shock or get a bolt gun turning my brain stem into pulp (which takes but a second and is pretty much painless unless done badly [which government regulation largely prevents]) before I was butchered. Rather than being held down by jews and then having my aorta sawn through by a ritual slaughterer while a Rabbi chanted/sang prescribed prayers in honour of the feast they were about to partake of from my body. If anybody wants to see how vile Shechita is then you need but search for videos of it online (there are plenty about) or watch the last part of '*Die Ewige Jude*', which contains footage (considered too shocking originally for German audiences) of such a slaughter taking place in 1939 or 1940. (2)

I really do find it utterly laughable that a jew would have the sheer chutzpah to claim that Shechita is one of the most '*humane*' methods there is: I presume therefore that Rabbi Goldberg believes that having your throat slit and bleeding out is an appropriate method of capital punishment? As if he does not then he is something of a hypocrite.

So Rabbi Goldberg you were saying something about Shechita not being '*barbaric*'? If it isn't '*barbaric*'; like you claim, then surely you can tell us all about how you go about performing such a slaughter and explain to us why it is so very superior to our goyische ways of slaughtering food animals as painlessly as possible?

The second point of interest for us is the implication of the Rabbinical Centre of Europe that if

the bill was to be passed and implemented by all member states then it would result in major financial loss for jewish slaughter houses as:

'When a shechita slaughter goes wrong, making the meat not kosher, a slaughterhouse will still sell the steak or chicken filet to a non-Jewish market without a kosher label.' (3)

So what we are being told here is that jews sell non-jews their waste products (the meat not worthy for their consumption), which; it is implied, they would not buy if they knew how the meat was slaughtered as Shechita is by any standard barbaric (and non-jews tend to like to cause the least amount of pain). In essence what the Rabbinical Council of Europe is worried about is that they won't be able to sell their waste produce for the non-jews to eat without having to tell them that this was the case.

The Rabbinical Council of Europe is; in essence, condoning a form of grey-area fraud; i.e. it isn't illegal but it is exactly legal either, by selling their waste product as meat that had been killed in accordance with non-religious standards (i.e. without any need to slit the animal's throat and sing/chant prayers while it is spurting blood in its death-throes) when in fact it has been killed according to religious specifications in ways that the Rabbinical Council of Europe explicitly suggest non-jews; except Muslims and the odd Christian sect, wouldn't approve of.

The Rabbinical Council of Europe also kindly tell us that their primary motivation for concern isn't the fact they have been essentially lying to consumers for their own organisational profit for years (as they tell us; through implication, in the article that they are partially supported by funds from these same kosher slaughterhouses), but that it might result in high meat prices for jews because their kosher meat isn't being subsidised by selling the waste produce to non-jews anymore. (4)

The third point of interest that meat slaughtered by the Shechita method provides funding for jewish communal organisations is also explicitly stated by the article when the indomitable Rabbi Goldberg is quoted by the article as follows:

'Funds from kosher food are an important contribution to Jewish institutions in Europe, the lack of these funds will mean the closure of many institutions which in turn will severely restrict Jewish life on the continent.'

Hang on a second Rabbi Goldberg: did you seriously just tell us that the supposed '*anti-Semitic myth*' of the '*Kosher Food Tax*' is actually real?

As if it was a negligible amount on the jewish organisational account books then you would not be telling us that without the funds from Shechita slaughter then jewish institutions would either cease to function or severely curtail their activities.

Let us think about how this works for a moment as a little thought experiment: Rabbi Goldberg is telling us that the funds that are extracted from the supervision of kashrut observance (i.e. '*funds from kosher food*' as he puts it making it sound like charitable donations rather than the business-to-business charge it is) are used by the rabbinical organisations; such as the Rabbinical

Council of Europe and presumably other organisations such as the Orthodox Union etc, to fund their other activities and are in fact a considerable source of income (possibly even primary) as this is the implication of Rabbi Goldberg's statement.

This means; if we include in it what we know are told about non-jews being sold the waste product from kosher slaughter houses and the statement that this subsidises the price jews pay for their meat, then that any organisation who is buying meat from a kosher slaughter house (and by extension any customer who is buying from any organisation who is) is paying the rabbinical organisations for the upkeep of jewish institutions that then seek to further jewish interests in non-jewish lands.

Now if that isn't a stealth tax by rabbinical organisations on non-jews for the explicit benefit of jews then I don't know what is!

One wonders if the ADL are now going to claim that Rabbi Goldberg is '*promoting anti-Semitic myths*' again: poor Rabbi Goldberg a jew and an '*evil-nazi-who-wants-to-kill-6-millions-jews*'.

Oy vey!

References

- (1) <http://www.ynetnews.com/articles/0,7340,L-4059855,00.html> [Last Accessed: 30/04/2011]
- (2) A veterinary description of the practice and the inevitable needless suffering it causes for the animal can be most succinctly found in Arnold Leese's excellent pamphlet on the subject: '*The Legalised Cruelty of Shechita*'. This maybe most easily read at the following address: <http://www.jrbooksonline.com/HTML-docs/cattle-slaughter.htm> [Last Accessed: 30/04/2011]
- (3) <http://www.ynetnews.com/articles/0,7340,L-4059855,00.html> [Last Accessed: 30/04/2011]
- (4) Ibid.

Being a Thorn in Victor's Side

Saturday, 7 May 2011

I don't usually comment on current events outside the purview of jews and jewry, but a quasi-anti-Semitic outlet; the American Free Press, which is run by the elusive and rather odd businessman Willis Carto has published an article by one of its leading '*investigative journalists*' who might be better termed a loon outside the asylum: Victor Thorn. Victor is something of a mainstay on the conspiracy monger scene (1) and his article '*Obama versus Osama: A Very Convenient Death*' have moved me from my habit of ignoring the latest loony bin claims to write a short rejoinder to the part of his article that seemed to me to be of any interest to readers here. (2)

Victor starts off his article by casting aspersions that the US military and intelligence community could of; by implication, found Bin Laden any time they chose by merely '*questioning the purpose of this fortress*' in Pakistan. Victor then goes on to play the proverbial numbers game

and asserts; in effect, that because the US military and intelligence community have billions; even trillions, of dollars of cash and the best technology to play with they should have been able to locate him at any time.

What Victor is doing here is creating a rhetorical basis for his claim that 9/11 is a '*NWO conspiracy*' etc ad infinitum by assigning perfectibility to his chosen abstract; in this case what is called omniscience in theology and perfect knowledge in economics, when Victor should realise that keeping a military and intelligence machine going is an expensive and time-consuming business and those involved are also human. They make mistakes and their opponents sometimes outwit them in spite; and sometimes because, of their large budgets and high technology. One isn't dealing with abstracts here Victor: these are people and unless you going to provide proof of complicity then you can't go around flinging your accusations at everyone in the hope that something will stick in the long run.

After all Victor: money doesn't necessarily buy loyalty or the right information now does it?

Also if Victor had cared to look at the situation in Pakistan lately he would have noticed that fortified compounds are not that unusual. After all Pakistan has been in an undeclared civil war lately with the various groups of tribal and/or Islamic insurgents. Or are you going to tell us Victor that these are all '*NWO operatives*' or some such lunacy?

As to the bounty on Bin Laden's head and why nobody turned him in: well Victor if you didn't notice people aren't solely motivated by money and with a few security precautions and the necessary hush money you can largely do what you want. If you've got a friendly domestic intelligence service with connections to your cause; like the Pakistani ISI, then all the better!

However let us do a little thought experiment: shall we Victor?

Say the '*NWO*' came after you and stuck a bounty on your head; say of \$25 million, and you hid out in an upmarket house in the middle of a town with some friends and the CIA were sympathetic enough to your cause to turn a blind eye. But yet you were eventually found by a '*NWO*' hit team and killed.

Would that therefore mean you were actually a fabrication and you had in fact died some years earlier because a few newspapers had reported this to be the case?

No obviously not, but that is your argument isn't it Victor?

So because someone managed to outwit your perfect abstract; the '*NWO*', they were therefore non-existent and it was all a plot by the military-industrial complex to manipulate public opinion in a favourable direction...

Oh and Victor here is a little something to mull over: why is one set of media '*elite*' (hence untrustworthy) and yet another is '*not elite*' (hence trustworthy)? Surely as an '*investigative reporter*' Victor you know better than anyone just how much reporters like you make up in order to '*get the scoop of a lifetime*'.

References

- (1) He has published numerous books about the so-called 'New World Order' that his conveniently lumped together opponents fit into.
- (2) As I don't have a current subscription to the American Free Press I cannot give precise references, but it was sent out to the free mailing list subscribers as a mail shot; of sorts, on 06/05/2011.

Would David Cameron prosecute Israeli War Criminals?

Saturday, 7 May 2011

On his recent visit to the United Kingdom the Israeli prime minister Benjamin Netanyahu; better known to Israelis as 'Bibi', had something of a problem as his chosen military attaché; Yochanan Locker, is part of the alleged war criminals of the 'Cast Lead 200'. (1) Under British law there is an unusual statute (2) which provides for the prosecution of those accused of any war crime; relating to or by British subjects or not, and as Locker is under suspicion of being responsible for the numerous alleged war crimes committed by the IDF. It was not outside of the realms of possibility that he could be arrested; regardless of his diplomatic immunity, and tried before the world as the Jewish war criminal that he could well be.

As it turned out Netanyahu decided to solve the problem by simply not bringing Locker with him (3) and thus circumventing any embarrassment to both Tel Aviv and Westminster if pro-Palestinian activists had brought public charges against him as an alleged war criminal under British law thus forcing his detention; however temporary, by the police. This would have caused severe repercussions for both parties and probably leading to Prime Minister Cameron doing a lot of grovelling at the feet of Prime Minister Netanyahu with only tangible economic, political, military and/or diplomatic concessions to the bandit state of Israel.

It is worth remembering that according to the latest research; a huge proportion of Conservative (David Cameron's party) members of parliament, are also members of the British Israel lobby (as are many of their Labour colleagues) (4) and that Cameron himself has gone on record numerous times to the effect that he is pretty much ready to betray Britain's strategic interests for the sake of being friends with Israel. (5)

For example Cameron said the following in 2010 at the annual Conservative Friends of Israel 'Business Lunch':

'The friendship we celebrate today has thrived in the long years of Opposition and I know in government, it will deepen, because the ties between this party and Israel are unbreakable. And in me, you have a Prime Minister whose belief in Israel is indestructible.' (6)

Here Cameron tells us that his belief in Israel is 'indestructible' (apparently his belief in the country he allegedly governs; the United Kingdom, is destructible by implication) and that the Israel Lobby in the UK dominates the Conservative party when he refers to the 'deep' bonds

between Israel's adjunct foreign network of influence and his party.

He then goes on to implicitly tell us just how much he buys into the massive; official and unofficial, Israeli propaganda effort by parroting the kind of rubbish put out by unabashed apologists for Israel and the Israeli government themselves when he states:

'When biased elements in the media paint Israel's defence of its people as unwarranted aggression, we need to make it clear: when rockets are being launched at Israeli citizens, when children are in danger, Israel is within its rights to protect its people.' (7)

Woah... hang on there Davy: did you just tell us that an opinion is only biased when it is *'anti-Israel'* and not when it *'pro-Israel'* (as that is the necessary consequence of your statement)?

Are you trying to seriously convince others that if facts; and I mean the evidence against Israel is not only considerable but beyond unreasonable doubt, (8) are anti-Israel and/or anti-Semitic they are just plain old biased in the first place and require a liberal dose of interpretative gloss (or plain denial) from Israel's official and/or unofficial propagandists to make them *'factual'*?

That is by any standard an absurd position for you to take Davy, but never-the-less you take it and you take it with all the gusto of a polite diplomatic bribe or two. Not to say that you are corrupt, but rather that modern politics; British and otherwise, is a general sink of corruption, self-aggrandisement and lack of principle.

Cameron then goes on to address the issue at hand when he states:

'When we see the abuse of the UK's laws to try and detain Israeli politicians who visit these shores, we need to act: changing the law so people don't fear coming to our country. That's what we are doing on Universal Jurisdiction.' (9)

So basically Davy is telling us here that if an Israeli commits a war crime anywhere in the world; against British subjects or not, then the law regarding the commission of war crimes should not apply to them because they are jews. Although presumably it still applies to everyone else: as after all jews are just special aren't they?

Let us be honest shall we Davy: that's hardly *'universal jurisdiction'* now is it?

Perhaps you should rename it as a *'selective jurisdiction'*: then it would say what it does on tin now wouldn't it?

This isn't helped by David Cameron's Foreign Secretary; and former leader of the Conservative party, William Hague who has been a devoted fan of Israel since he was very young who has also spoken out consistently in Israel's favour.

In 2010 he also told the British Israel Lobby the following on the issue of *'universal jurisdiction'*:

'We have had good discussions with Israeli ministers...on universal jurisdiction where the last government left us with an appalling situation where a politician like Mrs Livni could be threatened with arrest on coming to the UK.' (10)

Oh dear Silly Billy Hague seems to be as trolled (11) on Israeli propaganda as Davy is (12): as he is again effectively giving a blank cheque exception to Israeli politicians that they aren't included in the '*universal jurisdiction*' law and he intends to '*qualify it*' into '*selective jurisdiction*'.

Now if the two top figures in the British government and the British Conservative party are anxious to prostrate themselves in front of their Chosen masters then you are hardly likely to get the prosecution of alleged Israeli war criminals that pro-Palestinian activists seem to be hoping for and even trying seems relatively pointless other than as a show of defiance to the Jewish giant with feet of clay. But then I am sure it makes the leftists feel good to try and do something, but if it isn't going to have any impact then is there a point in expanding finite resources in the process?

Not really, but their doing it does happen to conveniently expose that Israel is the daddy, while Britain; that was formerly great, is the proverbial bitch of the relationship.

References

(1) A list of these individuals can be found at the following address:

http://www.richardsilverstein.com/tikun_olam/2010/11/17/idf-cast-lead-dirty-200/ [Last Accessed: 07/05/2011]

(2) The only two other countries who have similar laws that I know of are ironically Israel and occupied Germany both of whom use this law only to try and prosecute that supposed embodiment of all evil: members of the SS who supposedly did all sorts of horrible things to Jews in the war (or at least so '*holocaust survivors*' assure us).

(3) http://seattletimes.nwsources.com/html/nationworld/2014964260_apmlisraelbritain.html [Last Accessed: 07/05/2011]

(4) On this see David Cronin, 2011, '*Europe's Alliance with Israel: Aiding the Occupation*', 1st Edition, Verso: New York

(5) For example David Cameron wishes to aggressively isolate Iran and ensure '*regime change*', which is rather stupid considering that Iran would actually be a fairly useful country for Britain to have good strategic relations with considering the new bellicose Russia and the emergent '*Arab spring*' that is occurring (and of which the prolific critic of Israel; James Petras, has sagely noted there is; predictably, a substantial Islamist component). Instead Cameron places Israeli interests first and demands that Iran lick kosher boots, eat pork and do whatever Tel Aviv commands before any '*understanding*' can be reached.

(6) <http://www2.cfoi.co.uk/Events/PastEvents/> [Last Accessed: 07/05/2011]

(7) Ibid.

(8) David Cameron should try reading some of the considerable literature that has been produced by Arab, Israeli, European and American historians, researchers and scholars which has documented the conduct of Israel and its habit of doing whatever it likes while leaving its propaganda network to justify and explain it to the world who just don't seem to understand the

implicit idea behind much Jewish political thought that they are allowed to do whatever they please because they are the Chosen of Hashem.

(9) <http://www2.cfoi.co.uk/Events/PastEvents/> [Last Accessed: 07/05/2011]

(10) Ibid.

(11) For those unacquainted with British slang: this means very, very drunk and usually unable to stand up.

(12) David Cameron actually said the following and meant it (which I find beyond simply hilarious for someone complaining about supposed '*media bias against Israel*'): '*I know, and you know, that one of its biggest threats comes from those directly on its borders. Hezbollah, Hamas – terrorist organisations that are determined to use violence against Israel. We must confront their ideology – and help Israel achieve the security she deserves.*' (Ibid.)

Two Ordinary Jews confirm the existence of the Kosher Food Tax

Sunday, 8 May 2011

The Jewish Telegraph (1) currently has two letters up from its Jewish readership which concern the Kosher Food Tax issue and the fact that kosher food is unwittingly subsidised by non-Jews. As the Jewish Telegraph page does not operate on a separate URL I have taken the liberty of reprinting these letters in full below:

'Kashrut Threat

The laws just passed by the European Union which state that kosher meat must now be labelled as "unstunned" is just the thin end of the wedge.

Kosher meat prices will have to be increased as the parts of the animal usually sold to the non-Jewish market will be unsaleable because of the enforced labelling.

Will brit mila (2) be the next focus of their attack on our treasured Jewish values?

Why are so many billions of our taxes being donated by the European Parliament to the Palestinians, who are using the money to buy rockets and arms to attack our beloved Israel?

Coming out of Europe would not only be a huge financial benefit to our country but would ensure that our Jewish heritage, as well as shechita, will cease to be threatened.

Peter Redstone, ' (3)

And:

'Expensive Pesach (4)

Pesach is over, but once again the cost of keeping kosher rears its ugly head.

When is someone going to tackle this constantly recurring subject?

Pesach this year seems to have been more extortionate than ever. And before the "dedicated" reach for their pens to advise me I don't have to buy any "unnecessary luxuries", I don't think eight days on matzo and butter and only the bare essentials is a very attractive proposition.

If you have children and grandchildren, it's nice to be able to offer a drink of orange juice and perhaps a bit of chocolate!

The inescapable fact is that in the not-too-distant future, kosher food in general - and Pesach in particular - will become the exclusive domain of the committed (for whom no sacrifice is too great) and the wealthy, (for whom any amount can be spent without jeopardising anything else).

The rest are going to find themselves with some difficult choices.

People will tell me "supervision" is expensive. Do we have hoards of hibernating shomrim (5) worldwide who suddenly make an appearance pre-Pesach to possibly earn large amounts in a few weeks?

Our rabbonim (6) have no qualms about standing in the pulpit exhorting the congregation to donate for the needy who can't afford to make Pesach.

Why don't they exhort the retailers to reduce their prices, take less profit and make it easier for people to be able to keep kosher?

Let's not leave it too late.

Dennis Fisher, ' (7)

Readers will remember my recent article; *'The Rabbinical Council of Europe admits to the Kosher Food Tax'*, (8) where I discussed the implicit admittance of the reality of the Kosher Food Tax in relation to kosher slaughter houses (using the methods of Shechita) by the Rabbinical Council of Europe and its; unfortunately for him, outspoken spokesman: Rabbi Arye Goldberg. We may deduce further evidence for the reality of the Kosher Food Tax from these two letters on this general subject by ordinary jews who are both (implicitly) complaining that the non-jews are getting out of line for having the gall to ask the jews to actually inform them when they are trying to sell them waste meat from the Shechita slaughtering process as meat that had been humanely slaughtered according to our goyische standards.

Redstone is predictably trying to take the moral high ground by telling us that it is an implicit anti-Semitic conspiracy; *'the thin end of the wedge'*, by the European Union against its jewish population to ask the jews to label the waste products of inhumane Shechita slaughtering process as such. He amusingly complains that Shechita waste product will be *'unsaleable'* to non-jews if it is actually labelled as such rather than merely pawned off to non-jews as humanely slaughtered meat when that isn't the case.

Redstone then promptly hoists himself by his own petard; much as the Rabbinical Council of Europe did in their response on this issue to Ynet, when he maintains that his primary motivation for concern is not the implication that the kosher food industry; and by extension a large portion of the jewish community, have been committing a form of quasi-legal fraud against non-jews for years, but rather that this somewhat truthful labelling (‘*unstunned*’ is hardly the same as ‘*ritually-slaughtered*’ now is it Peter?) will cause jews to have to pay more for the meat that they choose to eat because it has been slaughtered according to the laws of Kashrut.

Woe betide jews actually abiding by market forces! Instead they want everyone to subsidize their meat prices and; by extension, their institutions!

Redstone promptly recommends removing the United Kingdom from the European Union post haste to preserve ‘*jewish tradition*’ against this implicit anti-Semitic conspiracy. Oy vey... it’s a Nazi conspiracy!

Perhaps Redstone would like to tell us why he thinks jewish meat should be subsidized by lying by omission to non-jews about its origin?

Fisher in contrast to Redstone is more sedate and reasonable, but he too implicitly notes the issue of the Kosher Food Tax by telling us that if this European Union bill is passed into law then:

‘The inescapable fact is that in the not-too-distant future, kosher food in general - and Pesach in particular - will become the exclusive domain of the committed (for whom no sacrifice is too great) and the wealthy, (for whom any amount can be spent without jeopardising anything else).’
(9)

So; in essence, what Fisher is saying is that kosher food is just getting too expensive for the jews who aren’t well off and those who aren’t obsessed with it (‘*the committed*’ (10)) so if a jew would like to keep kosher; but doesn’t feel he simply must do so, then a jew will buy and consume the cheaper treif rather than the more expensive food.

Fisher also implicitly blames the Kosher Food Tax for this when he asserts:

‘People will tell me “supervision” is expensive.’ (11)

What ‘*supervision*’ means in this context; for those unfamiliar with the complex laws of Kashut, is the fact that in order for a jew to be confident that a foodstuff or good has been prepared in accordance with the laws of Kashrut the process has to be periodically ‘*inspected*’ and/or ‘*supervised*’ by a rabbinical body; such as the Orthodox Union, which then once they are satisfied with the process allow their brand of certification to be used on the packaging to let observant jews know that they have confirmed that the production process; if it was followed correctly, was completely in line with the laws of Kashrut. The level of difficulty in; and requirements for, gaining this certification differs drastically between rabbinical organisations with the more difficult adhering to a stricter interpretation of the laws of Kashrut.

In general commercial organisations will tend to plump for one of the stricter interpretations

because it allows more observant jewish customers to *'feel safe'* in the knowledge that they are purchasing goods are kosher (as the less observant will equally take the certification of the stricter; as well as the less strict, rabbinical kosher certification organisations).

This certification process is paid for by fees to the rabbinical organisations responsible which are presumably charged on either a fixed tariff or as an hourly rate per *'consulting rabbi'*. The cost of this is then passed onto the consumer: this disparity between the cost price and the cost price plus rabbinical supervision charges is called the Kosher Food Tax. Its existence has long been denied by *'jewish defence'* organisations such as the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai Brith (who claim it is an *'anti-Semitic myth'*), but Fisher, Redstone and the Rabbinical Council of Europe have now all asserted by implication that it does exist and is widely known inside the jewish community.

So what is a jew to do?

Charge them all with being *'self-hating jews'*?

References

- (1) <http://www.jewishtelegraph.com/> [Last Accessed: 07/05/2011]
- (2) *'Brit Mila(h)'* literally means *'Covenant of Circumcision'*.
- (3) <http://www.jewishtelegraph.com/> [Last Accessed: 07/05/2011]
- (4) *'Pesach'* means the jewish festival of Passover.
- (5) *'Shomrim'* literally means *'[Moral] Guardians'* and refers to those jews who take it upon themselves to act as the *'morality police'* (New Yorkers may recognise these in the form of the *'modesty patrols'* in Hasidic dominated jewish neighbourhoods) of the jewish community.
- (6) *'Rabbonim'* is a more general plural form of *'Rabbis'*.
- (7) <http://www.jewishtelegraph.com/> [Last Accessed: 07/05/2011]
- (8) <http://semiticcontroversies.blogspot.com/2011/05/rabbinical-council-of-europe-admits-to.html> [Last Accessed: 07/05/2011]
- (9) <http://www.jewishtelegraph.com/> [Last Accessed: 07/05/2011]
- (10) I am of the general opinion that Fisher here is really referring to the concept of frum (*'piety/pious'*) jews rather than merely those who are *'committed'* as it just doesn't quite fit otherwise.
- (11) <http://www.jewishtelegraph.com/> [Last Accessed: 07/05/2011]

No Comment Necessary (08/05/2011)

Sunday, 8 May 2011

'The importance of this repetition is what is it all about ...we left the slavery of Egypt and slowly went up the ladder of Kedusha , from all near extinction to the level of receiving the Torah ,all of Israel united. We are blessed with times of celebration and festivals. And then what ...the day after we must not forget when out in the field, on a regular mundane day, don't forget the poor or the strangers ...don't forget the unique society, based on tzeddaka and chessed , we strive for.

It is quite usual that Parshat Emor falls out before Yom Haatzmaut – after 2000 years of Galut , we have our own Day of Independence , a day of a Thanksgiving , rejoicing and prayer...we are home and forever this time!

It is not by chance that we have to stop and think, amidst all the celebrations, what is this Independence all about?

Being blessed with a country of our own, a Jewish State, we should always remind ourselves of what type of society do we want, when we awaken the day after Independence Day ,what do we expect to find ?' (1)

- Zeev Schwartz (Director General of World Bnei Akiva)

'The City University of New York has voted not to honor playwright Tony Kushner with an honorary degree at its commencement after a board member objected, citing the Pulitzer Prize winner's statements on Israel.

The New York Jewish Week reported that the request by CUNY's John Jay College to recognize Kushner was turned down at a board of trustees meeting Monday after board member Jeffrey Wiesenfeld objected. Kushner would have been eligible to speak at the graduation ceremony.' (2)

- The American Jewish World

'With conservative lawmakers across the United States trying to outlaw sharia, or Islamic religious law, Jewish organizations are concerned that halachah could be next.

If the state legislative initiatives targeting sharia are successful, they would gut a central tenet of American Jewish religious communal life: The ability under U.S. law to resolve differences according to halachah, or Jewish religious law.

"The laws are not identical, but as a general rule they could be interpreted broadly to prevent two Jewish litigants from going to a beit din," a Jewish religious court, said Abba Cohen, the Washington director of Agudath Israel of America, an Orthodox umbrella group. "That would be a terrible infringement on our religious freedom."

A number of recent beit din arbitrations that were taken by litigants to civil courts -- on whether a batch of etrogim met kosher standards; on whether a teacher at a yeshiva was rightfully dismissed; and on the ownership of Torah scrolls -- would have no standing under the proposed laws.' (3)

- The Jewish Week of New York

'City officials and the Reform umbrella group both indicated that the vandalism pointed to Jewish religious extremists, though police said they had no suspects.

In a statement released April 15, the World Union said that it "condemns all violence that is motivated by hatred and religious extremism. As we approach the season of Jewish freedom, we call on all government and NGO agencies to show their abhorrence of these wanton senseless acts, we are confident that government leaders will take the lead in this condemnation and we call on Orthodox leaders throughout Israel to also show their disgust at this destructive inter-Jewish hatred."

Ra'anana Mayor Nahum Hofree condemned what he called the "bullying," saying the attack "does not characterize Ra'anana's people. This is a city of tolerance and exemplary coexistence."

In another incident of violence against a non-Orthodox synagogue, youths threw rocks at worshippers leaving a Masorti synagogue in Netanya on Sabbath eve April 15. The youths appeared to be Orthodox, eyewitnesses said, according to the Jerusalem Post. The youths reportedly tried to enter the building but stopped when they saw security cameras. The building has been attacked twice in the past.' (4)

- The Jewish Week of New York

'Rabbi Melissa Weintraub has been awarded \$100,000 for her work training Jewish leaders to be effective agents in Israeli-Palestinian relations.

Weintraub, founder and CEO of Encounters, was one of four young Americans named as winners of the first Grinnell College Young Innovator for Social Justice Prize.

The Grinnell Prize, which received more than 1,000 nominations from 66 countries, honors individuals under the age of 40 who have demonstrated leadership in their fields and who show creativity, commitment and extraordinary accomplishment in effecting positive social change.

"The winners of the Grinnell College Young Innovator for Social Justice Prize are outstanding examples of people who saw a huge social need and then worked creatively to meet that need and make the world a better place," said Raynard Kington, the college's president.

In the past decade, Encounter has brought more than 1,000 Jewish leaders on dialogue visits to Palestinian areas of the West Bank. The program focuses on person-to-person encounters to enable present and future opinion-makers and Jewish leaders to develop a more nuanced understanding of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

Each Grinnell prize winner received \$100,000, half for the individual and half to the organization. Four people representing three organizations shared \$300,000 in prize money this year.' (5)

- The Jewish Telegraphic Association

References

- (1) <http://www.israelnationalnews.com/Articles/Article.aspx/10216> [Last Accessed: 08/05/2011]
(2) <http://www.ajwnews.com/archives/9641> [Last Accessed: 08/05/2011]
(3) http://www.thejewishweek.com/news/national/anti_sharia_laws_stir_concerns_halachah_could_be_next [Last Accessed: 08/05/2011]
(4) http://www.thejewishweek.com/news/israel/raanana_rabbis_condemn_attack_reform_synagogue [Last Accessed: 08/05/2011]
(5) <http://www.jta.org/news/article/2011/05/08/3087596/rabbi-melissa-weintraub-wins-100000-as-young-innovator> [Last Accessed: 08/05/2011]

In Brief: Does the Wiesenthal Center support Scientology?

Monday, 9 May 2011

The Jewish Telegraphic Association released a news bulletin on May 8th telling its probably fairly astonished readers that:

'The Simon Wiesenthal Center honored actor and producer Tom Cruise with its Humanitarian Award.

The award, presented at a national tribute dinner May 5, was given to Cruise for his longtime support of the center and its Museum of Tolerance, the organization said. It was presented to Cruise by Brad Grey, chairman and CEO of Paramount Pictures. ' (1)

Whoa... hang on a minute. The Wiesenthal Center surely has to know about Tom Cruise's rather obsessive Scientological beliefs, which border on having a mental illness and certainly aren't rational in any way, shape or form. Now surely the Wiesenthal Center would have thought it better not to publicly advertise the fact that by accepting money from Scientology; via its proxy and ostensible public face Tom Cruise, they have endorsed Scientology's ideas and activities.

The fact that Scientology is an implicit factor in this we can ascertain from the fact that they keep their cult members; Tom Cruise included, on a fairly short leash. It is also interesting that in a recent similar case of donations received from Gaddafi's Libya; via his son's '*charitable foundations*', by the London School of Economics this was held to be '*compromising*' by jews who commented on it at the time.

Why haven't we heard a similar jewish outcry against the linking of the Wiesenthal Center with the Church of Scientology via Tom Cruise and the endorsement of that funding link by the Wiesenthal Center awarding Scientology's proxy a '*Humanitarian Award*'?

Well I guess it is all just Shoah business isn't it?

References

(1) <http://www.jta.org/news/article/2011/05/08/3087603/wiesenthal-center-honors-actor-tom-cruise> [Last Accessed: 08/05/2011]

(2) If you are interested in learning more about Scientology then read the numerous materials and information produced and reproduced by 'Operation Clambake', which exposes the diseased underbelly of this 'religion'. This is available at the following address: <http://www.xenu.net/>.

The First anti-Semite: Philostratus and the Jews

Monday, 9 May 2011

During my research reading on the jewish question I came across a mention (1) of the Greek philosopher Philostratus who had made some rather acidic comments regarding jews as a group; not only as a religion, in his work '*The Life of Apollonius of Tyana*'. I won't comment on Philostratus' life itself, but his comments on the jews are of great interest to us as they appear to have been forgotten by the critics of jewry today.

The usually quoted passage from Philostratus runs as follows:

'For the Jews have long been in revolt not only against the Romans, but against humanity; and a race that has made its own a life apart and irreconcilable, that cannot share with the rest of mankind in the pleasures of the table nor join in their libations or prayers or sacrifices, are separate from ourselves by a greater gulf than divides us from Susa or Bactra or the more distant Indies.' (2)

This should actually be read in the context of the whole passage to give clarity as to Philostratus' meaning:

'Look at the revolt against him planned by Vindex, you surely were the man of the hour, its natural leader, and not he! For you had an army at your back, and the forces you were leading against the Jews, would they not have been more suitably employed in chastising Nero? For the Jews have long been in revolt not only against the Romans, but against humanity; and a race that has made its own a life apart and irreconcilable, that cannot share with the rest of mankind in the pleasures of the table nor join in their libations or prayers or sacrifices, are separate from ourselves by a greater gulf than divides us from Susa or Bactra or the more distant Indies. What sense then or reason was there in chastising them for revolting from us, whom we had better have never annexed? As for Nero, who would not have prayed with his own hand to slay a man well-nigh drunk with human blood, singing as he sat amidst the hecatombs of his victims? I confess that I ever pricked up my ears when any messenger from yonder brought tidings of yourself, and told us how in one battle you had slain thirty thousand Jews and in the next fifty thousand. In such cases I would take the courier aside and quietly ask him: 'But what of the great man? Will he not rise to higher things than this?' Since then you have discovered in Vitellius an image and ape of Nero, and are turning your arms against him, persist in the policy you have embraced, for it too is a noble one, only let its sequel be noble too. You know how dear to the Romans are popular institutions, and how nearly all their conquests were won under a

free polity. ' (3)

It is clear from the complete passage that Philostratus' meaning is actually fairly well preserved in the passage usually quoted, but does need to be clarified by it. In essence what Philostratus is saying in this passage is that the jews are completely different at an intrinsic level from any other people in the world; possibly as a play on their claim to be the chosen of Hashem, and that; as this was the basis of their revolt against Rome, they are revolting '*against humanity*'; represented although not uniquely so, by the Roman Empire. (4)

Philostratus tells us that the jews spurn the rest of mankind and civilisation in general by the fact that they '*cannot share the pleasures of the table nor join in their libations or prayers or sacrifices*' (5) and points out by implication that they are an odd group of ancient luddites who refuse to engage in civilised behaviour and enjoy the fruits of the earth.

However Philostratus does imply that this is not actually a consequence of their religious beliefs per se; which would probably be the normal argument to try and dismiss his criticism, (6) when he declares that a '*greater gulf*' separates the jews from the rest of humanity as he understand it (i.e. Romans, Greeks etc), which implies that there is something distinctly biological about their opposition not merely something theological. This is confirmed by his comment that the Romans had better never have annexed the jews as they there is no reason to '*chastise*' them from revolting from Rome, because they are unable to comprehend civilisation or Roman values instead preferring to level in self-righteous ignorance and following their barbaric and blood cult that it please them to call a religion.

Philostratus also suggests this slightly earlier when he refers to the jews as a race (i.e. a nation in the Roman sense) who have '*made their own life apart and irreconcilable*' and they have '*long been in revolt*' both of which directly suggest that the jews have been distinctly separate for a longer time than the annexation of the territory they were occupying by the Roman empire. This combined with Philostratus' earlier comments leads us to tentatively conclude that Philostratus saw the jewish problem in a fairly innovative way as not one of religion; as most of his fellow contemporaries understand it, but as one of racial biology in the before Darwin, Galton and Mendel.

In supporting this conclusion we can point out that Philostratus' note that the jews are '*irreconcilable*' to humanity in general in addition to noting that it would better not to bother annexing them as they will always revolt against non-jews ruling them. This leads to only one necessary consequence: Philostratus felt that the solution of the jewish question in the Roman Empire was either to no bother with the jews or wipe them out root and branch. It is impossible to tell which he favoured as his reference to jews is brief, but pointed: however either could quite easily have been the case. (7)

Was Philostratus the first anti-Semite?

Quite possibly and certainly one of the first we know about.

Does he deserve to be remembered by modern anti-Semites?

Certainly.

References

- (1) Specifically in Shlomo Gliksman, 1939, *'The Falsifications of anti-Semitic Literature'*, 1st Edition, People's Institute for Dissemination of Biblical and Talmudic Jurisprudence: New York, p. 28
- (2) Philostr. V A 5.33. This is on p. 541 of Vol. I of Philostratus' *Vita Apollonii* in the Loeb Classical Library series.
- (3) Ibid.
- (4) For a critical introduction to this please see Andrea Berlin, Andrew Overman (Eds.), 2002, *'The First Jewish Revolt: Archaeology, History, and Ideology'*, 1st Edition, Routledge: New York
- (5) Philostr. V A 5.33
- (6) Gliksman, Op. Cit., p. 30 for example uses just this argument to dismiss Philostratus.
- (7) It is worth comparing Philostratus' ideas to those of those usually (incorrectly) credited as being the first anti-Semites such as Wilhelm Marr. On Marr see Moshe Zimmerman, 1988, *'Wilhelm Marr: Patriarch of anti-Semitism'*, 1st Edition, Oxford University Press: New York.

Rabbi Lazer Brody: 'Hashem will Slaughter the Goyim'

Monday, 9 May 2011

As anybody who has gotten to know me well knows I am a regular listener and reader of all kinds of Jewish audio programming and written materials, but not; of course, a friendly or uncritical listener they might wish I was. Today I will make a summary of Rabbi Lazer Brody's latest radio show; on Israel's Arutz Sheva media network and part of his *'Lazer Beams'* series, called *'Gog and Magog'*. (1)

Now let us allow Rabbi Brody to tell all (my comments/clarifications as to meaning in parentheses):

'The war of Gog and Magog [the gentile and the 'gentile spirit' aka the 'evil inclination' in Judaism] is the war against our Emunah [the Jewish spirit] – our Faith. Through attacking Emunah: Gog [the gentiles are] is trying to sever the Jewish soul from its source.'

'Any enemy can destroy a Jewish body, but the Jewish soul lives on forever: it is a tiny spark of Hashem, it is eternal.' [Judaism is a biological religion]

'[The war of] Gog and Magog [the gentiles and the 'gentile spirit] is a global assault to destroy Emunah [the Jewish spirit]: the pure and complete faith [of the Jews] in Hashem.'

'There is only way to defeat and to overcome the evil inclination [the gentiles]: each of us has to add the light of Emunah [the Jewish spirit] to the world.'

'Emunah is our entire [the Jewish] purpose in this world (to defeat Gog and Magog [the gentiles and the 'gentile spirit']).'

'This is the final generation before the [Jewish] Messiah: that's the war.'

Goes on to note that the 'people of Israel' are 'fighting for Emunah' [Israel equates Jews in Judaism] and the 'evil inclination' [the gentiles] is fighting 'tooth and nail against Emunah [the Jewish spirit]. That's his [the gentile's] worse enemy.'

'As soon as the [Jewish] Messiah comes: the evil inclination [the gentiles] is finished.'

'Then Hashem takes and slaughters the evil inclination [the gentiles]: then we have a world with no evil inclination [no gentiles]. A world that is full of [Jewish] knowledge, a world that is full of peace [the final product of Tikkun Olam], a world that is full of spiritual awareness [lack of non-Jewish souls] for that reason as it marks the end of the evil inclination [the gentiles and the 'gentile spirit']: it is fighting with all its power against Emunah [the Jews and the Jewish spirit] and against Hashem.'

'There will be tremendous amounts of [Jewish and gentile] casualties.'

'The war of Gog and Magog has already started.'

'Gog and Magog is a physical war. We live with a daily threat of suicide bombers and terrorists not only [to Jews] in Israel, but America and Europe.'

'Thousands of Jews have been expelled in Israel itself [by Jews influenced by gentiles and the 'gentile spirit'].'

'A Jewish soul may be born far away from Judaism, but it is still a Jewish soul.'

'[Jewish] Assimilation is death.'

'A non-Jewish or half-Jewish child is likely to grow up to be a suicide bomber.' [I paraphrase slightly.]

'The [Jewish] holy sages of the Talmuds had the ability to revive the dead.' [Yes: he was being serious.]

References

(1) You can listen to this yourself at the following address:

<http://www.israelnationalnews.com/Radio/News.aspx/3098> [Last Accessed: 09/05/2011]. All extracts I make from Rabbi Brody are from this radio show unless otherwise stated.

Savage Poetry: Martial on the Jews

Tuesday, 10 May 2011

Marcus Valerius Martialis; better known as Martial, is a renowned Roman poet particularly noted and treasured for his Epigrams, which have and continue to provide a large amount of valuable information for historians and scholars of ancient Rome. What is less well known about Martial is that he used his poetic talents to launch attacks the jews in several of his less quoted Epigrams: sometimes directly and sometimes in passing.

There are three principle themes to Martial's epigrammatic attacks on the jews:

- A) That the jews are a dirty and unclean people.
- B) That the jews are a lecherous people and frequently attempt to seduce others.
- C) That the jews are tricksters, thieves, liars and frauds.

It has frequently been suggested on the basis of ancient accounts; such as Martial's, of the jews that it shows that anti-Semitism is an abstract created to fit the jews and not the natural result of jewish action provoking gentile resentment (i.e. it is a fantasy-based not a reality-based intellectual position). This; to my mind, is a false dichotomy as it invokes two different periods (usually the classical world for poor and the medieval/early modern world for rich) to 'prove' that anti-Semitism has not been consistent in its arguments (which ignores the natural evolution of thought I might add), but I would point out that this argument compares two different periods in jewish history and of course different jews as if they were exactly the same.

So how on earth does it prove anything other than that jews were perceived in the ancient and classical worlds as lowly scoundrels and in the medieval and early modern worlds as rich scoundrels?

The only contradiction is that of arguing that jews must necessarily have held the same station in periods centuries apart (which is obviously absurd, but never the less is frequently believed to be a powerful argument against anti-Semitism for reasons I cannot seem to discover)! (1)

Having briefly cleaned up that frequent objection to the use of ancient and classical authors by anti-Semites: we can move on to Martial's first mention of the jews in his Epigrams.

To wit:

'Of the odour of a lake whence the water has retired; of the miasma which rise from the sulphurous waters of Albula; of the putrid stench of a marine fish-pond; of a lazy goat in amorous dalliance; of the old shoes of a tired veteran; of a fleece twice drenched in Tyrian dye; of the fasting breath of the Jews; of that of wretches under accusation; of the expiring lamp of the filthy Leda; of ointment made of the dregs of Sabine oil; of a fox in flight, or of the nest of the viper,----of all these things, Bassa, I would rather smell than smell like you.' (2)

Martial's meaning here might not immediately be obvious to the modern reader, but it can be simply explained by Martial's last phrase: *'I would rather smell than smell like you'*. When you reference this to what Martial says about jewish halitosis it becomes clear: Martial is saying that when a jew fasts (which are fairly frequent in Judaism) his breath smells as the *'putrid stench of a marine fish pond.'* (3)

This is quite possibly the first mention of the legendary *'foetor judaicus'*; the *'jewish stench'*, that has long been argued to be a made-up accusation on the basis of the belief that this stench indicated the impurity of the jews and the fact they were in league with the Devil to medieval Europeans. (4) Whether or not the jewish stench emanated from a supposed pact with the Devil or their ritual impurity: it does suggest an origin for the jewish stench that doesn't run foul of the commandment for frequent ritual bathing of jews in the communal mikveh.

That origin is simple: a form of halitosis that was not unique to jews, (5) but so common among them that Europeans for a millennia or more found utterly foul and presumed that it came from their bodies not just their mouths. It is also suggested by the fact that medieval Europeans believed that the jewish stench came from the inside of the jew not the outside, which suggests it wasn't so much they weren't clean but rather that there was something about them that smelt particularly bad.

In his next epigrammatic reference Martial continues to develop his attack on the jews as a people when he writes:

'You grant your favours, Caelia, to Parthians, to Germans, to Dacians; and despise not the homage of Cilicians and Cappadocians. To you journeys the Egyptian gallant from the city of Alexandria, and the swarthy Indian from the waters of the Eastern Ocean; nor do you shun the embraces of circumcised Jews; nor does the Alan, on his Sarmatic steed, pass by you. How comes it that, though a Roman girl, no attention on the part of a Roman citizen is agreeable to you?' (6)

What Martial is telling us here is that he; and Romans like him, regarded the jews as a filthy and sexually lecherous group of people. Even if a woman; like Caelia to whom Martial addresses his Epigram, had a sexually promiscuous reputation then it was regarded as the epitome of vice and disgrace to have sexual intercourse with a jew, an Alan or an Egyptian (all of whom were greatly looked down in ancient Roman society for different reasons although naturally jews and Egyptians tended to be grouped together). (7)

If we read this epigram in the context of Martial's earlier suggestion that jews are filthy and smell very bad (8) as well as Martial's mention of the mark of the covenant; the circumcision of the foreskin among the jews, it can be reasonably argued that what Martial is getting at is that the jews are hypocrites and is lambasting them as such.

By this we mean that if Martial had heard or read a little about Judaism; as is very probable by his mention of the ritual of circumcision and his later knowledge of jewish ideas about oaths and vows, he would have known that an integral part of Judaism and jewish culture has always been

the idea of their separation from the rest of humanity that Philostratus took considerable exception to. (9)

By suggesting that even jews willingly come to Caelia's bed for sexual reasons then Martial is pointing out; with something with a literary chortle, how the jews don't obey their own religious rules (not '*spilling the seed*' with non-jewish women as this would produce impure children such as in the Biblical case of Hagar and lead to '*idol worship*') when they think they can get away with it and that they will seduce anything and everything even Caelia (who is obviously not the most discerning of ladies with her favours [i.e. that the jews are barbarians and have no taste even in the bedroom]).

Martial then picks up another a theme when he addresses another aspect of this hypocritical grasping nature when he points out that the jews are taught to falsely beg by their mothers so that they don't have to work, but can enjoy all the fruits of the toil of others.

To wit:

'You ask why I so often go to my small domain at arid Momentum and the humble household at my farm? There is no place in town, Sparsus, where a poor man can either think or rest One cannot live for schoolmasters in the morning, corn grinders at night, and braziers' hammers all day and night. Here the money-changer indolently rattles piles of Nero's rough coins on his dirty counter; there a beater of Spanish gold belabours his worn stone with shining mallet. Nor does the fanatic rabble of Bellona cease from its clamour, nor the gabbling sailor with his piece of wreck hung over his shoulder; nor the Jew boy, brought up to begging by his mother, nor the blear-eyed huckster of matches. Who can enumerate the various interruptions to sleep at Rome? As well might you tell how many hands in the city strike the cymbals, when the moon under eclipse is assailed with the sound of the Colchian magic. You, Sparsus, are ignorant of such things, living, as you do, in luxurious ease on your Petilian domain; whose mansion, though on a level plane, overlooks the lofty hills which surround it; who enjoy the country in the city, with a Roman vine-dresser, and a vintage not to be surpassed on the Falernian mount. Within your own premises is a retired carriage drive; in your deep recesses sleep and repose are unbroken by the noise of tongues: and no daylight penetrates unless purposely admitted. But I am awakened by the laughter of the passing crowd; and all Rome is at my bed-side. Whenever, overcome with weariness, I long for repose, I repair to my country-house.' (10)

In this epigram to Sparsus: Martial; as I have noted above, uses the jews as part of the justification as to why he spends so much time on his estates in the country, because the jews are one of the notable and noisy problems on Roman streets with their habitual fraudulent begging, which Martial says their mothers taught them (or '*supped in with their mother's milk*' as one Spanish jewess put it according to a story recounted by Mocatta).

We can infer that Martial means that the jews engage in fraudulent begging by his placement of the problem of jewish beggars next to '*hucksters of matches*' (for Roman lamps) and the notoriously drunk '*gabbling sailors*' trying to pawn off some cheap trinket or another for money to spend on cups of wine. (11)

This informs us that Martial regarded jews as both a menace and as inherently dishonest tricksters who have been brought up to do it by their mothers and their religion: as Martial would have probably known that the maternal ancestry was; then as now, key to determining whether a jew is a jew in jewish religious law (which we now called halakhah). We can suggest that Martial probably knew this, because as we have seen, Martial indirectly pokes fun at jewish religious belief and their hypocrisy when compared to the actions of the jews in general.

In his final epigrammatic mention of the jews: Martial does not disappoint us. He finally takes the bull by the horns and addresses the jews directly (12) via one of their number who had dared to steal his work and claim it was his own.

To wit:

'As for the fact that you are exceedingly envious and everywhere carping at my writings, I pardon you, circumcised poet; you have your reasons. Nor am I at all concerned that, while carping at my verses, you steal them; for this too, circumcised poet, you have your reasons. This however, circumcised poet, annoys me, that, though you were born in the heart of Jerusalem, you attempt to seduce the object of my affections. You deny that such is the case, and swear by the temples of Jupiter. I do not believe you; swear, circumcised poet, by Anchialus.' (13)

Martial here perhaps makes mention of one of the first recorded instances of what we call 'chutzpah'. In this case the sheer audacity of a jew to frequently attack Martial's poetry in public and then steal Martial's poetry to present it as his own work. Of course: this is best understood in terms of egoism where the jewish poet was essentially jealous of Martial's poetic skills and reputation so he did his best; evidently it wasn't good enough, to attack Martial's reputation in order that he; the jew, might be better known and more widely regarded because of it.

In order to buttress this attempt to destroy Martial's reputation the jewish poet then published or recited Martial's own verses as his own to suggest that in fact he is a greater poet than Martial ever was, because at the time it would have been much harder for Martial to prove that the jewish poet had stolen his work and used it as his own. This is also perhaps one of the first instances of jewish plagiarism we have on record!

This interpretation is confirmed by the end of the first part of Martial's epigrammatic rejoinder by stating that the jewish poet '*has his reasons*', which implies; on the basis of Martial's other comments about jewish lechery, deceit and lack of cleanliness, that Martial regards this as something fundamental to both Judaism and jews as a people (i.e. something a little more than '*one bad egg*').

This is further confirmed by Martial's sharp understanding of the willingness of the jewish poet to swear a false oath/vow to Jupiter to the effect he did not steal Martial's work and present it as his own.

Martial's retort is simple and highly effective: '*Make that same oath/vow to Yahweh: I dare you.*' (14)

As Benovitz has argued; but has missed this reference by Martial, the famous and highly controversial Kol Nidre prayer said at Yom Kippur has part of its origin among the jews of ancient Rome and was somewhat influenced by the Roman ideas about human and divine oaths and vows. (15)

So perhaps if one is to take the worst possible interpretation of the Kol Nidre; that it invalidates jewish oaths and vows (to either or both non-jews or jews), then one could potentially furnish support for the argument that the origins of the Kol Nidre don't lie in forced conversions to Christianity, but rather in jewish attitudes to non-jews that both explicit and implicit in historic and current Judaism. (16)

This sharp recognition of the inherent falsity of the jewish poet's claim to have sworn to Jupiter that he had done no such thing also demonstrates that Martial at the very least was aware of the educated Roman discourse on the jews and Judaism. Martial's sharp wit noticed both the ostensible doctrines that forbade the jews to do many things, but also the fact that the jews carried on regardless when they thought they could get away with it or that it was to their advantage to do it at the time.

In light of all this we can begin to see a different side to Martial and his poetry not simply that of a gifted artist and linguist but also of a Roman intellectual who was a dedicated foe of the jews and used his gifts and fame to make his audience see that there was a rabid wolf close to their door.

It is just a shame they did not heed Martial's timely and beautifully worded warning of the danger that was nearly upon them.

References

- (1) The latest author to follow in this established intellectual rut is Robert Wistrich in his 1200 page magnum opus: Robert Wistrich, 2010, *'A Lethal Obsession: Anti-Semitism from Antiquity to the Global Jihad'*, 1st Edition, Random House: New York, but such notable authors on and scholars of anti-Semitism as Leon Poliakov, Matthias Bunzl, Gavin Langmuir among others have all followed this argument in varying degrees.
- (2) Mart. Epi. 4.4
- (3) For additional context please see Ibid. 1.50
- (4) Ronnie Po-Chia Hsia, 1988, *'The Myth of Ritual Murder: Jews and Magic in Reformation Germany'*, 1st Edition, Yale University Press: New Haven, pp. 132-134; Jacob Marcus, 1960, *'The Jew in the Medieval World: A Source Book 315 – 1791'*, 2nd Edition, The Jewish Publication Society of America: Philadelphia, pp. 143; 165-167
- (5) Quite probably due to their unusual diet and food preparation techniques.
- (6) Mart. Epi. 7.30
- (7) As in Suet. Tib. 36.
- (8) Mart. Epi. 4.4
- (9) Philostr. V A 5.33
- (10) Mart. Epi. 12.57
- (11) The great Roman satirist Juvenal implicitly agrees with Martial's assessment of this in Juv.

8.

(12) This is indicated by the title of the epigram: *'On a Jew: a Rival Poet'*.

(13) Mart. Epi. 11.94

(14) *'Anchialus'* is often held to be a corruption of *'As the Lord wills it'*, which would have been part of the way that jews ended their prayers so in essence Martial is demanding that the jewish poet pray to Yahweh and make a truthful oath on that prayer.

(15) Moshe Benovitz, 1998, *'Kol Nidre: Studies in the Development of Rabbinic Votive Offerings'*, 1st Edition, Scholars Press: Atlanta, pp. 137-143

(16) I intend to go into the subject of the Kol Nidre prayer in detail at a later date and analyse both anti-Semitic and anti-anti-Semitic arguments on this in the light of the halakhah, aggadah, commentators and the academic literature.

Was Che Guevara an anti-Semite?

Wednesday, 11 May 2011

Ernesto *'Che'* Guevara is best known as the consumerist icon of what we can; with reservation, call *'Western Counterculture'* and has been the subject of much positive and negative polemic across the broad *'left'* and *'right'* divide. Having read most of the work available in English on Che I felt that what has been overlooked in discussions of Che is his nascent identification of jews as one of his enemies. To be sure Che identified jews with capitalism generally and the United States of America specifically; largely as Marx himself did, (1) and phrased his objections to them in Marxist-Leninist phraseology and the consequent *'reservoir of knowledge'* as Wirsching put it. (2) That said the feeling the jews were the exploiter and the general enemy of the *'proletariat'* was something that Che did subscribe to and even if he did not realise it: Che talked about jews as an entity apart from any other in the exactly the same manner that anti-Semitism; current and historic, does.

In his *'Motorcycle Diaries'* Che only mentions jews once and late on in the published version of the work. His comments are as follows:

'The main problem now was getting to Iquitos; so we buckled down to the task. Our first target was the mayor, a certain Cohen, who we were told was Jewish but a good sort; there was no doubt he was Jewish, the problem was finding out if he was a good sort. He palmed us off on the shipping agents, who then palmed us off on the captain, who received us well enough and promised, as a huge concession, to charge us a third-class fare and let us travel first-class.' (3)

Here we can see that Che is identifying the mayor of Iquitos; who to be sure had a uniquely jewish surname, as jewish and not as anything else. Che is essentially treating the jews as a nationality in their own right in much the same way as one might assert that Americans in Argentina are still Americans. It is clear that what Che is indirectly informing us here is that he viewed jews as a international nation if you will as jews have no true homeland; although Israel had been in existence for four years, it was very much a nascent state with little actual hope; so it seemed at the time, of survival. If Che had merely viewed jews as a religious belief system; as opposed to a nationality, then he would have no need to point out twice that said Cohen was of

jewish origin on the basis of his name and let it pass without further comment.

A confirmation of our point here can be found in the comments of Che's companion in his motorcycle trip around South America; which forms the basis of the *'Motorcycle Diaries'*, Alberto Granado.

Granado also comments on jews in a similar way to Che when he records in his account of that journey:

'Intrigued, we gradually worked the conversation round to what brought them here. And this is how we found out about a terrible form of exploitation perpetrated by the Argentine, German, Jewish and Yankee landowners of this extremely wealthy agricultural region.' (4)

We can see in the above quotation that Granado is using exactly the same point of reference to Che in regard to jews in that he simply lists them as another nationality of the exploiters of the South American Indians, which he and Che refer to constantly in usually glowing; and often explicitly racial, terms. We need to understand Che and Granado's comments about jews in this intuitive racial light if we are to understand that Che and Granado both saw jews as a biological; as opposed to a religious entity, (5) which their leftist apologists would probably try to assert if they had picked up this nascent anti-Semitism on Che's part. (6)

Che was an anti-Semite: the Leftists need to deal with this fact not pretend it doesn't exist!

References

- (1) See Jerry Z. Muller, 2010, *'Capitalism and the Jews'*, 1st Edition, Princeton University Press: Princeton, pp. 33-44 for an excellent; if somewhat apologetic, summation of Marx's views on the close historical relationship between jews and capitalism.
 - (2) Andreas Wirsching, 2010, *'Violence as discourse? For a 'linguistic turn' in communist history'*, Twentieth Century Communism, Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 12-39
 - (3) Che Guevara, Ann Wright (Trans.), 1996, *'The Motorcycle Diaries: A Journey around South America'*, 1st Edition, Fourth Estate: London, pp. 124-125
 - (4) Alberto Granado, Lucia Alvarez de Toledo (Trans.), 2003, *'Travelling with Che Guevara: The Making of a Revolutionary'*, 1st Edition, Pimlico: London, p. 26
 - (5) It is interesting to note that neither Humberto Fontova, 2008, *'Exposing the Real Che Guevara and the Useful Idiots who Idolize Him'*, 2nd Edition, Sentinel: New York or Alvaro Vargas Llosa, 2006, *'The Che Guevara Myth and the Future of Liberty'*, 1st Edition, The Independent Institute: Oakland have noticed this not very obvious fact about Che Guevara considered that both of them are strongly critical of him and have picked up on his racial views.
 - (6) Unfortunately I do not read or write any Iberian language so I have had to consult translations.
 - (7) The only biographer of Che's who has picked up on this trend in Che's thought is David Sanderson, 2001, *'Che Guevara'*, 2nd Edition, Chancellor Press: London, p. 89
-

N.B. Please note that this is a hugely abridged version of my long article; *'Che Guevara:*

Revolutionary, Racist and anti-Semite’, that will appear on Semitic Controversies next week. I will provide a link to this detailed thesis here once I have published it.

Ex Nihilo Nihil Fit: The Consequence of Negro Scholars

Friday, 13 May 2011

By Thomas de Aynsworth

I recall that during my course work I had been tasked with the reading, analysis and review of an article from the much vaunted *"Journal of Black Studies"* in the United States. My professor was not necessarily anti-European; like most intellectuals, and later admitted that had he known the content of the article he would never have forced it upon any of his pupils. Nevertheless to me the article happened to make up in propagandistic value where it had lacked in any sort of academic merit. I shall post a few key passages of the article entitled, *"Rediscovering the 'Lost' Roman Caesar"* by one Molefi Kete Asante and Shaza Ismail, along with some much needed commentary. It is to my great regret that both of these negroes hold PhDs, while at current I do not.

The article focuses around one 3rd century AD Roman Caesar by the name of Septimius Severus. It sets out to prove in one way or another that the Emperor of most of the Aryan world (and much of the non-Aryan) was a coal black negro himself, as per the racist Afro-centric historical reinterpretation (black Cleopatra VII et al).

Here is the abstract:

"The aim of this article is to rescue, as much as possible, the history of the African Roman Emperor Lucius Septimius Severus in order to adequately place him, with his considerable faults and achievements, in the continental record of Africa. Thus, the authors present the reader with a general overview of the life and career of Severus, emphasizing the African character of his experience and that of his companions who worked to secure him the position of Emperor of Rome. They then interrogate the "identity" issues surrounding Severus's history in order to rediscover his place in the history of the Roman Empire." [1]

What Asante et al means by *"African character of his experience"* is that Septimius Severus' treatment by scholars, both contemporaries of his time and modern historians tend to be generally negative within the framework of the SPQR, mainly because of his alleged black ancestry and supposed *"racist biases"* associated therein.

"The task of recovering and rediscovering African history is long and tedious because the intellectual debris around the enslavement of Africans has cluttered what would otherwise have been a clear playing arena." [2]

I find this to be a dubious statement to be placed right at the introduction of the article, as it seems to hold an ideological weight rather than a factual one. The fact that blacks were enslaved

and Africa had been placed under Aryan control in the Age of Enlightenment means fundamentally little to the history of an emperor of a European empire. Asante also overlooks the fact that the area in which we are discussing, that is: Lepcis Magna (Severus' hometown) was painstakingly preserved and excavated as a Roman city, along with classical sites throughout North Africa. The common, albeit inaccurate belief that the later Europeans would have completely leveled the site as it is alleged they had done to entire (mythical and historic) African civilizations falls flat on its face. Instead, both Severus' life and family history are well preserved through comprehensive work and archaeological evidence, which Asante to a great degree overlooks.

"Second, we interrogate the "identity" issue surrounding Severus's history and attempt to rediscover his place in the history of the Roman Empire." [3]

If one does a thorough search on Severus' identity using primary sources and secondary commentary, one will discover that his mother; Fulvia Pia, was of Roman extraction, and that his father; Septimius Geta, had also come from Rome. His grandfather; also named Lucius Septimius Severus, originally came from Lepcis Magna (according to Dio). This means that Severus could have been partially of Punic descent and I am not alone in this hypothesis. In either case: he could of been mixed, given his family's pedigree as a both citizens of Rome and going back and forth from Italy (as was common for families of the eques order) for long stints. But the *"Semitic"* (in line with contemporary works on race in Roman North Africa, along with DNA and archaeological evidence) vision of Severus was not Asante's intention.

To wit:

"In the Roman period, Africans were among the characters who helped to establish the Roman civilization all over its territories. Some of the distinguished figures were Antonius Pius, who lived during the reign of the Roman Emperor Hadrian and succeeded to win his spurs in the Jewish war. Another political character was a senator called P. Salvius Julianus who was chosen as a consul ordinaries, which was a very special honor during the celebration of the 900th anniversary of the foundation of Rome in 148 CE. In court, several African names were recorded, such as the tutor of Aurelius Caesar, whose name was M. Cornelius Fronto of Cirta. .." [4]

Surprisingly: this list of *"Africans"* goes on, with only circumstantial (i.e. geography) to back the allegations up. Asante perhaps is unaware of the mobility of the Roman upper classes into the provinces in search of wealth and reputation. To put it bluntly: the geography of the time and the demographics does not support Asante's version. Every single character listed had full if not majority Roman descent.

As an aside, to those who are unfamiliar, the correct terminology is *consul ordinarius*. Asante; unfamiliar with Roman history, most likely erred on the side of caution when his *"spell-checker"* notified him of his *"misspelling."* If this were a senior high school paper the error could be overlooked. Though as you will see this is one of many errors of syntax, grammar and spelling Asante Ismail has made. Keep in mind that this is a paper written by 2 *"PhDs"* published in a *"peer-reviewed"* journal and thus should not have even made the cut, but I digress.

"In fact, an inscription from the 4th century gives the account of the auxiliary unit, Numerus Maurorum Aurelianorum, being stationed at Aballaya, the modern day town of Burgh-by-Sands. The soldiers of this unit had all come from Mauretania and Morocco. Furthermore, there is some suggestion that genetic and physical studies, based on the skeletal remains, might prove that some modern-day British have closer African ancestry than they realize. At least we now know that skeletons found in a Roman British cemetery outside of York reveal limb proportions of some of the men that suggest they were Black Africans (Snowden, 1971)." [5]

I find it unsurprising that Asante would point out this popular meme.

I have two issues with it:

1. There is no evidence that the modern descendants of Burgh-by-Sands hold any relation to *this Auxilia* in question, and I find it highly dubious that they would given the laws surrounding Roman soldiers on duty.
2. The mention of "*limb proportions*" in relation to "*race*" would mean that "*race*" is much more than skin color, and rightly so. Asante admits here that race is a determinant of more than just obvious superficial elements to a person, as is often purported by anti-whites on the subject. This is important to note as it alludes to the hypocrisy written by so-called "*anti-racists*."

"This means that he may have been a descendant of those Phoenicians (Lebanese) who fled into exile to Africa with the Princess Elissa Tyre in 814 BCE. She came with only a few followers, who soon were integrated into the indigenous African population of Africans and Berbers. The mother of Severus was Fulvia Pia, whose family moved from Africa to Italy. However, history does not give much information about Publius Septimius Geta, the father of Severus. We know only that he had two cousins who became consuls." [6]

Asante overlooks the historical data purporting that the Punic settlers who came to Africa were a sizable population that created colonies all along the North African coast, most notably Carthage, some 400 miles away from Lepcis Magna. The colonization of North Africa by the Punic people was unmatched in scale except for the Greeks who settled much of the Mediterranean and later Romans. It is mind-boggling to think that Hannibal, also of Punic origin was at the helm of a multi-racial civilization powerful enough to fight, and win in many instances against the Romans. It is thus unsurprising that Afro-centrists even claim that Hannibal himself was "*African*".

The truth, to the dismay of Afro-centrists, is not always so "*black and white*".

"The last words of Septimius Severus tell a lot about his character and his capability of being a Caesar with no royal background, of being the man of Rome with a non-Roman origin." [7]

Here again Asante has Severus wrong: placing ideology before fact and critical analysis as the man himself was of a lower nobility eques and according to Dio's account as well as *Historia Augusta* and Herodian's *Life of Septimius Severus* was well acquainted with the well-to-dos of

Rome even in his youth and with a corresponding story of him and other boys in the Caesar's dining room. The event was famous as Septimius allegedly sat in the Caesar's chair unknowingly, apparently as prophesy of his future power. This was purported to have happened when Severus was 18-20, while he would not be proclaimed emperor until his early 50s. In either case: Asante's version of Severus as a down and out negro newcomer in Rome reaching the top of imperial power is a complete fantasy. Severus' position during his ascent to power was on at least equal footing as any other privileged provincial Roman citizen.

"He was very rapidly promoted to the position of the governor of Galila Lugdunesis and Sicily." [8]

Again: a clear misspelling. What Asante was going for was *Gallia* Lugdunesis or today's Lyon in France. This sloppy attitude towards spelling and details sums up the attitude to accuracy in the article.

Asante also tends to quote primary classical sources by proxy. For example a quote from Cassius Dio reads: *"Severus was careful of everything that he desired..."* and the citation is accredited to *"Meijer, 2004."* I am bemused as to why Asante does this as there is no real reason to do so (nor is it acceptable in classical studies). He also misspells *"Pannonia"* (Southern Austria) as *"Pannonis"* a few sentences later. Again: I am not sure as to why he did this. Whether it was a spellchecker or merely an error on his part that such a thing was published after being peer-reviewed by other such *"scholars"*.

This next bit even the most frothing anti-racists will chuckle at. Misspelling again rears its ugly head:

*"The supporters and the **aliens** of Niger were all punished, and in order to make sure there would not be any further attacks from Syria"* [9]

I honestly hope that Asante does not turn out to be a member of Farrakhan's *"Nation of Islam"* movement, and that these *"aliens"* are anything more than Niger's *"allies."* Either way, probably the best bit of this article in terms of comic literature.

"Severus being a military man, he decided to achieve more victories by heading into Parthia in 197 CE. Parthia was weak by the time, so it did not take him along to add it to the Roman Empire (Wells, 1984, pp. 257-265)" [10]

Read the pair of sentences closely. Despite being grammatically incorrect it should be noted that *"Parthia"* was never completely subdued by the SPQR. Though Severus did make inroads into the various client kingdoms of Parthia and plundered them: he did not make any serious territorial gains. Parthia was never *"added"* to Rome as Parthia's eastern border was roughly to the extent of Alexander the Great's military campaign and even the passive observer knows that Rome never shared a border with India.

"Julia Domna introduced a new fashion to the Roman female coiffeur, which was the use of hair wigs, new to both the Syrian female and Roman style." [11]

The usage of hair wigs dates back to before Caesar Augustus in AD 31. Given that there is no citation anywhere, we can assume that this too is *"out to left field."*

"He was the first to start a boule (city council) in each and every nome capital (metropolis)."
[12]

"Boule" and "Nome" being Greek words would not extend to the entire Roman Empire (as Asante attests) but rather within Egypt, which is where the most numerous primary source material is located. Asante likely does not know that these words are Greek (given his lack of knowledge about European history in general) and thus conflates the words with their Latin equivalent (not knowing that a difference existed). He also notes that Severus lived during the *"early Roman Empire"* instead of *"mid-Roman Empire"* as would be more appropriate (in the 3rd century AD). On the next page Asante again quotes primary source material and cites a secondary source (that contains the primary material). Again this would be an error in academic circles. Asante perhaps was not notified when he wrote his dissertation that led to his doctorate.

"The facades on the northern and southern sides on the arch at Leptis Magna had scenes of male and female captives with Asian features." [13]

Asante's fantasy that Rome looked like modern downtown New York City is unabashedly revealed by *"Asian features."* Most likely when he took this idea from another book (no citation is provided) the *"Asian"* would be *"Eastern"* in what the Romans would have called *"Asia."* No doubt the author of whatever mystery source would have made this clear, as well, as is the tradition in classical scholarship. Of course such *"features"* would have been clothing and trinkets, as Syrians, Parthians and the various peoples in Anatolia (Asia Minor) were at the time racially European, with small Semitic communities. This was the trend up until AD 600-1500 during the genocidal campaigns throughout the region by both Mohammedans and invading Mongols.

"There remains in the literature and common thought in the West the idea that dark-skinned people never inhabited the northern part of Africa. This has given rise to the idea of Africa north of the Sahara and Africa south of the Sahara, a notion that has been disputed by the actual traversing of the desert on foot and camel for hundreds of years. Included in this formulation is the idea that northern Africa is White and southern Africa is Black. In fact, the earliest humans on earth, according to science, were black-skinned African people. The farther back into the past one goes, the Blacker the continent is from south to north. This means that the presence in the north of Amazighs and Arabs, who did not originate in Africa but who have now been resident in Africa for nearly 2,000 years, represents a more recent population than the Black population."
[14]

Asante questions the validity of Severus being of *Punic* or *Semitic* origin and muses over the idea of an idyllic black emperor ruling over Aryans. I find it amusing that; unable to argue the point with facts, Asante falls back on the *"out of Africa"* theory to try and create a version of Africa where some North Africans evolved into ostensibly *"white"* people while others stayed black. Reality had other plans. Africa like any other part of the world was tribalistic. The blacks in

North Africa (there were few: mainly in Morocco and in Egypt) would be in their own settlements away from northern Punic sites. This would be why their language, like that spoken by the Carthaginians, had no loan words from any African language groups, as the language itself was left unmolested by outsiders. This would not have been the case had the Semites who settled the land "*blended*" with the African natives as Asante would have us believe.

Asante also makes a critical error when using Carthage's creation myth purported by a secondary Roman source as the true historical record of Semitic colonization of North Africa. No major scholar today makes ethnic anecdotes regarding Rome based on the story of Romulus and Remus suckling a She-Wolf, or Aeneas travelling with the survivors of Troy to Italy. Does Asante also believe that Julius Caesar was the descendant of the goddess Venus, as well?

While the anti-racist movement tries to discredit "*white*" history by using "*Afro-centric*" inaccuracies: it is important to defend the traditional work made by Europeans thinkers (generally accurate and methodical), especially in a time of discrediting and slander by non-white "*scholars*." Asante's argument can be considered nothing of substance, and thus his work is without any historical value what-so-ever other than as a condemnation of the spineless of the modern university.

References

[1] Asante, M. K. and Ismail, S. "*Rediscovering the "Lost" Roman Caesar: Septimius Severus the African and Eurocentric Historiography*" in *Journal of Black Studies* Vol. 40, No. 4 (2010). pp. 606-618.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Id. Author's Note: 1. the abstract was a paragraph from the first page, and because of the way in which the journal is formatted, it is redundant. 2. For further reading into Severus' Punic ancestry, see: Birley, A. R. *Septimius Severus: The African Emperor*. London: Routledge, (2004).

[4] Id. pp. 607

[5] Id.

[6] Id. pp. 608, Author's Note: Asante's best argument lay with his taking one of the 3000 year old foundation myths of Carthage, which in turn comes from Roman sources, as complete fact. In reality, the colonization of North Africa by the Semitic Phoenicians was a massive population shift. Individuals from years of migration from the Eastern Semitic world would eventually find their way to Carthage and other semi-independent Punic kingdoms.

[7] Id. Author's Note: Severus' relationship to the imperial family is well known. For further reading, see book 75 of Cassius Dio's palace source, the *Historia Augusta's Life of Septimius Severus* and Herodian's *Roman History* 3.9.

[8] Id. pp. 609

[9] Id. pp. 610 Author's Note: This quite literally made my professor laugh aloud. This kind of pseudo-intellectual work is not fit for any academic journal.

[10] Id. Author's Note: Severus' involvement in Parthia is much more complex than Asante gives credit for. In fact, Septimius led two separate campaigns into the east, both in retaliation of Parthia's support of Pescinnius Niger. Asante just has, "*wanted to achieve[sic] more victories.*"

[11] Id. pp. 611

[12] Id.

[13] Id. pp. 612

[14] Id. pp. 615 Author's Note: Asante's decision to use "*according to science*" as an authority here marks the very powerful propaganda pull that the term in modern discourse holds.

No Comment Necessary (12/05/2011)

Friday, 13 May 2011

'Israel's cancelling of the residency status of 140,000 West Bank Palestinians reported by Haaretz constitutes a war crime and represents an Israeli attempt to affect the demographic composition of the West Bank.' (1)

- Haaretz

'Actually man is not the only speaking being in the Bible. Animals and birds also speak. Even the trees and plants utter God's praises. And inanimate objects like the stones and mountains also make themselves heard.' (2)

- Rabbi Raymond Apple

'While US President Barack Obama was busy orchestrating the assassination of terrorist mastermind Osama bin Laden, his half brother Mark Ndesandjo reconnected with his Jewish roots on his first trip to Israel.'

Ndesandjo, 45, was born to Barack Obama Senior's third wife, a Jewish American kindergarten teacher and the daughter of Lithuanian immigrants.' (3)

- The Jewish Journal of Los Angeles

'I understand the desire of some rabbis to be seen as real and human. But acting on a higher plane in public comes with the job description.' (4)

- Dennis Prager (Jewish Radio Host and Author)

'Hauntingly, Lanceter described her escape from almost certain death when her parents forced her through the window of the train carrying Jews to the Majdanek death camp in Poland.'

"I absolutely have no idea how I was able to do it," she told the audience. "I put out my head. The train was going very fast. I heard bullets because the Gestapo was shooting constantly."

It was the first of many near-death experiences for the then 14-year-old Lanceter, who described her long walk to safety through killing fields, illness, injury, and close calls with being captured.' (5)

- **Gina Lanceter** (Jewish 'Holocaust Survivor')

References

- (1) <http://www.haaretz.com/news/diplomacy-defense/erekat-israel-s-cancelation-of-palestinian-residency-is-a-war-crime-1.361079> [Last Accessed: 11/05/2011]
- (2) <http://www.israelnationalnews.com/Articles/Article.aspx/10203> [Last Accessed: 11/05/2011]
- (3) http://www.jewishjournal.com/israel/article/obamas_jewish_half_brother_visits_israel_20110511/ [Last Accessed: 11/05/2011]
- (4) http://www.jewishjournal.com/dennis_prager/article/dancing_with_the_rabbis_20110412/ [Last Accessed: 11/05/2011]
- (5) <http://njewishnews.com/article/statewide/mayor-rabbi-link-holocaust-to-todays-genocides> [Last Accessed: 11/05/2011]

Walk for Hate: The Anti-Defamation League tries to fleece the Goyim

Friday, 13 May 2011

I have noticed that the infamous jewish '*defence*' organisation; the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai Brith, has over the last few years put out more and more shrill demands to the jewish community; particularly that of New York and New Jersey, for donations to '*help it continue its vital/important work*', which seems to involve acting as an adjunct for the Mossad as the ADL has been in the cross hairs of the US government numerous times for passing information onto Israel regardless of American interests. (1)

Of course this not been successful or the money has been simply spent with complete disregard for the organisational well-being of the ADL. Certainly Abe Foxman has apparently not cut down on his feasting as he is still as corpulent and rotund as he ever was.

I take my lead from the article in the '*Jewish Exponent*' on this in that we are told; in all seriousness, that this fund-raising walk for an organisation, which prides itself on furthering the interests of a foreign government, is an '*opportunity to stand up and be counted against the forces of hatred, bigotry and bullying that tear at the fabric of our society, affecting the serenity of our lives and leading all too often to violence and bloodshed.*' (2)

Now if we deconstruct this a little in the context of the '*Jewish Exponent's*' intended audience; i.e. American jewry, we note that what this editorial is actually saying is that the ADL's fundraising walk is an opportunity to fund an organisation which furthers the interests of jews in the United States and makes it a nice place to live by making sure that American stays en hoc to Israel whether it likes it or not. Let us not mince words about this: the rhetorical phrase '*the forces of hatred, bigotry and bullying*' that the editorial uses to try and justify its unprincipled lobbying is both an abstract and more applicable; if we were to pin it down to an actual definition, to the ADL then its opponents.

The editorial goes on to make the bemusing observation: *'It's admittedly hard not to be against hate.'* (3)

Well hang on one darn cotton picking minute: why on earth do you need a massive organisation to combat *'the forces of hatred, bigotry and bullying'* if it is *'not hard to be against hate'*. And what is *'hate'* anyway for that matter?

If you *'hate'* *'hate'* then aren't you just as much of a *'hater'* than somebody who *'hates'* in the first place or are we going to proclaim that one position is rational and one is irrational on the basis of what is intellectually fashionable at the present time?

Of course the logic of it all seems to escape the *'Jewish Exponent'* which ploughs on; logical fallacies and intellectual fairy tales be damned, and they plough on into perhaps a more interesting observation: *'Organizers say at this point, they expect the walkers to mostly be non-Jews.'* (4)

Now let us again be frank: the *'organizers'* are the ADL. So then if they are *'expect'* most of the walkers to be non-jews then it surely means that the ADL have started to target non-jews to try and fund their bloated espionage gravy-train in New York.

Is this the ADL really that desperate for money that they have abandoned their strategy for near on a century of scaring the local jewish population into giving them money by horror stories of Nazi takeovers of the United States, a second (or even third) 'holocaust' and the republication of Arab literature condemning jews for being so kind and munificent with their bounty as to commit war crimes against them for living on land the jews covet.

Well if the ADL are out on the *'sponsored walk'* circuit with the cancer, homeless and religious charities then they have truly sunk to new lows in the jewish community.

Perhaps the fact that the ADL didn't get a bail out from the US government is causing a lot of kvetching around the ADL's office cubicles, but that is only a possibility.

We do know one thing for sure though: Abe Foxman is going to be seriously out of breath after the first thirty-nine steps! (5)

References

- (1) There is quite a lot of polemical literature about the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai Brith. A representative and notable example maybe found in Robert Williams, 1990, *'The Anti-Defamation League and its Use in the World Communist Offensive'*, 2nd Edition, Truth at Last Books: Marietta
- (2) http://www.jewishexponent.com/article/23500/Editorial_Lets_Walk_the_Walk/ [Last Accessed: 12/05/2011]
- (3) Ibid.
- (4) Ibid.
- (5) If you want a little amusement then you can read the walk's own purpose-built website:

<http://www.walkagainsthate.org/faf/home/default.asp?ievent=454682> [Last Accessed: 12/05/2011].

In Brief: Delin Colòn tries to be a Historian

Friday, 13 May 2011

I have recently been made aware; by the Baltimore Jewish Times' reference to it, (1) of a new '*book*' on Rasputin by a jewess; Delin Colòn, who is the great-great niece of Rasputin's jewish secretary: Aron Simanovitch and whose autobiography forms the basis of her historical revisionism.

Now I haven't read her '*book*' as of yet, but I have ordered a copy of it so all I have to go on so far is the interview that was published the Baltimore Jewish Times with her. I will write a fuller review of said '*book*' when I receive it and do a little digging among the primary and secondary sources.

However the credibility of Colòn is ironically; as she holds a graduate degree in Clinical Psychology, (2) seriously impugned by her own obviously ignorant comments about historical research. For example she tells us as follows:

'Someone said, "It seems like a short book. You need more to make your case." But there are only so many times you can say so-and-so agrees without getting too monotonous, and these were very credible sources.' (3)

Let us take a moment to consider this strange statement: someone tells Colòn that her '*book*' is too short and she '*needs more*' evidence (this last bit is unstated but implicit in the sentence's internal logic) so her response is: '*there are only so many times you can say so-and-so agrees without getting too monotonous*'. (4)

This is rather absurd at best as it presumes that there aren't numerous debates surrounding Rasputin's alleged philo or anti-Semitism (dependent on who you read) and that '*all the author's agree*' (which they don't). It also suggests more ludicrously that they agree in all details, which is again obvious absurd as they don't and if they did there would be no point to Colòn's book as it wouldn't say anything that hadn't been said before let alone bringing fresh research or a new perspective to the table.

I am a great supporter of lay historical writing and popular writing (which is part of why Semitic Controversies was created to take the forms of intellectual anti-Semitism to a wider audience), but what Colòn simply ignores or more likely has not understood is that one can write highly academic books with considerable source research behind them in a popular style without making them any less understandable or readable. An academic historian who does that for example is Helmut Walser-Smith and another is Orlando Figes.

The fact that Colòn doesn't seem to understand this very basic difference between writing well

and writing badly in scholarly texts is important, because it demonstrates that she simply doesn't have a clue when it comes to historical writing or historical research.

For example she claims the citations she makes are from '*very credible sources*', but fails to tell us why these sources are so very credible and why other sources she has certainly ignored (the primary and secondary literature on Rasputin himself is vast) are not. To analyse all the sources and to take into account their positions is a basic tenant of scholarship as understood by one of the fathers of modern historical writing: Leopold von Ranke.

Yet Colòn thinks that her great-great-uncle's primary source material; his autobiography that he tried and failed to sell to any publisher, (5) is somehow '*revolutionary*' in the study of Rasputin as she appears to have made the mistake of monomania in regard to historical sourcing. Forgetting; of course, that her great-great uncle-had an obvious agenda in writing such a book for profit and certainly would have sought to betray his former employer as a friend of the jews as to do such would have been to his advantage and brought more sales of his work following the Bolshevik revolution when many in the jewish community were looking for the Messiah to turn up from Russia.

I will review Colòn's book in detail when I receive my copy, but in her interview with the Baltimore Jewish Times: she not only didn't impress. She painted an intellectual target on her rump and asked for historians to take a few well-aimed pot-shots at her and her '*book*'. (6)

We'll have to see I suppose...

References

- (1)
[http://www.jewishtimes.com/index.php/jewishtimes/news/jt/local_news/why_rasputin_loved_jews/24925?](http://www.jewishtimes.com/index.php/jewishtimes/news/jt/local_news/why_rasputin_loved_jews/24925?utm_source=May+13%2C+2011&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=JT+weekly+email+-+May+13%2C+2011)
[utm_source=May+13%2C+2011&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=JT+weekly+email+-+May+13%2C+2011](http://www.jewishtimes.com/index.php/jewishtimes/news/jt/local_news/why_rasputin_loved_jews/24925?utm_source=May+13%2C+2011&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=JT+weekly+email+-+May+13%2C+2011) [Last Accessed: 12/05/2011]
- (2) Ibid.
- (3) Ibid.
- (4) Ibid.
- (5) Ibid.
- (6) I've refrained from making the obvious comparisons between Delin Colòn and Sergeant Colon from Terry Pratchett's Discworld novels, because it would seem too harsh to do so before I've read her actual work.

Lamponing the Jew: The Depiction of the Jews in Juvenal's 'Satires'

Saturday, 14 May 2011

Decimus Iunius Iuvenalis; better known to the Anglophone world as Juvenal, is one of the greatest of the Roman satirists whose work have come down to us through the ravages of time.

His work; Satires, is oft-quoted today and produced in various selections, but what those selections rarely inform the reader is that Juvenal also used his satirical talents to attack the jews.

Like the great poet Martial: Juvenal perceived that the jews were not merely a religious oddity but a threat to the very fabric of Roman society in how grasping and avaricious they were as a people. (1)

However unlike Martial or Philostratus: (2) Juvenal did not implicitly recognise that the jewish problem was not so much one of religion and abstract culture, but rather one of biology. Juvenal saw the jews; for what we can gather from his satires, as being a problem caused by a barbaric religion and a lack of a civilisation on the part of the jews.

That said however Juvenal does share his basic theme with Martial. This basic theme is that the jews; as a people, are tricksters, liars, thieves and frauds. One wonders about those who argue that anti-Semitism has no correlation to reality what-so-ever and how they can possibly say they know classical Rome better than the very intellectuals who lived in that city or the empire that expanded from it. We have testimony about the jews from a wide variety of Roman society; in time, political bias and rank, and nearly all of it is negative. Are we supposed to believe that modern philo-Semitism used to interpreted ancient anti-Judaism and anti-Semitism is supposed to give us the *'ultimate'* interpretation (i.e. the Romans and Greeks didn't know what they were talking about) when it contradicts the very sources on which it is supposedly based? (3)

Of course not, but yet so many of our contemporaries seem to think just this!

However enough of the slight academic generality as we should let Juvenal's attitude to the jews speak for itself. To wit in his third satire Juvenal comments as follows:

'Here Numa held his nightly assignations with his mistress; but now the holy fount and grove and shrine are let out to Jews, who possess a basket and a truss of hay for all their furnishings.'
(4)

We can see that here Juvenal is attacking the jews on two different issues. These are that:

A) The jews deliberately despoil Roman religious sites.

B) The jews are beggars and scoundrels.

On the first issue; of despoiling Roman religious sites, we can see that Juvenal points out that the temple complex he is talking about; *'the holy fount and grove and shrine'*, has been scandalously abandoned and has been defiled by renting it to jews who are now using it as a den of iniquity. This is the height of insolence to a Roman to use a holy sanctuary; former or otherwise, as a den of iniquity which turns it from the spiritual to the mundane. Thus what Juvenal means here is clear: the jews will wilfully despoil Roman temples should they be able to get their hands on them!

One is reminded of a similar instance; this time rumoured, of the jews upon their readmission

into England wanting to purchase St. Paul's Cathedral in London to turn into their new synagogue but this time according to the legendary rumour negotiations foundered upon the price (the jews naturally wanted a special price for a special people).

On the second issue; that the jews are beggars and scoundrels, we can see that Juvenal describes the jews who rent the temple complex as being possessed of '*a basket and a truss of hay for all their furnishings*' by which he means to convey to his reader that the jews have rented the temple complex but are beggars in essence, which plays into his theme that the jews wish to despoil the temple complex by not even living in a majesty appropriate to the site of their abode. This to Juvenal; as to his reader, would have been the height of scandal as they would have been able to understand the wealthy despoliation of a temple complex as at least it would indirectly honour the Gods, but to despoil a temple complex while being poor was a double insult to everything the Romans believed.

We can note as an aside that Juvenal's implicit reference to the jews as being beggars and lowly scoundrels does play very well into part of the economic history of jewry that is often overlooked by both anti-Semites and philo-Semites (historically and currently). This is what we may call the jewish itinerant pedlar whose shadow darkened Europe for centuries as the common face of jewry to the average European as the jewish financier and merchant was to the middle class and aristocracy. (5) These individuals often had few possessions of their own and made; often a very good, living selling whatever they could get their hands on for staggering mark-ups to non-jews and sometimes even fellow jews. (6)

That these itinerant jewish pedlars were similar to Juvenal's jews inhabiting the temple complex we can see from his reference to their few possessions (which is a classic sign of the itinerant pedlar) and later reference to the status of the jews as beggars and common (7) willing to sell anything for a price (even their '*religion*'). (8)

It is interesting to note that the basis for Juvenal's remarks about the jewish wish to despoil the sacred sites of the Romans; even in Rome itself, may be found in his largely correct understanding of Judaism as a religion. This basis may be found in the following passage from the Satires:

'Some who have had a father who reveres the Sabbath, worship nothing but the clouds, and the divinity of the heavens, and see no difference between eating swine's flesh, from which their father abstained, and that of man; and in time they take to circumcision. Having been wont to flout the laws of Rome, they learn and practise and revere the Jewish law, and all that Moses committed to his secret tome, forbidding to point out the way to any not worshipping the same rites, and conducting none but the circumcised to the desired fountain. For all which the father was to blame, who gave up every seventh day to idleness, keeping it apart from all the concerns of life.' (9)

Here we can see that Juvenal is satirising the jewish religion by noting that they don't worship their divinities/divinity through idols (as was then the basis of all other major religions) and instead assert that their divinity is omnipotent, omniscient and also wondrously invisible. Of course Juvenal is making fun of the Torah indirectly here by pointing out; as any educated Roman would have known, that the jews were forbidden to worship idols by their God because

in his absence they started worshipping the golden calf (possibly the origin of the idea common in European witch literature of kissing the devil's arse).

Of course Juvenal; much as Martial did, sees the irony in the hypocrisy of the jews who had; then as now, a huge level of disparity between their religious theory and how they actually behaved. This he later makes fun of by pointing out that a jewess will change her learned interpretation of jewish lore to suit each customer depending on much silver they are willing to fill her palm with. (10)

Juvenal makes a surprising mention of the mark of the covenant; circumcision, when he correctly notes that the jews abstain from pork ('*swine's flesh*') and see '*no difference*' between eating that and cannibalism. Here Juvenal is; of course, once again poking fun at the jews by comparing their own bodies with those of the meat of animals forbidden by kashrut. He is also pointing out; once again, the disparity between jewish religious theory and practice by noting that the jews willingly mutilate their genitalia (which is sacred flesh) but yet regard the mutilation of animals (which is non-sacred flesh) as being below them, while proclaiming contradictory commandments in the Decalogue (the ten commandments). This; of course, would have the basis for many a Roman or Greek intellectual chortle at the intellectual absurdity of Judaism and jewish rites.

Juvenal also notes that the jews '*flout the laws of Rome*' which is a direct reference to the supremacy of jewish religious law; what we now call halakhah, over Roman jurisprudence in jewish eyes and the fact that when in Rome they did not act like Romans but continued to act as if they were in Judea. One can easily imagine the corpulent jewish priest swaggering about Imperial Rome thinking he owned the place only to be kicked in the gutter and knifed by some crazed jewish adherent of the zealot cult; eager for his proverbial dark-eyed houris, for his '*worldliness*' and worship of Mammon. All this of course would have been a source of much intellectual amusement to both the average Roman (who we can presume probably despised the jews as much as the Roman elite did) and the Roman intellectual. After all who would have thought that these proverbial guttersnipes from the backside of beyond were anything more than an odd ink blot on the pages of history at the time?

This perceived supremacy of jewish religious law over the jurisprudence of non-jews is interesting to note as this has long been one of the most credible and hardest to attack of anti-Semitic arguments precisely because it is based in obvious fact to anybody who cares to study Judaism with a critical eye. Jews; and those who uncritically support them, attacking this position frequently assert that the Talmuds enjoin obedience to the laws of land in which the jew then happens to reside, but what that argument conveniently leaves out; lets call it what it is: lying by omission, is what is enjoined should the laws of the land and jewish religious law come into conflict i.e. what happens when to be a good jew one has to go against the laws of the land? The answer from the jewish literature is pretty unanimous: one should be a good jew first and obey the laws of the land second. (11) Even today jews are still enjoined by their rabbinical authorities to obey halakhah first and the laws of the land in which they reside second. (12)

It is clear that Juvenal's reference to the jews believing in their divinity '*in the clouds*' and the religious law he supposedly gave them is the origin of the implicit belief that Juvenal alludes to that the jews can do what they please, because they are unique and special (hence can occupy

and desecrate Roman temple complexes with abandon while Yahweh apparently plays the part of a celestial cheerleader) and need obey no rules that the non-jew might try to impose on them. (13)

It is also of note that Juvenal refers to the Torah as '*Moses' secret tome*', which suggests that the jews were trying to keep the text of Torah to themselves lest the non-jews '*misunderstand*' some of the passages therein and draw the logical conclusion that Judaism is explicitly anti-gentile and admonishes its followers to be a '*Chosen people*' and that that status is biological not merely based on religious confession and belief. Obviously parts of the Torah leaked out and by the time of Celsus the Epicurean it had become common knowledge among Roman intellectuals what the Torah contained but by then the Roman and Greek intellectuals were having to contend with early Christianity as a more overt and aggressive threat than Judaism had ever been (and as such their writings were focused on Christianity and often attacked Christianity through using the apparent lesser of the two intellectual evils: Judaism). (14)

Juvenal also picks up a common point of amusement for the Roman and Greek intellectual when he touches upon the Sabbath and the jews downing of proverbial tools for a day to '*honour their father*'. Juvenal predictably; and correctly I think, points this out as a sign of the inherent laziness of jews, but does not mention that they will tend to engage non-jews to do the tasks they would normally do for them while using legal loop holes in jewish religious law to allow them to get their work done as long as they don't specify that this work is being done on the Sabbath.

From this discussion it is therefore obvious that Juvenal's thought on the jewish question is based on the presumption that it is a question of religion and abstract culture and not one of biology. We can further see this in Juvenal's delightful satirizing of jewish religious hypocrisy and lapsed ethics.

The relevant passage is as follows:

'No sooner has that fellow departed than a palsied Jewess, leaving her basket and her truss of hay, comes begging to her secret ear; she is an interpreter of the laws of Jerusalem, a high priestess of the tree, a trusty go-between of highest heaven. She, too, fills her palm, but more sparingly, for a Jew will tell you dreams of any kind you please for the smallest of coins.' (15)

Once again here we find reference by Juvenal to the fact the jew is by nature something of an itinerant pedlar (16) when he refers to the '*basket*' and '*truss of hay*', but we also find here explicit reference to the false beggary of the jews not similar from Martial's comments regarding this phenomenon. (17)

Part of her begging Juvenal tells us; with obvious satirical intent, is to '*interpret the laws of Jerusalem*' for passers-by, by which he means to make his reader snort with laughter at the hypocrisy of the jews as a religious community and as a people. Juvenal; of course, is referring to the ability of every jew to somehow tell everyone else what jewish religious law really says, but what he or she says it is somehow differs from what every other jew thinks it is! (18)

Hence Juvenal wryly remarks that while jews occupy and desecrate Roman temple complexes

and holy places: they set themselves up as what the high priests or priestesses of the local tree, which is a nod to the nature worship and animism inherent in Roman and Greek mythology (that was the worship of idols according to Judaism and thus abhorrent).

Juvenal also remarks that one can change the '*laws of Jerusalem*' by simply giving the begging jewess more money and all of a sudden the prognostication becomes more favourable and oh wait the prediction was mistaken and that '*looking deeper*' it is now favourable if you cross her palm with more silver. Hence Juvenal's sarcastic reference to the jewess as a '*trusty go-between of highest heaven*' and that a jew; in general, will '*tell you dreams of any kind you please*' for a fee of course.

Oh, but wait that isn't from some anti-Semitic newspaper or text: it is from Juvenal one of the greatest satirists the world has ever known! Now watch the philo-Semites squirm and gabble about '*prejudice*', but they must answer the simple question of why on earth Juvenal would choose the jews alone to attribute his '*prejudices*' too and not everyone else as well?

Let us cut through the pestilent sophistic miasma of philo-Semitic '*clarifications*' and '*qualifications*': Juvenal was hardly to make things up when his contemporary Roman sources agree with him as well. Surely the Law of Parsimony tells us that the least number of assumptions; in the absence of evidence to the contrary (which is where oh worshippers of the self-chosen?), is the way to go and not simply trying to rationalise away comments by those we idolise that we don't like (as the philo-Semite does habitually)?

For Juvenal and the numerous other Roman authors critical of the jewish tradition (by far the majority who deign to mention Yahweh's little darlings) are talking about what they saw and the intellectual trends of the day: they are not trying to justify a pre-existing agenda based on the assumption of non-jewish guilt and jewish innocence (which forms the basis of post-holocaust philo-Semitism).

Juvenal goes on in his lampooning of jewish beggary and dishonesty when he refers to them indirectly as '*Syro-Phoenician*' and talks of the community from the Indumean gate, which was ancient Rome's jewish quarter and one of its poorer districts. (19)

To wit:

'And when it pleases him to go back to the all-night tavern, a Syro-Phoenician runs forth to meet him----- a denizen of the Idumean gate perpetually drenched in perfumes --- and salutes him as lord and prince with all the airs of a host; and with him comes Cyane, her dress tucked up, carrying a flagon of wine for sale.' (20)

Here Juvenal is relying on his Roman reader's knowledge of the contemporary geography of ancient Rome as he is noting the Semitic tendency to hondle (21), but then telling us that this '*Syro-Phoenician*' is actually a reference to jews by noting that he is from Indumean gate where the majority of Rome's jewish population at that time resided. In effect the passage should be understood as '*a Jew runs forth to meet him*' rather than that which a literal interpretation would suggest.

Juvenal's remarks about the jews in this context are different version of his jewish beggary and dishonesty theme that we have covered throughout this article. He ascribes to the jew a place in an '*all-night tavern*' (22) where the jew appears to be waiting for the unsuspecting non-jewish customer; having dolled himself up with effeminate perfume which is clearly distasteful to Juvenal, (23) so that he can sell him as much wine as he can possibly drink (hence his acting like a host and the offering of a flagon of [probably cheap] wine for sale) with the additional incentive of a prostitute ('*her dress tucked up*') and then take advantage of the Roman's drunken stupor to proverbially rob him blind. The fact that the jew is ostensibly poor is also provided contextually by Juvenal reference to the Indumean gate, which was one of the poorest quarters of Rome.

So much as the jew of Martial is taught by his mother to beg properly (and falsely): the jew according to Juvenal has refined this process into an art of the conman, which entails playing the host, pawning off cheap wine at an exorbitant price with the help of a willing prostitute (possibly a jewess playing the part of Esther) and then clean out his customer's pockets and possessions.

So what of the satirist Juvenal: well he certainly was no friend of the jews and nor was he an anti-Semite in the actual sense of the term, but he strongly opposed the jews of his day in his beautiful verse. It is a shame that Juvenal's contribution to the anti-jewish cause has so long been forgotten by anti-Semites and it deserves to be remembered and honoured once again.

References

(1) On Martial please see my article: '*Savage Poetry: Martial on the Jews*'. This is available at the following address: <http://semiticcontroversies.blogspot.com/2011/05/savage-poetry-martial-on-jews.html>.

(2) On Philostratus please see my article: '*The First anti-Semite: Philostratus and the Jews*'. This is available at the following address: <http://semiticcontroversies.blogspot.com/2011/05/first-anti-semite-philostratus-and-jews.html>.

(3) I am using slightly Hegelian language here, but it serves to demonstrate that the philo-Semites tend to conceive their ideas as the end of all interpretations as opposed to merely just another interpretation.

(4) Juv. 3

(5) For an excellent summary work of the economic life of the time which gave rise to the itinerant pedlar in popular myth and folklore see Christopher Dyer, 2005, '*Making a Living in the Middle Ages: The People of Britain 850 – 1520*', 2nd Edition, Yale University Press: New Haven; Georges Duby, Juliet Vale (Trans.), 1991, '*France in the Middle Ages 987 – 1460*', 1st Edition, Blackwell: Cambridge.

(6) This is a serious gap in the literature and the only work I know of that deals with this economic phenomenon in detail and in any language is: Betty Naggar, 1992, '*Jewish Pedlars and Hawkers 1740-1940*', 1st Edition, Porphyrogenitus: Camberley. Statistical backup for this argument is incidentally offered by the German statistical handbook on the jewish question: Institut zum Studium der Judenfrage, 1939, '*Die Juden in Deutschland: Herausgegeben vom Institut zum Studium der Judenfrage*', 8th Edition, Franz Eher Verlag: Munich, pp. 29-45

(7) Juv. 8

(8) Ibid. 6

(9) Ibid. 14

(10) Ibid. 6

(11) An explicit example is provided by Myer Lew, 1944, *The Jews of Poland: Their Political, Economic, Social and Communal Life in the Sixteenth Century as reflected by the Works of Rabbi Moses Isserls*, 1st Edition, Edward Goldston: London, n. 65 p. 129; Paul Kriwaczek, 2006, *Yiddish Civilisation: The Rise and Fall of a Forgotten Nation*, 2nd Edition, Phoenix: London, p. 140. Also worth reading in this case is the testimony of Jacob Brafmann, Siegfried Passarge (Trans.), 1928, *Das Buch vom Kahal*, 2 Vols., 1st Edition, Hammer Verlag: Leipzig, which spends considerable time on this issue from the perspective of a jewish rabbinical convert to Christianity (on the reasons for Brafmann's conversion and the origins of the book please see Brafmann, Op. Cit., Vol. I, pp. 3-7).

(12) As one can ascertain by reading about the recent concern among jewish religious authorities that halakhah could be removed from its status of a separate legal authority under American law: http://www.thejewishweek.com/news/national/anti_sharia_laws_stir_concerns_halachah_could_be_next. [Last Accessed: 14/05/2011]

(13) Surely giving credence to Philostratus' remark that the jews are in perpetual rebellion not only against Rome but humanity writ large as well. (Philostra. V A 5.33)

(14) On early Christianity and its conflict with Rome please see: Charles Freeman, 2009, *A New History of Early Christianity*, 1st Edition, Yale University Press: New Haven.

(15) Juv. 6

(16) Ibid. 3

(17) Mart. Epi. 12.57

(18) One could see this as an implicit nod to the egoistic theory of the jewish question as Juvenal is essentially telling us that every jew is an egomaniac who thinks he is the next Moses or David.

(19) Jerome Carcopino, E. O. Lorimer (Trans.), 1991, *Daily Life in Ancient Rome: The People and the City at the Height of the Empire*, 4th Edition, Penguin: New York, pp. 138-142

(20) Juv. 8

(21) To 'hondle' means to informally bargain/negotiate in a commercial context in Yiddish.

(22) This can be compared to the frequent jewish occupation of running taverns and inns in Eastern Europe during the early modern period to the advent of the Soviet Union in late 1917.

(23) The conservative idea that a real man did not need to wear perfume as it was a mark of an effeminate nature was actually quite common in ancient Rome as it was frequently ascribed to the luxuries and degeneracy of the East with their fleshpots and loose sexual mores. That said the Spartans were known to perfume their heavily muscled bodies and long hair, but this was rejected by the Romans. In a modern context one might remark as did Henry Ford in *The International Jew* that the jew always tries too hard to fit in and as such simply gets it wrong often with hilarious results. Juvenal also implies just this in his first satire when he says: *'The day itself is marked out by a fine round of business. First comes the dole; then the courts, and Apollo learned in the law, and those triumphal statues among which some Egyptian Arabarc or other has dared to set up his titles; against whose statue more than one kind of nuisance may be committed! Wearied and hopeless, the old clients leave the door, though the last hope that a man relinquishes is that of a dinner; the poor wretches must buy their cabbage and their fuel. Meanwhile their lordly patron will be devouring the choicest products of wood and sea, lying alone upon an empty couch; for off those huge and splendid antique dinner-tables he will consume a whole patrimony at a single meal. Ere long no parasites will be left! Who can bear to*

see luxury so mean? What a huge gullet to have a whole boar----an animal created for conviviality----served up to it! But you will soon pay for it, my friend, when you take off your clothes, and with distended stomach carry your peacock into the bath undigested! Hence a sudden death, and an intestate old age; the new and merry tale runs the round of every dinner-table, and the corpse is carried forth to burial amid the cheers of enraged friends!’ (Juv. 1)
[Arabarc is an allusion to the Jewish Prefect of Egypt between 67 – 70 A.D.]

Suetonius on the Jews

Sunday, 15 May 2011

Gaius Suetonius Tranquillus; better known to students of history everywhere as simply Suetonius, is one of the great historians of the Roman era who wrote twelve accounts of the various reigns of twelve Roman emperors. He continues to be a primary source for both popular historical accounts of this time period and as an invaluable source for academic historians studying both the empire and historical writing at the time. Suetonius; unlike other near contemporaries of his, did not make any attacks on the Jews as such, but he; in the course of historical writing, does note upon their activities from time to time.

So what Suetonius has to say about this is of obvious interest to us from an anti-Semitic point of view, because as a source he is both neutral on the question of Jews and in a position to take a wider view of events as opposed to the more usual narrow view that pervades Roman historical writing.

As Suetonius divides his work up into twelve different reigns and the comments about Jews are made on three different occasions in three of these twelve books (i.e. one in each book). Thus we can only make very general surmises as to the situation as related by Suetonius, but they are still of value as they lend weight to the writings of more polemical authors on this question.

The first mention we find of Jews in Suetonius’ work is after the death of Julius Caesar where he records the following:

‘Thereupon the musicians and professional mourners, who had walked in the funeral train wearing the robes that he had himself worn at his four triumphs, tore these in pieces and flung them on the flames – to which veterans who had assisted at his triumphs added the arms that they had then borne. Many women in the audience sacrificed their jewellery together with their children’s breast-plaques and robes. Public grief was enhanced by crowds of foreigners lamenting in their own fashion, especially Jews, who came flocking to the forum several nights in succession.’ (1)

There are several things to note on the basis of this history in that it indicates that there was a significant colony of Jews in Rome by the time of Caesar’s death, which is important in that it tells us that Jews could well have been playing a notable role in the affairs of state; albeit behind the scenes, at this fairly early stage.

The second is something Henry Ford most famously pointed out in *'The International Jew'* in so far as jews have a tendency to try to be something too hard. So in Ford's case: they tried to be American but ended up being hyper-American and in the case of Rome they ended up being hyper-Roman. This is demonstrated in the fact that jews *'especially' 'flocked to the forum'* to pay tribute to Caesar who they naturally saw as an object to venerate for their own best egoistic advantage as those who did not venerate Caesar would surely have been looked upon as siding with his murderers lead by Brutus.

The third is more conjectural in that Suetonius mentions how many Romans sacrificed jewellery to throw it in the flames as an offering to a great warrior and statesman in the true Roman model. Now obviously jewellery would have included large amounts of precious metals, stones and gems which would not have been melted or otherwise rendered useless by the funeral pyre (as it isn't likely to have been hot enough). Thus it is plausible to suggest that part of the reason for the jews flocking to the forum for several night was to pick clean the offerings to the divine Julius to clean up, re-use and sell on to the highest bidder.

It might be conjectural, but if Suetonius' account is accurate it firstly explains why the jews should flock to the forum at night in such numbers and secondly why Suetonius deigns to mention that the jews were particularly drawn to the forum under cover of darkness. Perhaps Suetonius suspected some mischief was afoot from the jews, but being the neutral (by Roman standards) scholar of history he was he could not uncover any proof that this was the case, but he could make mention of the fact that this was rather odd and hence worthy of being recorded. As otherwise why bother and single out the jews for special mention?

The next reference to the jews is from the reign of the Emperor Tiberius and reads as follows:

'He abolished foreign cults at Rome, particularly the Egyptian and Jewish, forcing all citizens who had embraced their superstitious faiths to burn their religious vestments and other accessories. Jews of military age were removed to unhealthy regions, on the pretext of drafting them into the army; the others of the same race or of similar beliefs were expelled from the city and threatened with slavery if they defied the order. Tiberius also banished all astrologers except such as asked for his forgiveness and undertook to make no more predictions.' (2)

Once again there are several points of note here in that Suetonius relates how Tiberius sought to suppress the growing menace of foreign religious cults to Roman law and order. We can gather from Suetonius' wording that this was a wide problem and had greater implications than just the suppression of Judaism in the capital. That said Tiberius is telling us that by this time Judaism was aggressively seeking converts among Roman citizens and as it denied the very basis of both Roman law (the worship of the Emperor) and its adherents viewed themselves as above Roman law (only subject to jewish religious law) then we can see that Tiberius was quite right to suppress it: as these fashionable cult followers of Judaism more than likely had no clue about the nature of the religion they were *'joining'*.

One may suspect that Judaism was presented by the jews in Rome as another *'mystery cult'* which can be argued on the basis that Suetonius refers to it in the same breath as he does the worship of Isis (the Egyptian cult that needed fairly frequent suppression in Rome because of its

subversive nature). The probability is that the jews rationalised their biologically-based religion to gain converts by using one of two simple devices later used in Judaism in general: jewish mysticism (which would in effect cover up the actual doctrines of the religion with appeals to the '*mystery*' of it all) and/or the use of an early form of the Noahide laws.

The Noahide laws; for those unacquainted with the concept, are a small set of mitzvot (commandments) that are supposed to be easy for non-jews; who in Judaism are extremely subject to the '*evil inclination*' (which can be transliterated to mean '*the gentile spirit*'), to follow so that they can enter Gan Eden (heaven) with the jews as the servants of the jews. Since in Judaism observant jews have to follow the taryag mitzvot (613 commandments) to go straight to Gan Eden; rather than going through Gehenna first (roughly equivalent to purgatory), and to break a commandment is to have sacrificed ones emunah (which can be transliterated to mean '*the jewish spirit*' but is usually translated to mean faith which doesn't cover its actual meaning) to take the '*evil inclination*' in its stead (i.e. temporarily sacrificed their chosen status to enjoy the evil of the gentiles).

If one adds to that the biological dimension of Judaism; as represented in the jewish caste system, then ones realises that the basis of the idea of the '*Noahides*' is that those born non-jews are genetically inferior to born jews even if they come to be regarded as having been '*born with jewish souls*' (the only way one is allowed to convert to Judaism in essence).

It is thus interesting to note that the jews were attracted converts and to account for that we can only turn; as I have said, to either the jews using a form of jewish mysticism (to cover up the not very pleasant doctrines regarding non-jews) and/or an early form of the Noahide laws.

It is interesting that Tiberius should have sent all the male jews to the '*unhealthy regions*'; probably a reference to the marshes, under the pretext of trying to make men of the male jews in the legions. (3) One wonders whether Tiberius saw that the jews were trying to raise insurrection against him much as they did under the leadership of Chrestus during the reign of Claudius and took pre-emptive action to behead the conspiracy by taking away its followers and manpower. (4) Whether Tiberius left the male jews to die in the '*unhealthy regions*' is not recorded, but we may presume that he did.

However I think it is likely that his action in sending the male jews to the '*unhealthy regions*' was to behead such a conspiracy as is indicated by his banishing the remaining jews and their converts and threatening them with the reduction to slavery if they tried to remain in Rome. This later points directly implies what Juvenal stated so well about jews in that they thought they were above Roman law (5) and so Tiberius was forced to take drastic action to force them to leave Rome and stop trying to incite revolt against his rightful rule using their '*converts*' as a shield against the righteous fury of the Roman gladius.

The third and final direct mention of the jews by Suetonius is; as previously pointed out, from his work on the reign of the Emperor Claudius. Suetonius tells us that:

'It now became illegal for foreigners to adopt the names of Roman families, and any who usurped the rights of Roman citizens were executed in the Esquiline Field.'

[...]

Because the Jews at Rome caused continuous disturbances at the instigation of Chrestus, he expelled them from the city. ' (6)

There are two things to note here. Firstly is the obvious connotation that the foreigners in general; including the jews, were taking the names of Roman families; legally or not, and trying to claim the rights; including free bread and water paid for and provided by the Roman state, given to Roman citizens. I think it is important to realise here that when Suetonius says Roman citizens it would be better translated as '*citizens of the city of Rome*' as a Roman citizen is a general term, while a citizen of the city of Rome had more rights than did the ordinary citizen of the Roman empire. One of these; as I have said, was the right to have free bread and water provided by the state and another; which was exported to the provinces in later years, was the free attendance of public games, races and banquets.

It is therefore rather obvious why a foreigner; jews included, would want to get in on this particular act and we may also note that this may again be an example of jews adopting Roman names to camouflage the fact that they were jews. Much as jews in Judea often went one of two ways: either being hyper-jewish (i.e. the first Hasidim) (7) or they became hyper-Greek (i.e. the Hellenizing jews so abused in the later Tanakh).

In the latter case the jews tended to adopt Greek names, the Greek language and Greek ideas (in essence becoming hyper-Greek and therefore not very Greek at all) although there was some spectrum of compromise available as with one of the few jewish thinkers extant from this time: Philo (i.e. trying to reconcile the Torah with Greek philosophy much as Saadia Gaon later tried to do). One wonders why; if this example of the problem of jewish assimilation and all it entailed was in so well-known a classical work as Suetonius, the thinkers of the 19th and 20th centuries by enlarge couldn't recognise the basic danger. (8)

Secondly we come one of the largest and longest running academic controversies of all time: the issue of '*Chrestus*'. Christians tend to transliterate this into '*Christus*', but I am of the opinion; based on my own understanding of the issue, that this is wishful thinking on their part as scholars have outlined that the text clearly says '*Chrestus*' not '*Christus*' and even if it did say '*Christus*' there is no reason; as far as I can ascertain (i.e. without starting off having assumed your conclusion), for believing it to be anything more than a mention of an odd rebellious cult rather than the nascent Christians in Rome. (9) However having stated my opinion on that issue I will focus on the jewish aspect of this comment by Suetonius.

Here Suetonius is telling us simply that the jews had revolted against the Roman government in Rome itself and were causing '*continuous disturbance*' to the population. This probably indicates that what was happening was not a wholesale insurrection; as there certainly weren't enough jews or converts to do that, and there is no mention of the use of the Praetorian Guard, the Legions or the Auxilia to crush a rebellion which we would expect if it had been an insurrection.

The likelihood is that Chrestus; probably either a jewish rabble-rouser or mentally-ill mystic with delusions of grandeur, stirred up the jews to start a campaign against the Roman authorities under the likely presumption that divine aid would be forthcoming if he did so. Of course the legions of angels didn't turn up to massacre the goyim and Chrestus; who was probably crucified (ironically enough), lost the ensuing struggle. It is possible that Chrestus may have been influenced by the ideas of the Hasidim and particularly the zealot community (that were certainly at least somewhat known by the jewish communities throughout the empire), which advocated the violent and bloody overthrow of Roman government and power to bring about a jewish super power; lead by the jewish messiah, that would rule the goyim in the name of Yahweh.

Claudius; of course, took the logical option to deal with the problem after Chrestus had been suppressed: he expelled all the jews from Rome. In fact there is other evidence that Claudius was something of a budding anti-Semite as pointed out by the late and great anti-Semitic classicist Revilo Oliver. (10)

All in all Suetonius offers much information to us and can be used to back up quite a wide range of arguments about the conduct of the jews in ancient and classical times. Once again I am forced to note that anti-Semites have been very slow to appreciate the value of Suetonius' comments as they offer much opportunity to attack the jews from a direct they do not have prepared answers for.

References

(1) Suet. Iul. 84

(2) Ibid. Tib. 36

(3) Much as the Russian empire much later tried to do the same thing by selecting part of the male jew population every where and trying to raise them to be good Russian patriots and Orthodox Christians in the Tsars armies. This; of course, failed, was subject to jewish corruption (the rabbinical families never got their sons selected in this way) and only succeeded in creating a caste of potential jewish traitors inside the Russian army much like the Mamluks had earlier proved to be in the Ottoman empire.

(4) Suet. Claud. 25

(5) Juv. 14

(6) Suet. Claud. 25

(7) It should be understood that the followers of the movement that uses the Baal Shem Tov; or Besht, as its figurehead adopted its name from this time as a parallel they saw in the past for their own time. On the Baal Shem Tov's life see Moshe Rosman, 1996, *'Founder of Hasidim: A Quest for the Historical Ba'al Shem Tov'*, 1st Edition, University of California Press: Berkeley and on his ideas see Jacob Schochet, 1995, *'The Mystical Dimension'*, 3 Vols., 2nd Edition, Kehot: New York.

(8) An interesting anthology of discussions of the thought and reactions of intellectuals, politicians and the man in the street on this topic can be found in Helmut Walser-Smith (Ed.), 2001, *'Protestants, Catholics and Jews in Germany, 1800-1914'*, 1st Edition, Berg: New York. Of particular note is Walser-Smith and Clark's assertion on p. 13 (in their chapter *'The Fate of Nathan'*) that by 1905 (based on the official jewish statistics compiled by the community) one third of all jewish marriages in Berlin were between a jew and a German. It seems that the

lessons of Rome were not learned by the intellectuals and were just ignored in favour of the latest fashionable superstition.

(9) Compare to the clear mention of Christiani in Suet. Ner. 16.

(10) Revido Oliver, 2007, *The Jewish Strategy*, 2nd Edition, Historical Review Press: Uckfield, pp. 17-23. Oliver produces a full English transcription (with the original Greek for those wishing to check the translation) of a papyrus letter from Claudius on the Jews that is both authentic and rarely included in collections of documents about the reign of Claudius for reasons that become obvious upon the reading (as it relates to the anti-Jewish riots in Alexandria which are a favourite hobbyhorse of modern Jewish scholarship).

The Emperor Claudius on the Jews

Monday, 16 May 2011

Claudius is possibly one of the most famous of all Roman emperors largely thanks to Robert Graves' best-selling novel; *I, Claudius*, and its subsequent television dramatisation starring Brian Blessed (as the Emperor Augustus) and the homosexual Jew Derek Jacobi (as the future Emperor Claudius). (1)

During Claudius' reign there were increasing tensions between the Jewish and non-Jewish communities as evidenced by the Jews of Rome causing a '*continuous disturbance*' under the leadership of a Jew named Chrestus. (2) Claudius naturally took the logical course and expelled the Jews; writ large, from Rome much as Tiberius had. (3)

In the A.D. 41 the Jews and the Greeks of Alexandria began to clash again as they had for decades as the Jews sought more privileges and to be allowed into Greek-only institutions such as the gymnasia. Of course the Greeks didn't fancy going and sitting in Jew-only proto-yeshivot, but this didn't seem to matter to the Jews for it was only about what they couldn't do and where they couldn't go. So naturally the Jews decided to make a big fuss about being '*persecuted*', which began to cause riots to flare up again as the Jews started swaggering around the streets in the belief that the extra privileges they had extracted from the Emperor Augustus were going to be upgraded yet further. (4)

However the Greeks of Alexandria having long been wise to the nuances of Jewish behaviour and detesting the Jews as usurpers and usurers didn't take this in their stride and instead clashed openly with the Jews. Beating them in the streets and probably killing a few: this caused a series of public disturbances in Alexandria between the mainly Greek and the minority Jewish population where running battles were fought on the streets.

This naturally caused the Roman authorities in Alexandria to appeal to the Emperor Claudius for aid and to which he sent the following public declaration after consultation with both the Greeks and the Jews:

'As for who were responsible for the outbreak and insurrection, or rather, if we must designate it correctly, for the wars against the Jews, although your envoys and especially Dionysius son of

Theon distinguished themselves in argument with their (Jewish) adversaries, I nevertheless decided not to investigate the matter thoroughly, and I entered into the ledgers of my mind a ruthless indignation against whichever nation recommences hostilities; I now emphatically give warning that if the two peoples do not desist from their disastrous and contumacious hatred of one another, I shall be compelled to show what a benevolent ruler can be when is roused to righteous anger. Therefore I solemnly conjure the Alexandrians to behave with forbearance and kindness towards the Jews who have for a long time lived in the same city, and not to obstruct any of their customary rites in the cult of their god, but to permit them to observe the customs they followed in the time of the Divine Augustus, which I now sanction, after hearing both sides of the case. On the other hand, I now order the Jews not to agitate for more privileges than those they have long enjoyed, and not again to have the unprecedented insolence to send out their own ambassadors as though they were living in a separate state, and furthermore (I order them) not to force their way into games and contests held by the gymnasiarchs and cosmetae (officers who presided over the physical and intellectual education of the Greek youth in Alexandria) while they (the Jews) reap the profits of their own special privileges and, living in a city that is not their own, enjoy all the bountiful advantages of that city, furthermore (I order the Jews) not to import or bring in (i.e., into Alexandria) by ship Jews from Asia Minor or Egypt (from which Alexandria was administratively separated) , a procedure that must excite in me the gravest suspicions. Otherwise (i.e., if the Jews do not obey), I will by all means take vengeance on them as fomenters of what is a universal plague throughout the civilised world.

If both peoples, desisting from these practices, are willing to live together with tolerance and kindness toward one another, I, for my part, will show the utmost concern for the prosperity of the city (Alexandria) as being one joined to us by friendship from the time of our ancestors.

I assure you that my friend, (Tiberius Claudius) Barbillus (one of six Roman citizens among the twelve envoys from Alexandria) , has always shown solicitude for your welfare whenever he appeared before me, and he now championed your cause with great zeal and distinction, and the same goes for my friend, Tiberius Claudius Archibius (another one of the envoys). Farewell.' (5)

There are numerous points of interest in this letter that not only require but demand comment.

These are as follows:

A) The Greeks objected to the Jewish 'cultic rights'; i.e. the worship of Yahweh, being carried out as they rightly conceived that Judaism; then as now, rejects on its initial premise any other god but Yahweh; although the Decalogue does implicitly recognise that other gods actually exist, (6) which naturally offended the Greeks. They also probably held that evil rites were being conducted on the Jews based on numerous rumours that were circulating at the time, (7) which would have been exacerbated by the excessive secrecy with which the Jews surrounded their religion. (8) This 'separateness' and lack of ability to integrate or engage with the Imperial cult; because of their religion, is evinced by the Jews daring to send their own ambassadors; as if they were a nation, to the Emperor which he obviously took great exception to.

B) The Jews were; as Claudius states, 'agitating' for more privileges for themselves beyond what was normal for citizens of the Roman Empire and this probably included further trade

concessions in addition to the special privileges conferred on them as jews by the Emperor Augustus. We may particularly ascertain the jews were seeking to '*reap further profit*' from Claudius' wording that the jews should be pleased with the ability they have to '*reap the profits of their own special privileges*'. (9)

C) The jews were arrogantly and forcibly seeking access into Greek educational establishments and when the Greeks of Alexandria refused to grant this demand the jews tried force (probably using hired thugs from the local Egyptian population). (10)

D) The jews were importing large numbers of jews from Palestine and the rest of Egypt; openly and by stealth, in order to swell their ranks either as a form of proto-Zionist project, (11) a way to gain more privileges by the use of numbers and/or simply for the sake of avarice. (12)

E) That Claudius felt that the cause of the problems in Alexandria was the jews and not the Greeks, which maybe ascertained from the fact he only admonishes the Greeks to tolerate the jews and their rites, while he specifies what the jews have done wrong and should not do in the future if they wish to avoid imperial retribution.

We can see from this list that the actual grievances of the Greeks and their causes are very real and the Greeks of Alexandria were understandably worried about a jewish takeover being effected and the jews gaining yet more concessions which would inevitably cause Greek economic, social and political life to deteriorate. At this juncture it would be wise to point that the inevitable response of the philo-Semite here will be that these are socio-economic; not racial, cause, but while it is true the symptoms are socio-economic in nature: they are fundamentally caused by the collision of two biologically very different peoples and the resultant competition between the two. The socio-economic symptoms in essence are the way that the Greeks of Alexandria expressed their racial concern as a group about the competing biological group: the jews and the fact that they were favoured by the edict of the Emperor Augustine and were seeking further competitive advantage over the Greeks in the city.

So if this is true then the advocate of socio-economic causation will answer then how do you understand socio-economic symptoms with a racial basis as opposed to the socio-economic competition endemic in any social system.

To this we can simply respond that the key to recognising this is simply to realise that all biological groups; from the genus to the individual, are in competition with one another and that all socio-economic competition is an expression of the evolutionary need to compete. That means that all competition between groups is biological in nature and that competition between racial groups may be recognised simply through noting where biologically different groups are in evidence as they will naturally cluster together and as a broad generalised unit compete with the other biological group. In this case we are simply dealing with sub-species; i.e. racial, competition between two different sub-species, which will inevitably lead to the victory of the one over the other either by driving the other off or by eliminating it as a threat. As it happens the Alexandrian Greeks did in fact eventually rise up against the jews and do just this when a jewish conspiracy emanating from Palestine sought to conquer the whole of North Africa in the name of Yahweh. (13)

If we understand all this it becomes clear to us that jewish behaviour has; as a rule, not changed much in almost two millennia and it says something for the racial understanding of the jewish question that jews behaviour is; if properly understood, largely consistent and what has changed over the years is the way of interpreting and understanding that behaviour.

Was the Emperor Claudius an anti-Semite?

I don't think we can go that far, but rather that Claudius' experiences dealing with the jews caused him to become increasingly opposed to the jews as a people and Judaism as a religion.

References

- (1) The veracity of Robert Graves as the classical scholar his hagiographers and publishers claimed; and continue to claim, he has been spectacularly destroyed by the classicist Revilo Oliver in his 2006, *'America's Decline: The Education of a Conservative'*, 2nd Edition, Historical Review Press: Uckfield, pp. 145-147
- (2) Suet. Claud. 25
- (3) Ibid. Tib. 36
- (4) The jews were exempt from the heavy local and imperial taxes levied on the local Greek and Egyptian population by the Roman state due to the privileges conferred upon them by the Emperor Augustus. Revilo Oliver, 2007, *'The Jewish Strategy'*, 2nd Edition, Historical Review Press: Uckfield, p. 23. He takes this from papyrus no. 8877 in Berlin.
- (5) Ibid, pp. 22-23; Oliver offers an exact linguistic nuance breakdown of the translation of the key passage on p. 24 as an aid to the reader. I have retained Oliver's helpful in-line notes in the passage.
- (6) *'You shall have no gods before me'*, which implies that other gods exist and that Yahweh; rather than saying that other gods don't is saying that they do but that he is the supreme god. That said all three Abrahamic faiths assume there is only and has only ever been one god.
- (7) For example the Greek Grammarian Apion is cited by Josephus in *'Against Apion'* as asserting that the jews worshipped the head of an ass in the Temple at Jerusalem and sacrificed non-jewish children to Yahweh.
- (8) Juv. 14
- (9) I am reminded here of Juvenal's comment that the jews are obsessed with money and will do anything to get it. I.e. *'No sooner has that fellow departed than a palsied Jewess, leaving her basket and her truss of hay, comes begging to her secret ear; she is an interpreter of the laws of Jerusalem, a high priestess of the tree, a trusty go-between of highest heaven. She, too, fills her palm, but more sparingly, for a Jew will tell you dreams of any kind you please for the smallest of coins.'* (Juv. 6)
- (10) This is reminiscent of the story of Mordechai and Esther in Persia as celebrated by the jews; historically and currently, on Purim with a night of drunken gratitude and quite often violence towards non-jews by way of celebration. On this see Elliot Horowitz, 2007, *'Reckless Rites: Purim and the Legacy of Jewish Violence'*, 1st Edition, Princeton University Press: Princeton.
- (11) For further context of this jewish habit please see Strab. 16.2.28:38 and/or my article; *'Strabo on the Jews'*, which is available at the following address:
<http://semiticcontroversies.blogspot.com/2011/05/strabo-on-jews.html>.

(12) This idea is sometimes expressed colloquially today in the Jewish phrase: '*Oy what a bargain!*'

(13) John Allegro, 1971, '*The Chosen People: A Study of Jewish History from the time of the Exile until the Revolt of Bar Kochba*', 1st Edition, Hodder & Stoughton: London, pp. 243-249

Some Thoughts on Ilan Pappé

Tuesday, 17 May 2011

Ilan Pappé; sometime professor at the University of Exeter and formerly of the University of Haifa, is something of a rarity among Jewish scholars of Jewish history: as critical of Jews as he is of Gentiles. That might sound like a harsh judgement to those unacquainted with the field of Jewish studies, but it is unfortunately if anything something of an understatement of the situation in which we find ourselves. In that the academics, researchers and general odd-bods who populate the field of Jewish studies tend to churn out apologetics for Jewry rather than taking a critical view of their subject.

The focus; in spite of the various Jewish studies '*mission statements*', in essence is not to critically study Jews, Judaism and the interaction with the societies in which they lived and still live, but rather to find excuses as to why the Jews aren't to blame for anything that happened to; or anything that has been said about, them. Literally gallons of ink is spilled every year in the field in great tomes and numerous journal articles wondering out loud how anyone could think ill of the Jews and how anyone who did; or does, is ipso facto irrational and otherwise a '*nazi-who-wants-to-kill-six-millions-Jews*'. (1)

Pappé is something rather different and it is refreshing to see some kind of critical attitude to the Jewish role in Jewish history as an active; as opposed to passive, factor in their '*persecution*' and why people might not like Jews. What is interesting is that the Israeli '*revisionist historians*' are not actually revisionists in the historical sense at all as revisionism is a form of historical skepticism and a demand for facts to back up bland assertions and wide interpretations. In essence then revisionism in the historical sense is the constant revision of the interpretation of history in close reference to the facts including extensive source criticism.

Israeli historical revisionism; as recently pointed out by a colleague of Pappé's, (2) is actually a more sophisticated form of non-biblical literalist apologetics for Israel's existence and the Jewish people in general. Rather than using the old methods of Israeli historiography; backed up by a few credulous or nefarious Christian academics in the United States, which were in effect to present a wholly incredible history of the Jews from the time of the final destruction of the Jewish kingdom by the Emperor Hadrian to the beginning of the occupation of Palestine by the Jews as the logic end of Yahweh's plan for them. All that they needed was the Messiah to turn up and the Jews would literally be ruling the world!

Israeli '*historical revisionism*' by contrast simply does away with the old pure certainties and claims that while Zionism was desirable it has not been without problems and that it is possible that the Messiah might not turn up: such is the historical position of the ilk of Benny Morris.

Who has for reasons unknown to me long been feted on the leftist side of the fence, but they have suddenly and violently rejected him after his vicious defamation of Pappe proving what some of us had long suspected. (3) Benny Morris and his ilk are just more sophisticated proponents of the jews as the proverbial master race theory of traditional (i.e. from Labour to Revisionist) Zionist; and most schools of Israeli, historiography.

Although the Messiah does appear to be rather late (or perhaps he has just been a very naughty boy): hence why the jews in New York take the occasional trip out to the backwoods of America to con the proverbial yokels out of their hard-earned savings to '*send more jews to Israel*' (or to be pedantic '*make Aliyah*') so that the '*end times*' scenario can start. Of course Israel has its own modern day zealots who deny anything remotely science related (unless they can claim Hashem inspired a jew to create it or assist in its creation) and periodically demand that Israel start the long-awaited slaughter of the goyim (as Hashem will surely marshal his celestial armies in support). (4)

With all that is going on in academe Pappe is something of a breath of fresh intellectual air; in spite and not because of his foetor judaicus, in his honesty to tackle the proverbial '*pink elephant in the room*' in jewish studies: i.e. that the jews might just have caused much of the reaction to their own behaviour. Such a revolutionary thought is not really brought up by Pappe in his most famous book; '*The Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine*', (5) and neither is it really considered in his journal articles or other academic or popular books of his that I have read.

Instead Pappe focuses on proving that the anti-gentile genocide; lets not beat around the linguistic bush shall we, committed by Israel during the supposed '*War of Independence*'; perhaps more aptly named the '*War of Western Dependence*', were:

A) The logical result of Zionist political philosophy.

B) Systematically planned and organised before hand by major jewish figures.

With his first point I think Pappe has stayed his own hand considerably as Zionism as a political philosophy was implicitly genocidal towards gentiles from its very earliest days as the basic ideological plank that informs Zionism is the '*chosen*' nature of the jewish people and how they are called to rule the world (as the priestly class and proverbial interface between Yahweh and the world). You can read that suggestion in both Herzl and Hess: the two intellectual fathers of Zionism. (6) You can also read that attitude among Zionism's early major rabbinical supporters such as the Baseler Rav (7) and Rav Abraham Kook. (8)

Perhaps that just cuts too close to the bone for Pappe?

With the second point Pappe is much stronger and provides ample evidence for the existence of Plan Dalet; the plan to kill, torture and generally terrorise the native Arab population to leave so that the self-chosen could move in and steal (or rather '*find*' halakhically speaking) everything that wasn't nailed down, which actively included such major figures in jewish history as Moshe Dayan, Yigael Yadin and David Ben-Gurion i.e. the founding fathers of modern Israel.

Pappe notes; not incorrectly, that it is hard to argue that this coordinated activity wasn't the centralised organised conspiracy that he evidences it to have been. Indeed those Israeli apologists who argue that either Arab losses have been grossly exaggerated (i.e. *'there was no Nakba'*) or that there was no conspiracy, but what massacres there were merely the work of a few jewish extremists (i.e. Benny Morris and the Israeli *'historical revisionists'*) are offering utterly fanciful interpretations of Israeli history according to Pappe.

Interestingly Pappe hints that the basis of much of this assumption of general jewish innocence in Israeli history is the sentimental notion that jews like Ben Gurion, Yadin and Dayan cannot be held up to the same intellectual scrutiny as others as they are part of hero-pantheon of Israel's national mythos (pun not intended).

In essence Pappe tells us that some jews are open to criticism from other jews; although one can imagine that there will be screams of *'jewish self-hatred'* and *'anti-Semitism'* from some quarters, but that other jews; perceived to be the *'chosen of the chosen'* if you will, are immune from non-superficial criticism in Israeli historical circles because to criticise them would in effect mean criticising Israel and doubting Israel's right to exist as an entity squatting on Arab land.

According to Pappe and those jewish historians who agree with him; like Shlomo Sand, no jew should be immune from criticism and that historical research serves a higher purpose than adjunct propaganda for the Israeli state.

Now that's a first: I agree with a jew!

References

- (1) Possibly the classic example of this attitude may be found in Moshe Zimmerman, 1988, *'Wilhelm Marr: The Patriarch of anti-Semitism'*, 1st Edition, Oxford University Press: New York, where he spends the entire somewhat detailed biography trying to invent reasons why Marr was completely irrational, was jealous of jews and otherwise invented his anti-Semitic attitudes because the jews rejected him.
- (2) In Shlomo Sand, 2010, *'The Invention of the Jewish People'*, 1st Edition, Verso: New York
- (3) For example: http://www.palestinechronicle.com/view_article_details.php?id=16848 [Last Accessed: 17/05/2011]
- (4) I pointed out just an instance in my article; *'Rabbi Lazer Brody: 'Hashem will Slaughter the Goyim'*, which is available at the following address:
<http://semiticcontroversies.blogspot.com/2011/05/rabbi-lazer-brody-hashem-will-slaughter.html>.
- (5) Ilan Pappe, 2007, *'The Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine'*, 1st Edition, One World: New York
- (6) This is most easily found and described in Alan Clark, 2005-10, *'Zionism: The Real Enemy of the Jews'*, 3 Vols., 1st Edition, World Focus/Clarity: London, but it may be found in numerous works on the question of Israeli history and the history of Zionism.
- (7) Arthur Cohn, 1972, *'Of Israel's Teachings and Destiny: Sermons, Studies and Essays'*, 1st Edition, Ahron Press: New York, pp. 111-113
- (8) Roger Friedland, Richard Hecht, 1996, *'To Rule Jerusalem'*, 1st Edition, Cambridge University Press: New York, pp. 200-209

And now for something completely different...

Wednesday, 18 May 2011

The Israel Ministry of Foreign Affairs announced the following on 17/05/2011:

'DFM Ayalon said that the denunciation reveals double-standards towards Israel: "It is incumbent on that a United Nations senior official will denounce the provocative violence against Israel, its citizens and its sovereignty, instead of pointing the finger at a democracy trying to defend itself". Ayalon added that "Israel's territory is not worthless and will not be abandoned. Israel has the right and duty, as does any nation, to defend itself and its borders. It is disappointing that the person in charge of humanitarian affairs at the UN requires explanations on why defensible borders are a fundamental right of Israel's citizens. Israelis are not second class citizens and they are entitled to all the rights of citizens of other nations".

Ayalon also expressed another protest against the false representation of Israel contained in the OCHA reports . "There is not now, nor has there been, a humanitarian crisis in the Palestinian territories, these reports are inflaming the atmosphere and hurting regional stability," Ayalon said.'

I will provide a translation of what Deputy Foreign Minister Ayalon should have said:

'DFM Ayalon said that the denunciation reveals Israel's double-standards towards the United Nations: "It is incumbent on that a senior Israeli official will denounce the provocative violence against Palestine, its citizens and its sovereignty, instead of pointing the finger at a democracy trying to defend itself". Ayalon added that "The Palestinian territories are not worthless and will not be abandoned. Palestine has the right and duty, as does any nation, to defend itself and its borders. It is disappointing that the person in charge of humanitarian affairs in Israel requires explanations on why defensible borders are a fundamental right of Palestine's citizens. Palestinians are not second class citizens and they are entitled to all the rights of citizens of other nations".

Ayalon also expressed another protest against the false representation of Palestine contained in the Israel Lobby's reports. "There is a humanitarian crisis in the Palestinian territories, these reports are inflaming the atmosphere and hurting regional stability," Ayalon said.'

Oy vey!

From the Archive: Edouard Drumont's 'Les Juifs Contre la France'

Sunday, 22 May 2011

As I haven't had as much time this weekend (blame the wife) as I'd have liked to complete my forthcoming articles on Geoffrey Chaucer's *'The Prioress' Tale'*, Celsus the Epicurean's and

Porhyry of Tyre's anti-Judaism and Che Guevara's anti-Semitism. I decided than rather than not publish anything I'd reproduce something that one of the great founding fathers of anti-Semitism; Edouard Drumont, (1) wrote at the time of the Dreyfus Affair. (2)

Let us allow the great man to speak for himself:

'What is the exact meaning of the frenzied campaign organized by world Jewry to panic France, dishonor the French army and, in so doing, put it in no condition to play a role in Europe?

This campaign simply means that the totality of interests of which Jewry is composed has taken a position against France and finds it advantageous that France cease to be a great European power.

It seems pointless to me in these articles, which are written from a philosophical and social point of view, to give myself over to puerile indignation and vain declamations on this subject.

If the circumstances were such that I was invested with an authority that would permit me to save my country I would turn the big Jews and their accomplices over to a court martial that would have them executed. But in the theoretical and speculative domains I find it quite natural and logical that the Jews do what they do. To think otherwise would mean falling into the mania common among Frenchmen, who find themselves so lovable that they imagine that the whole world should love them.

The Jews formerly had a nationality. They lost it because of their divisions and their absolute lack of any instinct of hierarchy and order. Thanks to their genius as conspirators and traffickers they reconstituted a money power that is formidable, not only though the force that money itself possesses, but because the Jews have diminished or destroyed the other powers so that only theirs remain, because they have modeled, fashioned, molded a society where money is the true master of all.

This money power, like all powers, is only inspired by its own interests. It goes in the direction that seems most profitable to it. At the time of the Revolution it was for us; it then supported Bonaparte; in 1815 it was clearly against him and, at the time of Waterloo it fought with Rothschild as energetically as did Wellington.

It was for the Second Empire at the beginning, and was against it at the end. It worked for Germany. It provided funds for republican newspapers of the Ferry tendency just as today it supports internationalist and anarchist newspapers. It prepared our destruction then as it prepares it today.

After our disasters this power came back over to us. It gave us an appearance or an illusion of revival and prosperity through financial movement, and it profited from this by making France a prey upon which all the Jews of the world fell. Financiers have grabbed all our savings, the others have invaded the posts and great worldly situations and shared honors and decorations among themselves.

Today the Jews think that there is nothing else they can get from us, aside from the last honorary baubles from the World's Fair. They know our cashboxes are empty, that the savings banks will be unable to reimburse the billions that were confided to them. They know the depths of the abyss hidden by the false décor of our budgets. They are preparing to liquidate France the same way they liquidated Spain.

If the anti-Semites don't manage to save France by the means used by Danton this liquidation will be carried out in the blink of an eye.

Never has there been a more serious moment. We are going to witness: we already are witnessing a new sharing out of the world. The question is: are we going to intervene in this sharing out or will we be excluded. When the Russian alliance was concluded it was decided that we would take part in this; today they no longer see the necessity of giving us our share.

The true goal of the campaign organized by the Jews, and for which Dreyfus was only ever a pretext, was to destroy the might, or the appearance of might, that was given by an army that only a few years ago seemed to be an element which Europe had to take into account.

An autocratic government like that of the Tsar had to pass through many prejudices and hesitations in bringing about a rapprochement with a government as unstable and bizarre as ours. What decided the Tsar was obviously not the sympathy inspired in him by our politicians, it was that still imposing and solid mass that was the French army barely three years ago.

The Jews said to Russia:

"You believe this? You are naïve. We are going to make a consortium, add a few million to those that Germany will give us, group together all the frothers of the press, all the worm-eaten crooks of Panama and the Chemins de fer du Sud. After all this you'll see what's left of the army.

"Every day you'll be able to read in the newspapers in huge print that General Mercier, who had pushed his audacity so far as to arrest a wretched Jew who had turned French military

secrets over to Germany, should be sent to a prison camp. As for Boisdeffre, he who we believed would play the role of Moltke, the high chief of the General Staff, the general who placed his name at the bottom of the Franco-Russian military accord, he will piously disappear without even trying to defend himself before a handful of rogues who all would have joined Baihaut at Mazas [prison] if Loubet hadn't committed a veritable crime by hiding the list of Panamists from justice...Incidentally, for this act Loubet was unanimously condemned by the Chamber before being acclaimed by it after been booed at Auteuil by the people of Paris."

The Jews have done what they announced, and we must recognize that they have proceeded to this moral destruction of the French army with unequalled virtuosity.' (3)

References

- (1) There is quite a lot of work in French and German about Drumont, but little in English. Fortunately part of that slim amount is a decent biography in the form of Frederick Busi, 1986, *'The Pope of Antisemitism: The Life and Legacy of Edouard-Adolphe Drumont'*, 1st Edition, University Press of America: New York.
- (2) I intend to go into the Dreyfus affair in some detail, but it will take a lot of literary and archival research on the subject (as the literature on it is vast and primarily in four languages). For a very brief pro-jewish (Dreyfusard) summary please see Albert Lindemann, 1993, *'The Jew Accused: Three Anti-Semitic Affairs (Dreyfus, Beilis, Frank) 1894-1915'*, 2nd Edition, Cambridge University Press: New York, pp. 57-128
- (3) I take the article from the small Marxists.org archive on the Dreyfus affair:
<http://www.marxists.org/history/france/dreyfus-affair/drumont.htm> (Last Accessed: 22/05/2011)

Shoah or Ritual Murder?

Monday, 23 May 2011

When I wake every morning one of the first things I do; other than get a cup of tea and have a shower, is to browse the morning's latest news about all things jewish. It never ceases to amaze me that during that morning browse I usually find multiple references to the '*holocaust*' or how some '*holocaust survivor*' has decided to grace the world with his or her '*memories*' about the event some 60-70 years after the fact. However I am forced to wonder how holocaustians account for the sheer chutzpah they are engaging in by '*collecting*' this '*oral testimony*' to serve as '*evidence*' for alleged crimes that occurred decades ago (not that I am impugning the gathering of claims and data).

Perhaps they realise that the '*holocaust*' theory of what happened to the jews of Europe is based largely on a few dozen testimonies, which with a little bit of creative editing can be made to fit a preconceived thesis that also happens to then be re-confirmed by scholars who believe in the theory and therefore see the evidence through that lens. It is rather like believing in say the Illuminati and looking at history with the idea that there is a great rationalist conspiracy against

religious belief going on. You are going to find what you want to see in history and you can then present your theory to the world with all its accompanying evidence.

The difference between a believer in the Illuminati and the '*holocaust*' is essentially that the latter is far better educated, holds higher social position and is able to call upon the assistance of a wider range of fellow researchers who also happen to be staunch believers. It isn't an uncommon tactic in debate to simply bombard your opponent with references and points until they cry for mercy and retreat, which is essentially what holocaustians habitually do in their literature.

We need to realise that historical fact is largely historical theory and like in scientific theory we are never totally sure something happened or didn't happen, but we can be as sure as we can be that something did based on what currently know. The difference between historical theory and scientific theory however is that the later is testable while the former is generally not.

The only way we can almost totally sure that something happened; and we should realise that this is constantly evolving, is if all the evidence we have points to the same conclusion. What you might call '*convergence of evidence*', but again a difference between science and history rears its ugly head. You can pick a hole in a historical theory easily enough by using linguistics, archaeology and so forth. It isn't hard to find something to attack a theory with, but in science the proof is in the pudding. If you say you can build a perpetual motion machine or think Einstein's theories are junk then the onus is on you to prove it, because if you are right and truly believe you are so then you should be able to do what you claim you can.

In history things are rather different, because even the most apparently objective fact is often not what it seems because other historians have picked away at it for some time and come up with other theories and related evidence that you should (and indeed must) address in order for your interpretation (i.e. your theory) to have a seat at the proverbial table. And let us get another thing clear shall we: the popularity of a theory doesn't make it right, but rather the best propagandised theory.

The interesting thing about all this is that the jewish historians; particularly of anti-Semitism, try to have their historical cake and eat it to. What do I mean by that?

Well on the one hand we have ritual murder; supposedly committed by the jews and the evidence for which is largely based on eyewitness testimony, and on the other we have the Shoah: supposedly committed by the Germans and the evidence for which is largely based on eyewitness testimony.

Yet our jewish historians tell us that the first; ritual murder, is an outrageous lie made up by an evil anti-Semites to defame the jews, while the second; the Shoah, is the lord's honest truth and was carried out by evil anti-Semites to exterminate the jews.

Notice a pattern there?

In both statements of belief we see that the jews assume the anti-Semite; otherwise known in

Judaism as Amalek (the eternal enemy), to be both completely evil and obsessed with hurting the jews: the Chosen people of Yahweh.

So what are the jewish historians doing?

Well it should be obvious by now: they are applying the ideas of Judaism; consciously or not, to their positions in order to deal with uncomfortable evidential realities where they should know; as some jewish historians have covered both ritual murder and the Shoah in their research (Leon Poliakov is a good example who published extensively on both issues), that their two evidential standards are incompatible especially considering that there were several major ritual murder trials in the 18th and 19th centuries (which are often touched on by literature on the '*holocaust*').

That said they simply ignore this and carry on purporting their double standard as if it were the most logical thing in the world. However that said it is logical in its way, but only if we take as read the assumptions that underlie both Judaism and to a large extent secular jewish culture as the truth. We; of course, would dispute the logicity of those assumptions (as; I suspect, would many jewish historians), but it doesn't stop them from being implicitly made by jewish historians as a group (and they have been transferred in varying degrees to non-jewish historians of jewry).

That is the problem with historical theory in many ways: in that with science one has the ability to experiment, but in history one has no such recourse outside of the growing field of experimental history where historians and experts physically test different things to see if the historical record is credible.

However in most cases; outside of testing whether something could have worked or physically happened, experimental history is of little use. We can't really test historical theories outside of their purely physical properties; which means that the '*holocaust*' is actually a testable theory as many of its claims are purely physical and fantastic. But then it depends whose testimony you take to be credible doesn't it?

As you can see history is not really an objective science (as wishful thinking historians of many different disciplines like to pretend), but in fact the creation of a believable and arguable pseudo-mythology supported by a cloud of interpretation and data in the same way that believing in Thor's hammer is backed by the existence of thunder clouds.

So the question remains: what do you want believe in?

You pick: the Shoah or Ritual Murder?

Fried Hasid

Monday, 23 May 2011

You couldn't make it up if you tried: the Hasids are at it again here in NY.

'A religious rift in a Rockland County Hasidic town turned violent Sunday when a man was severely burned.

Cops arrested a man from a rival synagogue, according to The Journal News.

Aron Rottenberg, 43, suffered third-degree burns to more than 50% of his body when Shaul Spitzer attacked him with a rag soaked in flammable fluid, police told the newspaper.

Police arrested Spitzer after the attack at 4 a.m. in New Square and charged him with first-degree attempted arson and first-degree assault.

Spitzer also suffered severe burns to his hands and arms, police told the newspaper.

Members of the Friedwald Center, where Rottenberg and his family worship, have split from the congregation of David Twersky, the Hasidic community's grand rabbi and leader.' (1)

I wonder what Martin Buber; the great jewish apologist for Hasidim, would make of this?

References

(1) http://www.nydailynews.com/news/ny_crime/2011/05/23/2011-05-23_badly_burned_in_hasidic_rift.html [Last Accessed: 23/05/2011]

The Jew as Untermensch: Celsus the Epicurean on the Jews

Tuesday, 24 May 2011

Celsus the Epicurean; usually known as simply Celsus, was a pagan intellectual who wrote a book; '*On the True Doctrine*', that attacked the growing; then largely jewish, sect of Christianity in Rome. We do not; in fact, have a copy of Celsus' original work, but what we do have is quotations from Origen's reply to him; '*Against Celsus*', some years later that reproduces something of the work and presuming that Origen's reproduction is a reasonably honest representation of Celsus' original (possible although hard to definitively prove or disprove). Celsus has been called many names throughout the years; largely by Christian scholars who have sought to dismiss him, but he has had something of a renaissance since the secularisation of the study of the fathers of the Church and the later pagan thinkers. (1)

This revival of more impartial scholarship of the later pagan intellectuals has fortunately lead to Hoffmann extracting and making sense of what we have of Celsus' original text. This was then drawn up into a small book of the flowing text of Celsus' thought that would have formed part; although certainly not all or probably even most, of '*On the True Doctrine*'. (2)

As '*On the True Doctrine*' is a work against Christianity which uses Judaism as part of the means to attack Christianity we have to think slightly laterally here and think of the meaning behind his arguments as opposed to the ostensible argument themselves, which are; as we have

said, primarily directed against Christianity not Judaism.

When Celsus first mentions the jews; by this we should understand that Celsus means jew as a follower of Judaism not jews here, he is using them as an example of the fact that Christianity to him was not an original religion and borrowed many of its ideas from other '*Eastern*' as well as '*Western*' religions. (3) Celsus also anticipates modern theological criticism when he notes that Christian (and by extension jewish) doctrines in fact largely come from other religions and he particularly notes; in line with the normal trend in Roman thought regarding the jews, that Judaism is a corruption of the religion of the Egyptians (4) and perhaps Celsus more particularly means the worship of Isis, which he would have known of in his day and age. (5)

This suggests that Celsus saw the jewish religion as largely a subversive cult, but which unlike Christianity was not as aggressive or as open in its pretensions to rule the world. This is confirmed when Celsus notes that the Torah is nonsense and derides the very idea that the jews are '*chosen*' by an all-powerful god as he tells us that the Torah is but '*one among many*'. (6) However in spite of his derision of the notion of the '*chosen*' status of the jews: Celsus explicitly recognises that the jews are a nation whose national religion is Judaism. (7) Celsus at a fundamental level recognises that Judaism is a biological religion that is unique to one people and does not function in the same way religions in general are assumed to (historically and currently).

It also noteworthy that Celsus finds the followers of Judaism to be '*gullible*' (8) and that the principle deceiver of the jews was Moses himself. (9) This forms the basis of one Celsus' principle arguments against Judaism in that he recounts that the basis of Judaism; and indeed for him most forms of cultic religion, is defrauding people to believe that there is one god in the sky with no proof for crediting such a fantastic intellectual position. Indeed Celsus goes as far as to state that Moses fought against the '*natural inclination*' of man to believe in many different gods and goddesses and did so by dishonest means. (10)

Celsus asserts that much of Moses' aforesaid dishonest means relates to Moses being '*a magician*'; i.e. a trickster and con-artist, (11) and he held such power over the jews because they were naturally superstitious (i.e. very gullible) and were '*addicted to sorcery*' according to the Torah. (12) It is interesting to note that the jews being regarded as the principle sorcerer and black magician is a common theme in European witchcraft literature (13) and indeed the jews may have been responsible; in large part, for the much overstated and oft little understood '*witch craze*' due to their close association with witch beliefs and magical practices in Christianity. (14) We can remind ourselves that jews are still heavily involved with the '*occult*' and that much '*occult*' literature takes its cue from Judaism; directly or not, (15) as well as the fact that many major occultist figures have been jews. (16)

Celsus also declares that the jews '*worship angels*' (17) meaning by it that the jewish obsession with name-based magic (18) and the use of angelic invocation as an intercession between Yahweh and jew is actually similar to the pagan concept of a leading god with numerous subordinate gods. Celsus' point is simple: that if one uses angels to intercede between jew and Yahweh then surely that is using the same mechanism as does paganism with its lower order of gods and goddesses. Therefore Celsus asserts; correctly I think, that jewish claims; then and

now, to be monotheists are doubtful at best and at worst patently absurd as many; i.e. orthodox and ultra-orthodox, jews still worship Yahweh through the medium of a sub-ordinate goddess (the Shekhina/Shekhinah) (19) who the jews '*make love to*' in order to attract the attention and favour of Yahweh. (20)

Celsus however does mistakenly attribute one angel as being the Sabbath, (21) but his point is ironically somewhat valid in that the Sabbath; or Shabbos, is almost an object of worship in Judaism as it does revolve almost entirely around Shabbos even with jewish festivals one of the first questions to be answered in the major commentators on the halakhah; jewish religious law, is 'what do you do if it falls upon the Sabbath?'

This might seem inconsequential to some, but we can regard it as an important point to make in that Judaism revolves around the act of the creation of the universe by Yahweh which reinforces the idea of the chosen status of the jews and the difference between Adam (jews) and the lesser orders of beings (haAdam [non-jews] and animals).

The jew in Judaism is in essence able to celebrate Shabbos; and has a biological right to do so, while a non-jew in Judaism does not and merely plays the part of a spectator who doesn't know on a biological level; i.e. is inferior to the jew, what he/she has done wrong, while a jew is far more able to discern right/wrong and good/evil than a non-jew because they are far less subject to the '*evil inclination*' (the '*gentile spirit*' in essence).

So what Celsus; probably accidentally, has stumbled upon here is at the very core of Judaism there lies idol worship with that idol being themselves as the apex of all that Yahweh has ever wanted his creation to be.

Celsus then; in a section entitled the '*Address to the Jews*', indicates that he has made a study of Judaism when he rhetorically addresses the jews on the subject of jewish converts to Christianity. This is shown by the fact that he refers to the jews; writ large, in their own; biologically-based, terminology as '*Israel*'. (22) It is interesting to note that Celsus here seems to be on the cusp of comprehending Judaism; as Juvenal did, (23) as a biological group who happen to have a religion when he asserts that he '*addresses the jewish believers*' who have become Christians. (24)

It is plausible to conversely argue here that because Celsus conceived of Christianity as an off-shoot of Judaism (25) and Celsus means that the jews who converted to Christianity did so because they believed Jesus to be the Messiah as predicted in Judaism. I reject this argument because it fails to take into account that Celsus argues that Judaism was not an original religion and moreover gained all of its ideas from different '*Eastern*' and '*Western*' religions. (26) If Judaism was not; per Celsus' reasoning, an original religion then how can we ascertain that Celsus' '*jewish believers*' were actually viewing Jesus as the Messiah predicted by Judaism?

This argument; that Celsus is referring to the logical progression from Judaism to Christianity, is flawed precisely because the assumption that underlies it is that Judaism was just another religion and that therefore the '*believers*' merely changed religions, which undermines the argument as it presumes that Celsus views Judaism as an original religion (which he explicitly

tells us he does not) and that '*jewish believers*' could only have come from Judaism.

By Celsus' use of '*Israel*' and '*jewish believers*' for Judaism we can see that he recognises the jews as a people separate from their religion, but that their national existence is owed largely to that religion which has separated them from the rest of humanity. (27)

This view is perhaps somewhat muddled on a first reading in view of Celsus' own unfortunate habit of using Judaism as a club with which to hit Christianity over the head, but this is more because Christians of the time often appealed to Judaism for their historical tradition as a way to backfill the story of Jesus of Nazareth. Celsus; in fact, explains this very point early on in '*On the True Doctrine*' when he speaks of the use the Christians make of the '*books of Moses*' as an intellectual base from which to work. (28)

Celsus however makes it quite clear that he is using Judaism to attack Christianity because of its use by Christians and not because he views it as a superior religion or that he views the jews as unobjectionable. (29) He even adopts the common Greek rhetorical tool of taking the jewish position to criticise Christian ideas, but we can hardly suggest on that basis that he was a philo-Semite (30) as he also uses a Greek similarly. (31)

We can see Celsus hostility to jews and Judaism explicitly on occasion in '*On the True Doctrine*' and in one such instance he remarks in relation to '*miracles*' and '*wonders*' claimed by the jews that: '*yet I am also bound to say that the jews have a knack for generating such nonsense.*' (32) This is partly a repetition of his anti-jewish theme that the jews are a gullible and superstitious people, but also a wider condemnation of the practises of Judaism and the habit of the jews of lying about religious experiences for their own benefit. (33)

Another instance of this hostility may be found in Celsus' point that the Christians are a prideful group and that in this they are just as proud as the jews. (34) This is clearly not a comparison that Celsus considers to be favourable in relation to his extremely hostile attitude towards Christians as a group and the fact that he considers them to be a subversive secret society devoted to anti-Roman attitudes. (35)

Interestingly Celsus makes an allusion when discussing Egyptian religion to the jews worshipping various animal heads in the seclusion of their temple and tents. (36) This can be compared to Apion's argument that the jews worshipped an asses head in the Temple in Jerusalem, (37) but as there is no proof other than testimony of this kind and the periodic reference in the Torah and Tanakh to '*idol worship*' then it is difficult to argue definitively that the jews did indeed worship craven images. However it cannot be abandoned as a real possibility either.

Celsus continues his assault on Judaism by addressing the concept of the Messiah that we have already touched on. He firstly makes reference to the Christian argument that the Messiah has already come and then immediately refers to the jewish argument that he simply hasn't turned up yet as being '*shameful*' and '*not worth refuting*'. (38) The basis of Celsus thought here is simply that at least Christians can identify their living god, while the jews simply don't bother and just claim that the invisible all-knowing god will send one at some indeterminate point in the future

and the jews will naturally recognise him via '*miracles*' and '*wonders*', (39) which Celsus so rightly derides as both intellectual absurdity and insanity. (40)

So; contrary to Freeman's view, to Celsus the Christians are not always worse than the jews, (41) but in fact quite a lot of the time the jews are worse than the Christians! (42)

Celsus also points out; in the course of attacking the concept of the Messiah, that the '*jews say that as life is filled with all manner of evil, it is necessary for God to send someone down so that the wicked may be punished and everything purified, as it was when the first flood occurred.*' (43)

Celsus here implicitly recognises the distinction that is dominant within Judaism between Adam (jews) and haAdam (gentiles) whereby jews are regarded as a race apart from the gentiles; which we discussed earlier, (44) and that their actions are the only important factor as to whether the rest of the world gets punished. (45) Celsus is also here implicitly pointing to the concept of the '*evil inclination*' in Judaism where-by the '*spirit of the gentile*' replaces the emunah (46) of the jews making them perform '*evil*' thus incurring the wrath of Yahweh for daring to emulate the lower orders of his creatures (i.e. gentiles and/or animals).

Celsus sees this; and rightly so, as a positively idiotic idea in that it asserts that man; the jew, was created imperfect by a perfect being who then decides to take vengeance on said imperfect creation by using such innovative genocidal ideas as smiting cities (47) and flooding the world with water created from nothing. (48) Indeed Celsus enjoys poking fun at the absurdity of a supposedly perfect being; who is neither capricious or shares any human characteristic, who delights in '*reducing cities to rubble*' for no reason other than their citizens obeying the biological instincts that he supposedly gave them in the first place. (49)

Celsus then proceeds to offer possibly the ultimate insult to jews; in light of the laws of kashrut and the idea of their '*chosen*' status, by referring to them as being intellectually lower than '*worms and frogs*' in their intellectual '*squabbles*' and sophistries. (50) Celsus also later refers to Judaism as the '*thoughts of worms*'; perhaps a parallel concept of Nietzsche '*untermensch*' and Stoddard's '*underman*', suggesting as he does several times that the jews are '*uncivilised*' and '*barbarians*' incapable of culture.

This is further backed up by his reference to their origins being of '*dark obscurity*', which is a direct assault on their '*chosen*' status that Celsus clearly; and rightly, believes is not only intellectually false but utterly stupid. (51) He then once again proceeds to further insult the jews by pointing out; once again, that according to their own Torah they are merely runaway slaves (52) and the offspring of '*sorcerers and deceivers.*' (53)

Celsus then proceeds to press his attack on jews; as a people and a religion, yet further by assailing the story of Adam and Eve in Genesis. He points out that the jews are completely uncivilised creatures and are unable to comprehend the beauties of Greek poetry such as that of Hesiod. (54) Celsus laughs at the very notion that a serpent could have bested the perfect jewish god; Yahweh, and declares that the idea that Adam was originally a mud pie and Eve a mud pie's rib is '*crude and fantastic*', (55) which plays into one of his argument's themes in that the jews

are a superstitious, credulous, uncivilised and fundamentally stupid people (and that the Christians are also such by extension for copying the jews).

Celsus then proceeds to insult the jews even more by declaring that if their god; Yahweh, isn't even able to control his own creation and is also unable to best a lowly serpent then he is a '*weakling*' (56) and presumably is going to run scared from a proverbial fly like his '*chosen*' people.

As proof of this weakness of both Yahweh and his '*chosen*' people Celsus points out that a man is angry with the jews: he exterminates them all. (57) While; according to Celsus, the supposed supreme deity merely sends letters of complaint in the form of the Messiah. Here; of course, Celsus is confusing the jewish and Christian concepts of the Messiah and does not realise; perhaps understandably so, that the jewish messiah is the '*son of Yahweh*' who will turn up and then lead the jews to rule the world as is their destiny according to Judaism.

Celsus moves on once more to poke fun at the jews by pointing out that the jews supposed '*land of milk and honey*' in Palestine was a barren wasteland. Celsus here is possibly referring to Strabo's comment regarding it being inhospitable and generally hostile: so much so that nobody else wanted it. (58) Celsus means very simply that if the jews are the '*chosen*' people of the one supreme god; who is omniscient and omnipotent, then why didn't he assign to them one of the great fertile bits of land where they could have prospered? (59)

No; Celsus tells the jews, you aren't the '*chosen*' of the supreme god, but rather you simply chose yourselves or were duped by a barely literate trickster's sleight of hand! (60)

Celsus develops his argument that the jews are a nation and have chosen themselves; rather than having been chosen by the supreme lord of the universe, when he points out directly this time that the problem with jews is not so much that they believe such things (as Celsus regards these weird beliefs as essentially harmless although probably subversive), but rather that jews abandon their weird beliefs, profess the ideas of other nations and then warp them to fit the assumptions that underlie both Judaism and the customs of the jews. (61)

In this we can see Celsus' development of the parallel to Nietzsche's idea of the '*untermensch*' and Stoddard's conception of the '*underman*' in so far as Celsus is asserting that the uncivilised and barbarous nations of the world; notably the jews, will always try to ape the more advanced and able civilisations leading to the corruption of those civilisations if they allow the uncivilised and barbarous nations among them to appropriate their ideas, corrupt them and eventually turn them against their creators in newly modified form.

Celsus' comments also in a sense anticipate socio-biology's fundamental argument that although organisms are part of nature they also try to change nature around them in order to make nature fit their own evolutionary stratagem. Are not Celsus' comments to the same basic affect in that they suggest that a nation will seek to change the evolutionary environment in which it competes; e.g. the empire that has conquered and attempted to integrate it, in order to best fit its own evolutionary stratagem?

In this case we can see that the attempted general usage; although certainly not the only one, was most likely the medium of religion to which the jews presented to the Romans in the age-old alluring form of the mystery cult. (62)

Indeed Celsus is so hostile to Judaism that goes so far as to call the Torah '*absolute rubbish*'! (63)

He makes further comment regarding this when he asserts how superstitious and idiotic; i.e. how barbaric and uncivilised, the jews are in so far as Judea is filled with mentally-ill prophets proclaiming absurdities which '*no sane or intelligent person would trouble himself to figure out.*' (64) Celsus' point here is that the Torah (and presumably the part of Tanakh he knew) could just have easily been concocted by any number of proverbial lunatics high on anything from their own ego, their own stewed brains and/or magic mushrooms than those whose writings form its substance. (65)

Celsus takes this even further when he all but declares the jews to be contrary to humanity as a whole; much as Philostratus argued, (66) by pointing out that the jews under the direction of Moses and Yahweh slaughtered '*whole races of people*'; including infants, in order that they might be '*rich and famous*' and '*populate the earth*'. (67)

Celsus then; gleefully, turns this on its head and kicks the jews in the intellectual groin by pointing out that their supposed status as the '*chosen*' people of Yahweh surely indicates that if they disobey their supreme god they will too get exterminated if he is so inclined. (68) The jews think this is unlikely of course, but Celsus certainly didn't think so given that if one follows the logic of the Torah and Judaism that is one of the inevitable consequences of the assumptions and intellectual positions that are taken.

Celsus then; as we have discussed, was certainly no friend to the jews and indeed viewed them as one of the most dangerous foes that Rome had ever faced in that he saw them as a subversive threat to the national fabric of Roman society who would not integrate and used others to do their bidding while remaining smirking in the background peddling their wares much as Martial attacked them as doing in a notable epigram. (69)

Is Celsus' proto-anti-Semitism the reason that his writings were actively destroyed and only survive in quotation from the Fathers of the Church?

We'll never know for sure, but it is certainly an intriguing possibility: is it not?

References

(1) One can hardly assert that the study of Cicero, Plato or Aristotle had ever been lacking as neither of those thinkers have ever been a direct threat to Christian thought as such, but later pagan and agnostic thinkers did confront Christianity directly and were dismissed without answer by those after the fathers of the Church had attacked their work. For example John Calvin read Cicero regularly, Martin Luther hated learning and teaching Aristotle and Saint Thomas Aquinas' '*Summa Theologica*' is an attempt to synthesize Platonic and Aristotelian ideas with

Christian theology (Saint Augustine's theology having become largely untenable by the rediscovery of Aristotle's *Physics*).

(2) R. Joseph Hoffmann, 1987, *Celsus - On the True Doctrine: A Discourse Against the Christians*, 1st Edition, Oxford University Press: New York

(3) Ibid, p. 55

(4) For example Strab 16.2.35; Diod. Sic. 1.28; Tac. Hist. 5.2-4

(5) Suet. Tib. 36: suggests by implication the association of the worship of Isis and Judaism in Rome and Celsus supports just such an association in Hoffmann, Op. Cit., pp. 88; 98

(6) Ibid, pp. 55-56

(7) Ibid.

(8) Ibid, pp. 54; 57; 59-60; 73; 106

(9) Ibid, p. 56

(10) Ibid. pp. 56; 70-71; 94-95; 108

(11) Ibid, pp. 56; 59-60; 64; 69; 79; 85-86; 89-90

(12) Ibid. p. 56

(13) Ronnie Po-Chia Hsia, 1988, *The Myth of Ritual Murder: Jews and Magic in Reformation Germany*, 1st Edition, Yale University Press: New Haven, pp. 144-151; Joshua Trachtenberg, 1943, *The Devil and the Jews: The Medieval Conception of the Jew and its Relation to Modern Antisemitism*, 1st Edition, Yale University Press: New Haven, pp. 196-216

(14) Brian Levack, 1995, *The Witch-Hunt in Early Modern Europe*, 2nd Edition, Longman: New York, pp. 228-229; Norman Cohn, 1993, *Europe's Inner Demons: The Demonization of Christians in Medieval Christendom*, 2nd Edition, Pimlico: London, pp. 5-8; Jeffrey Burton Russell, 1972, *Witchcraft in the Middle Ages*, 1st Edition, Cornell University Press: New York, pp. 167-169

(15) Usually using Kabbalah as a starting point for their effusions of mumbo-jumbo.

(16) A good example is Anton La Vey: the jewish founder of the *'Church of Satan'*.

(17) Hoffmann, Op. Cit., pp. 56; 96-97

(18) Name-based magic is the basis for much of the theory of witchcraft in Europe interestingly enough: most notably the idea of the *'evil eye'* and *'being overlooked'*.

(19) Formerly the Canaanite goddess Astarte: it is worth noting that the ancient jews stole Yahweh from the Canaanites too so it was only right that they steal both parties in the celestial couple.

(20) On this see William Dever, 2005, *Did God have a Wife?: Archaeology and Folk Religion in Ancient Israel*, 1st Edition, Eerdmans: Grand Rapids and Erich Brauer, Raphael Patai, 1990, *The Hebrew Goddess*, 3rd Edition, Wayne State University Press: Detroit.

(21) Hoffmann, Op. Cit., p. 56

(22) Ibid, p. 60

(23) On this see my article; *'Lamprooning the Jew: The Depiction of the Jews in Juvenal's Satires'*, which is available at the following address:

<http://semiticcontroversies.blogspot.com/2011/05/lamprooning-jew-depiction-of-jews-in.html>.

(24) Hoffmann, Op. Cit., p. 60

(25) Ibid, p. 59

(26) Ibid, pp. 55-56

(27) Similar to Philostr. V A 5.33

(28) Hoffmann, Op. Cit., pp. 55; 67

(29) Ibid, p. 56; 69

- (30) Ibid, pp. 61-64
- (31) Ibid, pp. 69-76
- (32) Ibid, p. 69
- (33) Still one of the best run-downs of absurd jewish '*miracles*' and '*wonders*' can be found in Joshua Trachtenberg, 1939, '*Jewish Magic and Superstition: A Study in Folk Religion*', 1st Edition, Behrman's Jewish Book House: New York.
- (34) Hoffmann, Op. Cit., p. 70
- (35) Ibid, pp. 53; 74-75
- (36) Ibid, pp. 71; 117
- (37) Joseph. Ap. 2:8
- (38) Hoffmann, Op. Cit., p. 76
- (39) Ibid, p. 69
- (40) Ibid, pp. 76-78
- (41) Charles Freeman, 2009, '*A New History of Early Christianity*', 1st Edition, Yale University Press: New Haven, pp. 172-173, which; although Freeman doesn't cite it as such, is probably based on Hoffmann, Op. Cit., p. 87 where Celsus seems to suggest that the Christians are all jews but what he in fact means is that Christianity simply isn't an original religion in that it takes a lot of justifications and ideas from Judaism (which is not an original religion either) as Celsus himself clarifies on Ibid, pp. 89; 105.
- (42) As implicitly claimed by Hoffmann in his introduction. Ibid, pp. 5-6
- (43) Ibid, p. 78
- (44) Ibid, pp. 55-56; 83; 87-88
- (45) Ibid, p. 78
- (46) Usually translated as '*faith*', but that doesn't clarify its meaning hence my use of '*spirit of the jews*' rather than '*faith*' as the former makes the meaning obvious while the latter conceals it via literality.
- (47) Hoffmann, Op. Cit., p. 78
- (48) I.e. Noah's flood.
- (49) Hoffmann, Op. Cit., pp. 78-79; 96
- (50) Ibid, pp. 79; 81
- (51) Ibid., p. 79
- (52) Effectively calling them mamzerim (lit. '*bastards*') i.e. those of illegitimate origin. This is possibly one of the greatest insults that can be levelled at jews as it directly calls into question their '*chosen*' status by suggesting they are not born of a suitably jewish union.
- (53) Hoffmann, Op. Cit., pp. 79; 85-86
- (54) Ibid, p. 80
- (55) Ibid. pp. 80; 104-105
- (56) Ibid, p. 80
- (57) Ibid, p. 82
- (58) Strab. 16.2.37-38
- (59) Hoffmann, Op. Cit., pp. 89; 105
- (60) Ibid, p. 89
- (61) Ibid.
- (62) Suet. Tib. 36. I have discussed this passage in some detail in my article; '*Suetonius on the Jews*', which is available at the following address:
<http://semiticcontroversies.blogspot.com/2011/05/suetonius-on-jews.html>.

(63) Hoffmann, Op. Cit., p. 101

(64) Ibid, p. 107

(65) I have covered part of this argument in my article; '*Strabo on the Jews*', which is available at the following address: <http://semiticcontroversies.blogspot.com/2011/05/strabo-on-jews.html>.

(66) Philostr. V A 5.33

(67) Hoffmann, Op. Cit., pp. 108-109

(68) Ibid, p. 108

(69) Mart. Epi. 12:57

Yet another Kosher Communist: Amy Levy

Wednesday, 25 May 2011

Long-time readers of SC will remember that I occasionally comment on the goings-on the various learned societies and interest groups of which I am a member. One of these groups is the '*Socialist History Society*'; or SHS, and I have pointed out several times before the absolute profusion of work about the '*chosen*'; (1) as well as the fact that most of the officers and major figures in the society have Yahweh's holy ichor flowing through their veins, (2) that the SHS produces, sponsors and propagandises for.

Yet another kosher communist is now being promoted by the SHS in the form of the jewish communist, writer and probable lesbian: Amy Levy.

Levy was something a novelist; perhaps the Israel Zangwill of her day, although not in the same league as her jewish contemporary Benjamin Disraeli. That said Levy does seem to have shared Disraeli's radical political interests to a degree (in spite of Disraeli's supposed '*Conservatism*'). (3)

Levy is also famous for being a friend of Eleanor Marx; favourite daughter of the infamous Karl Marx (and his battered and abused wife Jenny von Westphalen), (4) and although she doesn't come in for a mention in any biography or work on Marx or Engels I have read she does get a mention in Yvonne Kapp's superb work on Eleanor that has yet to be surpassed. (5)

Amy Levy is; of course, long-dead, (6) but her legacy of jewish involvement with communism apparently lives on in the SHS with not one but three female scholars (one of whom is; surprise surprise, also a jewess [Nadia Valman of the University of London]) (7) giving separate talks about her at the Bishopsgate Institute in London (in the United Kingdom for those with limited geographical knowledge).

One wonders why the scholars; historians and otherwise, who are sympathetic to Marxism (all of those presenting on Amy Levy have fairly open positive biases towards their subject) (8) are so obsessed with jews when one of the basic postulates of both Marxism and most modern; although not historic, socialist thought is that every individual has an equal right to be part of the community and get an equal share in its general fortunes (ergo the socialist slogan: '*from each according to their ability, to each according to their need*'). (9)

The question remains: why out of all the 'proletarian' activists and 'de-classed' intellectuals do the leftists seem so obsessed with Shylock and not with Bassanio or Antonio?

Could it be I wonder that so many of their 'proletarian' activists and 'de-classed' intellectuals just so happen to be past or present members of tribe? (10)

References

- (1) See for example my article; '*A Little More Gefilte in the Socialist History Society*', which is available at the following address: <http://semiticcontroversies.blogspot.com/2010/08/in-brief-little-more-gefilte-in.html>.
- (2) See my article; '*The Socialist History Society does Auschwitz*', which is available at the following address: <http://semiticcontroversies.blogspot.com/2010/11/socialist-history-society-does.html>.
- (3) Cecil Roth, 1952, '*Benjamin Disraeli: The Earl of Beaconsfield*', 1st Edition, Philosophical Library: New York, pp. 40-48; Sarah Bradford, 1996, '*Disraeli*', 2nd Edition, Phoenix: London, pp. 40-44
- (4) Heinz Frederick Peters, 1986, '*Red Jenny: A Life with Karl Marx*', 1st Edition, St. Martin's Press: New York remains the best biography of Jenny von Westphalen I know of and is preferable to the more commonly-cited hagiographic account offered by Luise Dornemann, 1971, '*Jenny Marx: Der Lebensweg einer Sozialistin*', 1st Edition, Dietz Verlag: Berlin, which builds its case on the same logic used by Pierre Durand, 1970, '*La vie amoureuse de Karl Marx*', 1st Edition, Julliard: Paris, which Peters rightly takes explicit and frequent issue with.
- (5) Yvonne Kapp, 1979, '*Eleanor Marx*', 2 Vols., 1st Edition, Virago: London. Levy's relationship with Eleanor is described in detail by Kapp in Vol. II, pp. 258-260.
- (6) She committed suicide after becoming depressed possibly because of her lesbianism.
- (7) <http://www.english.qmul.ac.uk/staff/valmann.html> [Last Accessed: 24/05/2011]
- (8) To be fair to Levy she is the subject of general scholarly inquiry from a literary standpoint for example in Kate Flint, 2009, '*Photographic Memory*', Romanticism and Victorianism on the Net, Vol. 53, pp. 1-4. Flint also touches on one of my favourite authors; Thomas de Quincey, in the course of her article whose work I thoroughly recommend for both its comic and intellectual value.
- (9) I might add that that necessarily implies that those who are given more according to their need are essentially extorting those who are giving more according to their ability and nullifying natural selection in the process, which is just what happened in countries that follow the castles in the sky of most socialists (although let it be known that I am no friend of capitalism either).
- (10) I have pointed this out in passing in another article; '*Another Kosher Communist Obituary*', concerning the obsession the SHS has with the self-chosen ones, which is available at the following address: <http://semiticcontroversies.blogspot.com/2010/09/another-kosher-communist-obituary.html>.

An Overbearing Lawyer and a Kiddy Fiddler Accountant: Wallace Bock and Irving Kamsler

Wednesday, 25 May 2011

I note from 'The Atlantic Wire's' article on the death of New York heiress and famous society recluse Huguette Clark in regard to her jewish lawyer; Wallace Bock, that:

'Clark's charitable donations have already lead to some scrutiny of Bock. Dedman reported on MSNBC that, shortly after the terrorist attacks of Sept. 11, 2001, "he had solicited a donation from Clark of more than \$1.5 million, which she gave to a West Bank community where his daughter is a settler." Such a solicitation is prohibited under New York ethics rules, so a court could conceivably intervene, but it would be hard to prove a charitable donation was made under coercion. Clark doesn't seem to be much of a philanthropist.' (1)

So basically Bock aggressively solicited his own elderly client for \$1.5 million that he promptly gave directly to Israel and indirectly his own daughter. Nice: so basically Bock feels that it is ethical for a lawyer for all but force his elderly client to give money to his family and his pet causes?

Bock needs to be struck off and imprisoned until he pays the estate of Mrs Clark back with the \$1.5 million he owes it (with a usurious rate of interest of course).

Oh and before anyone tries to tell me he isn't jewish: he is one of two things if he has a daughter who is an Israeli settler in the West Bank (i.e. fanatical right wing zealots in the main). He either married a jewess (quite possible) or he is himself a jew: the latter seems to me the more likely of the two, but either way he is not the most reputable of individuals in any sense.

The article also mentions the late Mrs Clark's jewish accountant; Irving Kamsler, who has been convicted of being a paedophile. I quote the article as follows:

'All of Clark's affairs are handled by her lawyer, Wallace Bock and her accountant, Irving Kamsler, who themselves are the object of some suspicion. A series of report on MSNBC last year led to an investigation, still underway, into whether the pair have been inappropriately taking advantage of their positions of power over Clark's fortunes. Kamsler has been convicted of distributing indecent material to 13 and 15-year-old girls in an AOL chatroom.' (2)

This is even more disgusting and the fact is that that Kamsler is indisputably jewish as he was the President of the Board of Congregation Shaarei Shalom in 2007-2008 before he was caught trying to groom underage gentile girls for sex. (3)

I quote:

'Mr. Kamsler, a Riverdalian who is a certified public accountant, tasted a little bit of heaven and a whole lot of hell over the course of last summer. On June 21, 2007, Congregation Shaarei Shalom announced he was named president of the board of the reform temple, which broke off from Riverdale Temple. But less than a month later, "IRV1040," the Internet handle the DA says Mr. Kamsler used, sent pornographic pictures to an undercover Nassau County agent posing as a 15-year-old girl in a chat room, according to court documents.'

Mr. Kamsler even allegedly went as far as to describe sexual acts, according to his felony complaint.

According to the original felony complaint and the indictment, "IRV1040" engaged in graphic discussions with girls he thought were as young as 13.

[...]

The new charges include allegations of attempting to endanger the welfare of a child on three times in eight days in September 2005 and three times in a five-day span in November 2005.' (4)

And jews wonder why they get stereotyped negatively?

Here's an answer for you boys: you might just be somewhat like those stereotypes!

References

(1) http://news.yahoo.com/s/atlantic/20110524/ts_atlantic/fatehuguetclarksfortune38100 [Last Accessed: 25/05/2011]

(2) Ibid.

(3) <http://www.riverdalepress.com/stories/Kamsler-pleads-not-guilty-to-porn-charge,28095> [Last Accessed: 25/05/2011]

(4) Ibid.

Reader Mail (26/05/2011)

Thursday, 26 May 2011

I received the following letter from a reader yesterday and I think it provides a unique and highly original insight into the jews from a differing intellectual perspective and background than my own:

'Dear Karl Radl

I read with interest your post about Strabo's writing on the Jews. Having been a Fundamentalist Christian in my youth before coming to believe that the Bible was mostly mythical in nature, and rather ugly besides, I read Strabo and other early gentile writings about the Jews in order to try

to learn more about the origin of the Judaeo-Christian myth. I was prompted to re-read Strabo's passage after reading your post, and came across this surprising passage:

From superstition arose abstinence from flesh, from the eating of which it is now the custom to refrain, circumcision, cliterodectomy, and other practices which the people observe.

<http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsourc/History/strabo.html>

I totally missed the reference to cliterodectomy on my first read- perhaps it is not in all versions? It seems unprecedented that the Jews were credited with the practice, I wonder how Strabo came to believe it was the case? Could he be right, or is he falling victim to a Hellenistic polemic? It's also strange that he credits circumcision as a post-Mosaic corruption, this is surely the Greek hatred of bodily mutilation being exhibited.

The Egyptians and West Semites practiced circumcision so we should probably assume this is where they got the practice.

Having said that, however, it occurs to me that a tradition existed of Moses not circumcising his son- in that instance Yahweh attacked him and nearly killed him until his wife performed the magical ceremony necessary to avert Yahweh's wrath.

Exodus 4: 24.And it came to pass by the way in the inn, that the LORD met him, and sought to kill him. [25](#)Then Zipporah took a sharp stone, and cut off the foreskin of her son, and cast it at his feet, and said, Surely a bloody husband art thou to me. [26](#)So he let him go: then she said, A bloody husband thou art, because of the circumcision.

(What a bizarre tale- Yahweh is some sort of assassin that assaults his followers in a hotel? And Moses sees him coming for him? How exactly did this go down?)

Regarding Moses and entheogens, I doubt we will ever know anything about the true Moses, since the books credited to him are very obviously later composite compositions. Having recently read Wellhausen's Prolegomena to the History of Israel, I can say that the endless sacrifices, tithes and atonements, offerings for uncleanness, land apportioning etc. in the Priestly sources (Leviticus and part of Joshua) show the hand of a caste of parasites, the Levites, whose subsistence was from the labors of the am ha eretz, the common folk from the other tribes. Remember, somebody ate all those "burnt offerings", the temple complex was a massive barbecue pit for the priests. Eventually, the temple became a monopoly, and the privileges of priesthood were disputed among the various sub-castes.

Anyway, just some thoughts.'

Karl replies:

'Thank you for your fascinating letter.

The issue of the origins of the covenant (represented by circumcision); are as you say, shrouded in mystery (my article on Strabo was primarily meant to make people think about the whole of what Strabo says rather than one or two quotations), but I think you are right to suggest that Strabo is wrong about his idea that circumcision is post-mosaic and that it stems from the Greek habit of condemning such bodily mutilation as unmanly.

I think we may plausibly locate the reason why Strabo antedates it to after Moses in his fundamental admiration for Moses (as is evident from the tone he uses in dealing with Moses as an individual being rather laudatory as opposed to antagonistic in the same way that say Tacitus, Celsus and Diodorus Siculus are in their comments on the origins of Jews and Judaism) as the innovator of what was in Strabo's eyes a pleasant enough little religion. Perhaps the only general attitude I know of similar to Strabo's in this regard is Pliny the Elder's in regard to the Essenes, which he seems to have seen more positively than say Porphyry of Tyre in his 'On Abstinence from Animal Flesh' (Book 4:11-14 if you are interested) [on whom I am currently writing an article for publication in the next few days].

This admiration therefore potentially leads Strabo to antedate the rite of circumcision to after Moses, because otherwise Strabo felt that he could not reasonably write admirably of the man and potentially be taken seriously on the subject by his fellow Hellenes.

On the issue of cliterodectomy appearing: you are quite right it doesn't seem to appear in a few translations (including the two I used in my article) being simply rendered in with circumcision and bodily mutilation. That is obviously arguable, but I'd suggest it is a case of a translator; consciously or not, using literality to subtly change the meaning of a given passage. It is not dissimilar with the Hebrew of the Kitzur Schulchan Aruch; for example, where the English translation of Goldin uses half the thesaurus to come up with different ways of saying 'non-Jew' (pagan, idolators, non-Israel, gentiles, heathens, people of the earth etc) when Ganzfried's original text is clear in its meaning and intent.

If cliterodectomy is indeed in the original Greek then it would indeed further suggest the practice of circumcision has its origins among the Egyptians and West Semites. Although it could conceivably have been transmitted from the worship of Yahweh and Astarte [YHWH and the Shekhina in Judaism] when they took those gods from the Canaanites (much as one could see the occasional reference to child sacrifice in Torah as being related to the worship of Baal [where they threw live babies into a fire] etc).

As to Moses not circumcising his son and causing the wrath of Yahweh to descend upon him: the key point to me would be the parallel this suggests in the rabbinic and kabbalistic literature of the use of imaginary 'cautionary tales'; usually with supernatural actors, forcing them to conform to the will of their vengeful god.

The best way to understand this I think would be to point out that it is probably not meant to be literally understood in terms of Moses' action, but rather as an allegorical tale which cautions the Jews to observe the rite of circumcision imposed by Moses on his son precisely because if

they do not it invokes the wroth of Hashem. You can find an excellent list and summary of similar tales in Joshua Trachtenberg, 1939, 'Jewish Magic and Superstition: A Study in Folk Religion' and Aryeh Wineman's, 1988, 'Beyond Appearances'.

However I think we can also understand this on a more literal level when we look at the passage you cite from Exodus when it talks of the circumcision of Moses' son in that:

A) How did Moses recognise Yahweh? Why did Yahweh attack Moses in an inn? Why did Moses attribute such an attack to Yahweh?

This is; of course, a rationalistic point, but I believe such questions necessarily lead us to the conclusion that either the story is an allegory, Moses was mentally-ill, Moses lied in order to hide how he had been hurt etc (a tryst with a prostitute leading to a confrontation with her pimp or the innkeeper perhaps which would make sense of Zipporah's weird reaction), Yahweh is a very strange god or some/all of these conclusions at once.

B) Zipporah's reaction is absolutely hysterical and out of all proportion to the preceeding passage. This could be understood egocentrically to point to the idea that I echoed above that she thought; rightly or wrongly, that Moses had been with another woman or loved someone else (etc). Leading her to take revenge on the proverbial 'child of the devil' by doing some DIY with a handy bit of knapped flint.

You could also regard the way the passage is phrased to be an inclination in favour of human sacrifice in Judaism. Interestingly it is one of the very few religions that according to (mainstream) scholars hasn't had anything to do with human sacrifice at any time: another one is Christianity although like Judaism I would personally dispute that (since the early Christians were accused of just that by the Romans which is conventionally understood as being a misunderstanding of the sacrament of eucharist).

Regarding the use of entheogens my point was largely to put forward the argument that Strabo's wording suggests that Moses was engaging in something like this as it illustrates a use of Strabo's 'Geography' that people can put it to, which is; propagandistically speaking, highly effective particularly if combined with a decent knowledge of the stories, legends and folklore of the Tanakh.

I haven't read Wellhausen although I am contemplating writing a commentary on the Tanakh (all sections) to explain its message from a viewpoint critical of the jews and then using that in abridged form to create a daily comment on the verses concerned.

You are however quite right in your notes on the Tanakh and I get the impression: that you know far more about it than I do!

However your comment about the 'burnt offerings' did remind me of Homer's two great ballads where he describes how the Greeks kill a goat/sheep, butcher it, remove the thigh bones wrap them in slabs of meat and then roast them in honour of the gods. They would then 'taste the inner meats', drink their wine offerings and proceed to feast on the proverbial divine barbeque.'

In Brief: Job Cuts for the Gentiles and £2 Million for Auschwitz

Thursday, 26 May 2011

I learn from page 2 of *'The Jewish News'* of 26th May 2011 that the British government in its *'wisdom'* has decided in a time when there are over 2 million Britons unemployed to give £2.15 million of tax payers money to Auschwitz. Yes: you heard me correctly the British government is cutting thousands of jobs and demanding that its serving soldiers take pay cuts, while it gives £2.15 million to the jews as a proverbial slush fund to help preserve a bunch of decaying sheds which serve as a kind of historical Disneyland for Israeli tourists.

Now hang on a minute, but surely the British government's priorities are arse-about-face here in that they are preaching absolute austerity on the one hand, but are happy to donate millions of pounds to something not even in the British national interest while they allow women and children to starve because the jews have demanded they stump up cash to pay for the expenses the jews have in forcing the *'holocaust'* on just about everyone.

Why isn't Israel the one paying for the upkeep of Auschwitz as they after all benefit most from it and make the most use of it?

When is somebody just going to say *'no'* to the jews?

Ernesta Drinker Bullitt: 'The Jews hate the Germans, Poles and Russians'

Friday, 27 May 2011

I was doing some research today and I stumbled across a particularly apposite quote from the wife of the famous American politician: William C. Bullitt. I thought I would share it with the world as it seems to have typically been largely ignored:

'The only things left of Brest Litovsk are three churches and a new rock-garden, flowers and "verboten" sign complete, built amid the ruins by the Germans. Warsaw is much the same as ever. Whoever spread the rumour that all children under seven years of age were dead in Poland, probably went through Warsaw in the night. The Jews to whom Billy [William C. Bullitt – KR] spoke said they hated Germans, Poles, and Russians equally, but at least no one shied bricks at them under German rule.' (1)

This is quite interesting in that it gives us very blunt testimony that the jews in the pale of settlement; i.e. a good part of the territory given to Germany by the Treaty of Brest Litovsk, really didn't want anybody but jews to rule them, which adds yet another nail in the coffin of the philo-Semitic myth that the jews were; and are, *'just another religious minority'*.

How can a religious minority use nationality to determine who it wants to rule it? After all surely

if it were just a normal religious minority; say like Buddhists, then they would simply wish for a Buddhist to rule them not for a separate country for themselves because they were a nationality (which is the sub-text to Bullitt's remarks).

References

(1) Ernesta Drinker Bullitt, 1917, '*An Uncensored Diary from the Central Empires*', 1st Edition, Doubleday: New York, pp. 162-163

Israel steals from the United States yet again...

Friday, 27 May 2011

We've all heard of Jonathan Pollard, the Sayanim network and the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai Brith being prosecuted for helping Israel in various nefarious ways in its apparent quest for world domination. However it seems that fortunately there are groups in the United States who are willing to oppose this agenda in spite of the potential hot water it will tend to land them in to do so. However it seems some brave souls are beginning a quest to decapitate the monstrous hydra that is the Israel Lobby at its very heart: by bankrupting AIPAC. I know AIPAC is swimming in funds by Political Action Committee standards, but even it would be hard-pressed to come up with \$6.64 billion, especially in the wake of the financial destruction that the self-chosen suffered in the wake of the collapse of Bernie Madoff's ponzi schemes.

To wit:

'WASHINGTON--([BUSINESS WIRE](#))--Today the Section 301 Committee of the US Trade Representative formally received a petition demanding \$6.64 billion in compensation for US exporters. In 1984 US exporters were urged to submit business confidential data about their prices, market share, internal costs and market strategy to the International Trade Commission. The USTR guaranteed confidentiality and compiled the data into a classified report for use in negotiating the US-Israel Free Trade Agreement.

The Israeli government obtained the classified USTR report and passed it to the American Israel Public Affairs Committee to use in lobbying and public relations. Declassified FBI investigation files in the petition reveal AIPAC's legislative director made illicit duplications before returning the report by order of the USTR. The FBI interviewed Israeli Minister of Economics Dan Halpern who admitted obtaining the classified document and giving it to AIPAC.

According to the petition Israel unfairly leveraged the business confidential data stolen from US corporations and industry groups to create new export oriented industries to penetrate the American market. Israel thereby gained an unwarranted systemic advantage. The US-Israel FTA is an anomaly among all bilateral FTAs in that it principally benefits the foreign party,

providing a destination for 40% of Israel's exports. The petition claims it is now a private industry funded foreign aid program. In 2010 the US Israel FTA produced an \$11.2 billion US deficit in goods trade. Over a decade the US deficit has averaged \$7.09 billion per year. The cumulative US-Israel deficit in current dollars since 1985 is \$80.9 billion.

Analysis of all other US-bilateral FTAs reveals that they do not deliver a systemic advantage to either partner. In 2010, the US had a \$31.43 billion total surplus with its other bilateral FTA partners, though in 2006 and 2007 these same agreements produced a narrow US deficit.

The petition recommends the \$6.64 billion be proportionally divided between nearly 80 US organizations according to their trailing 10 year revenues. If the Israeli government will not pay damages directly, the petition recommends the US implement a five year import duty over all Israeli exports to the United States to generate the compensation.' (1)

Oh please let this go to court and allow just some of the iceberg of the Israel Lobby's dirty laundry to come out!

References

(1) <http://www.businesswire.com/news/home/20110524006801/en/6.64-Billion-Damages-Sought-Israeli-Government-AIPAC> [Last Accessed: 26/05/2011]

Rabbis, Informers and Paedophiles

Saturday, 28 May 2011

I am informed by the Jewish Daily Forward of 25th May 2011 that the ultra-Orthodox rabbinical authorities have established two recent rulings on the issue of jews going to secular authorities about cases of paedophilia within the ultra-Orthodox community. (1) Now the issue of paedophilia inside the ultra-Orthodox has always been something of an open secret that while the mainstream media is content to attack Catholic priests for similar vile activities it simply ignores the problem when jews are involved.

The first ruling by Rav Shalom Elyashiv states that frum jews with a '*reasonable suspicion*' of paedophilic abuse inside the community can go to the secular authorities and that does not count as being an '*informer*' in halakhah (jewish religious law). The second clarifying ruling by Rav Shlomo Gottesman clarifies Elyashiv's ruling to define what '*reasonable suspicion*' in fact is as Elyashiv hadn't; predictably enough, qualified his meaning enough to enable it to be put into practice.

The qualified ruling is essentially no change at all from the current halakhic status quo in ultra-orthodoxy with the jew who suspects that paedophilic abuse is going forced to '*consult*' a rabbi '*with experience in these matters*'. Rav Gottesman doesn't define what he means by '*experience in these matters*', but I must admit I am unsure as to whether he means a rabbi who happens to

be a '*reformed paedophile*' or one who specialises in the halakhah surrounding deviant sexuality.

He probably means the latter, but I think it speaks volumes that he could within reason mean the former as each jew supposedly possesses a '*special soul*' that is born within a '*special body*'. So taking a matter to those who aren't born with a '*special soul*' born in a '*special body*' is rather galling for a jew to say the least. Hence jews don't tend to go to secular authorities and even often try (sometimes successfully) to manipulate them to their advantage. (2)

This is one of the problem that philo-Semites have long struggled with in that Judaism explicitly believes in the superiority of the jew over the gentile and that said superiority is innate. It isn't even remotely arguable that is not the case, because the halakhah on the subject and the rabbinic literature make this very clear. However it doesn't stop them trying to say that Judaism is a '*universalist religion*'! (3)

One symptom of this idea of superiority of the jew over the non-jew can be found in the idea of the '*informer*' in Judaism, which simply means a jew who goes to secular authorities without permission to report anything to them. Usually the example given by jews to justify this particular part of the halakhah and its rabbinic commentary is that of the jew who goes to the secular authorities lying about the jews and causing said authorities to swoop down on the jewish community. The implied assumption there; of course, is that what all the jews who have gone to the secular communities without permission have done so to report imagined crimes and libels against their fellow jews.

This disgust is still evident in modern secular jews when they discuss the motives of '*fellow jews*' who have turned against their people. (4) This is almost certainly in part due to the fact that Judaism conceives of the past, present and future being essentially the same. (5)

However as the famous Rabbi Solomon Luria himself implicitly tells us the '*informer*' did often have good reason to go to the secular authorities as; for example, the jewish authorities regularly disregarded the '*law of the land*' (6) which they claimed the halakhah tells them they should; note not must, obey and imposed death penalties by sanctioned mob lynching. (7) It is also quite probable that the rabbinical authorities in this case didn't want the secular authorities investigating their financial dealings either as that would almost certainly lead to reprisals for things like tax evasion and lead to the confiscation of the wealth they had accumulated as part of their holy industry.

So then is it any wonder that rabbinical authorities like Meir of Lublin demanded that '*informers*' be hunted down and killed by their fellow jews? (8)

What does this mean for ultra-orthodox paedophiles?

It means that Rav Elyashiv's ruling with Rav Gottesman's '*clarification*' is essentially a free licence to rape children precisely because the ruling refuses to get secular authorities involved because they aren't jewish. What is particularly galling about it is the fact that ultra-orthodoxy is notorious for helping sexual criminals within its own ranks escape justice and I remember read some years ago an account by a child of notable ultra-orthodox halakhic authority to the effect

that when she was a few years old her father began raping her on a regular basis and the rest of the ultra-orthodox knew all about, but said nothing because her father was a great halakhic authority and was at the apex of a supposedly glittering career.

In essence then ultra-orthodoxy is telling the world in general that its jews are permitted to be paedophiles just so long as they don't annoy specific rabbis; who *'have experience in such matters'*, and then only if the threat to the community of discovery outweighs the problem of having non-jews investigate the inner workings of community with an ultra-orthodox rabbi; who *'has experience in such matters'*, go to the gentile police.

So we may reasonably say that ultra-Orthodoxy knowingly gives aid and succour to jewish paedophiles and with these two rulings will continue to do so. After all a jew is allowed to tell *'white lies'*! (9)

Don't let your children be around ultra-Orthodox jews!

References

- (1) <http://forward.com/articles/138131/> [Accessed: 27/05/2011]
- (2) An excellent detailed case study of this maybe be found in Jonathon Frankel, 1997, *'The Damascus Affair: "Ritual Murder," Politics and the Jews in 1840'*, 1st Edition, Cambridge University Press: New York
- (3) Morris Kertzer, Lawrence Hoffman, 1996, *'What is a Jew?'*, 5th Edition, Simon & Schuster: New York, p. 114
- (4) Gavin Langmuir, 1984, *'Thomas of Monmouth: Detector of Ritual Murder'*, Speculum, Vol. 59, pp. 830-832
- (5) Moshe Davis, 1978, *'I am a Jew'*, 1st Edition, Mowbray: Oxford, pp. 132-134
- (6) Solomon Luria, 1859, *'Sheelot u-Teshubot Maharshal'*, 11
- (7) Paul Kriwaczek, 2006, *'Yiddish Civilisation: The Rise and Fall of a Forgotten Nation'*, 2nd Edition, Phoenix: London, p. 140
- (8) Myer Lew, 1944, *'The Jews of Poland: Their Political, Economic, Social and Communal Life in the Sixteenth Century as reflected in the Works of Rabbi Moses Isserls'*, 1st Edition, Edward Goldston: London, pp. 128-129
- (9) Davis, Op. Cit., p. 71

The Neo-Platonic Jew-Hater: Porphyry of Tyre on the Jews (Part I)

Saturday, 28 May 2011

Porphyry of Tyre; like Celsus the Epicurean who he was influenced by, (1) was an anti-Christian pagan intellectual who wrote one of the best known anti-Christian works of the late classical world; *'Against the Christians'*, of which we only have fragments that have been preserved in the works of several of the Fathers of the Church and the early Christian intellectuals notably Eusebius of Caesarea, Jerome and Macarius. Unlike Origen who quoted Celsus' own words extensively these other Christian thinkers chose to attack Porphyry's arguments without quoting

them in the main so we are forced to work heavily from a selection of fragments in their writings on the presumption that they are not misrepresenting Porphyry's arguments.

Fortunately we do have copies of some of Porphyry's other works such as *'On Abstinence from Animal Food'*, *'On the Cave of the Nymphs'* etc. This has allowed us to be able to compare; to a degree, the reasoning that the hostile Christian thinkers present as Porphyry's with that in his existent works.

The best way to proceed with our analysis of Porphyry is to focus on the work that we know he wrote and then use the fragments preserved by the highly partisan Christian thinkers to help illuminate them. Where there is no reference from Porphyry's known works: we are forced to rely on the later Christian interpretation of them. This is obviously a less than ideal situation to be in, but this is what we have to work with to understand Porphyry's comments on the jews.

Porphyry; like Celsus, attacked Judaism largely through the medium of his critique of Christianity which was to both himself and Celsus: the more aggressive of the two subversive cults that we then causing murder and mayhem in pagan Rome.

In his treatise; *'On Abstinence from Animal Food'*, Porphyry mentions the jewish custom of regarding pork as being a forbidden; i.e. treif, food. (2) One reason that Porphyry doesn't mention for why the jews may have originally felt that the pig was a particularly unclean animal is found in the fact that pigs will eat almost anything as part of their diet and a necessary implication of that is that they may drink/eat faeces, drink urine, roll around in cesspits to cool themselves etc. These are all things that both historically and currently jews have been particularly fearful of; i.e. their own bodily fluids, and have gone into great and frequent detail about the impact of faeces and urine on a jew's religious life. (3) We may even reasonably trace this hypochondria to be the origins of Freud's theory of psychoanalysis. (4)

However Porphyry's own reason; that there simply weren't any pigs where the jews lived, (5) can be dismissed as without foundation as we know of substantial deposits of pig bones in the kingdom of Judea for example. (6) We cannot criticise Porphyry much for this as many modern scholars have taken a similar line of thought as to the early date of the jews prohibition of park and subsequent lack of development of pig husbandry. (7) Porphyry seems to have come to this conclusion on the basis of the practices of the Greeks and using a bit of lateral thinking in so far Porphyry tells us that the Greeks do not sacrifice camels or elephants to the gods, because they are not indigenous to Greece. (8) Porphyry then logically extrapolates that the reasons that the jews and Phoenicians did not eat pork was because there weren't pigs in their countries. Porphyry was however quite wrong on both counts. (9)

Porphyry then moves on to comment on the sacrificial practices within Judaism and in doing so he reveals his deep personal antipathy towards the jews as both a religion and as a people when he tells us as follows:

'But of the Syrians, the Jews indeed, through the sacrifice which they first made, even now, says Theophrastus, sacrifice animals, and if we were persuaded by them to sacrifice in the same way that they do, we should abstain from the deed. For they do not feast on the flesh of the sacrificed

animals, but having thrown the whole of the victims into the fire, and poured much honey and wine on them during the night, they swiftly consume the sacrifice, in order that the all-seeing sun may not become a spectator of it. And they do this, fasting during all the intermediate days, and through the whole of this time, as belonging to the class of philosophers, and also discourse with each other about the divinity. But in the night, they apply themselves to the theory of the stars, surveying them, and through prayers invoking God. For these make offerings both of other animals and themselves, doing this from necessity, and not from their own will.' (10)

Here we find Porphyry's tone rather changed from his passing comments about his theories about the origin of Jewish dietary requirements. Instead Porphyry is confronting the Jews directly and pointing out to his reader just how vile and abusive are the chosen of Yahweh.

Interestingly Porphyry's argument points out that the Jewish idea of the sacrifice was quite different to that as understood by the Roman and Greek world where the sacrifice of the chosen animal was a holy gift to the gods to win favour with them in their eternal whimsical existences. The method chosen; so Porphyry implies, was comparatively quick and involved the least amount of pain possible for the victim: an interpretation confirmed by Porphyry's own earlier argument that kindness towards animals is also important. (11)

Porphyry is even persuaded to inform his reader that if the Romans and Greeks performed their animal sacrifices like the Jews and Syrians did they would simply abstain from them. For Roman and Greeks; while being no shrinking violets when it came to blood, violence and animal sacrifice, detested cruelty for its own sake and found it to be a decidedly 'Eastern' concept. We really cannot emphasise how unusual it is to find a Roman who endorses the blood sacrifices of animals to the gods suggesting that another people's sacrifices are so cruel and evil that it would cause him and his nation to recoil in absolute horror!

Porphyry does not spare us the lurid details of the Jewish ritual either and describes it in a manner that we would today more associate with witchcraft, Satanism and the Black Mass. (12) Indeed he recounts to us in detail that the Jews; in a similar spirit as the sacrifice of children to the god Baal, throw their sacrificial victims into 'the fire' watching them burn. A key issue here is whether the Jews were at this point slitting the throats of the victims before they threw them in the fire: however this is very difficult to determine with any certainty precisely because we have little testimony about the order of the Jewish sacrifice in this period other than what biblical tradition would have us believe and what the Romans believed to have been the case. (13)

We may however briefly note that Porphyry's picture of Jewish sacrifice does; in fact, tally with that given by Apion when he accused the Jews of keeping a Gentile in the temple to fatten up, slaughter him and then 'taste his entrails'.

To wit:

'Antiochus found in our temple a bed, and a man lying upon it, with a small table before him, full of dainties, from the [fishes of the] sea, and the fowls of the dry land... he fell down upon his knees, and begged to be released; and that when the king bid him sit down, and tell him who he was, and why he dwelt there, and what was the meaning of those various sorts of food that were

set before him the man made a lamentable complaint, and with sighs, and tears in his eyes, gave him this account of the distress he was in; and said that he was a Greek and that as he went over this province, in order to get his living, he was seized upon by foreigners, on a sudden, and brought to this temple, and shut up therein, and was seen by nobody, but was fattened by these curious provisions thus set before him; and that truly at the first such unexpected advantages seemed to him matter of great joy; that after a while, he inquired of the servants that came to him and was by them informed that it was in order to the fulfilling a law of the Jews, which they must not tell him, that he was thus fed; and that they did the same at a set time every year: that they used to catch a Greek foreigner, and fat him thus up every year, and then lead him to a certain wood, and kill him, and sacrifice with their accustomed solemnities, and taste of his entrails, and take an oath upon this sacrificing a Greek, that they would ever be at enmity with the Greeks; and that then they threw the remaining parts of the miserable wretch into a certain pit. ' (14)

Now if we compare that to what Porphyry describes the ritual of jewish sacrifice as follows: *'For they do not feast on the flesh of the sacrificed animals, but having thrown the whole of the victims into the fire, and poured much honey and wine on them during the night, they swiftly consume the sacrifice, in order that the all-seeing sun may not become a spectator of it. ' (15)*

The only slight difference in the ritual here prescribed is that in the version of Apion there is no explicit mention of the sacrificial fire, but that may be inferred from Apion's assertion that the jews sacrifice the Greek *'with their accustomed solemnities'* and *'taste his entrails'*, which we may reasonably take to mean that they cooked him so as to *'taste his inner meats'* per one of the strange linguistic qwerks of ancient Greeks. (16)

Thus we can see that what Porphyry may; in fact, knowingly or unknowingly (the latter is more likely given the context and his lack of further mention) is a rite of human sacrifice within Judaism at this time. (17)

However if we assume; for the sake of argument, that he merely means the sacrifice of animals then the ritual that is being performed by the jews according to Porphyry has as its centre the consuming of the burnt offering by the jewish priests after engaging in a little culinary work by sprinkling generous doses of honey and wine on either the carcass or the dying animal. We may find in this ritual; if Porphyry's description of it is correct, the suggestion of the origins of Judaism being not from the supposedly beautiful and ethical monotheism that the jews have long claimed it to be, but rather as a form of cruel oriental cult bent like the Aztecs on sacrificing as many victims as possible to their vengeful god. After all he did spend much of the Tanakh variously smiting the jews did he not?

What makes the cult of Yahweh somewhat unusual in this regard is both the fact that the jewish priests seemed to treat their sacrifice as if it were lunch and undoubtedly kept that from the rest of the population who were providing them with their the actual victims or the money to purchase them. This compares quite differently to the general pagan practice where the sacrifice was in itself holy but after a prescribed time it was well-known to the populace that the food would be consumed by the priests or fed to the deserving and in need.

We may also point out that the Jewish cult of the Essenes; an off-shoot of the original Hasidim, quite possibly shared sacrificial communal meals with the initiates in the community rather than have the priests consume them in secret by night. (18) Evidence of this may adduced for the number of specifically buried remnants of sacrificial meals that have been found in various sites associated with the Essenes. (19)

This compares rather starkly with Roman and Greek ritual as we can just imagine the Jewish priests gorging themselves on fine roasted meats in secret midnight ceremonies. It is this that is of particular interest to us, because it indicates that Porphyry saw Judaism as a form of dishonest mystery cult that was unique to the Jewish nation.

That it was unique to the Jewish nation we can see from Porphyry's earlier assertion that:

'From all these causes, therefore, we do not spare the life of brutes; but we destroy those who commence hostilities against us, as also those who do not, lest we should suffer any evil from them. For there is no one who, if he sees a serpent, will not, if he is able, destroy it, in order that neither it, nor any other serpent, may bite a man. And this arises, not only from our hatred of those that are the destroyers of our race, but likewise from that kindness which subsists between one man and another. But though the war against brutes is just, yet we abstain from many which associate with men.' (20)

We can see here that although Porphyry is only seemingly talking about animals his thought process is also applicable to peoples as well. He means very simply that we do not spare the life of psychotic or very bad-tempered animals, because they are likely to cause evil. So thus he logically reasons that it must also be so with humans and their groups; i.e. nations, suggesting implicitly that one should not be afraid to raise their hand against what they perceive to be evil and that which would do them harm.

That which Porphyry particularly wishes to erase is the Jewish cult; i.e. Judaism, that he considers so odious in its sacrifices that if the Greeks or Romans adopted a similar system they would reject sacrifice altogether!

Porphyry finds particular fault in the Jews *'discoursing on the nature of god'* after having partaken of such horrific sacrifices and tells us that in this time they apply themselves to the *'theory of the stars'* by which he means astrology for which the Jews have a particular penchant (21) and have long been under explicit halakhic ban to have no involvement with it.

It is also interesting to note that Porphyry's passing reference to the *'all-seeing sun'* is possibly a reference to the conjectured Atenist origins of Moses and the original Jews. (22)

So from this we begin to see that Porphyry is being a little less obvious in his animosity towards Jews than Celsus for example, but that animosity is still very much there and layered into his thought. All we need do is but extract it and boil it down to its essence to see that Porphyry really was no shrinking violet from implicitly advocating stringent measures against the Jews as a people and Judaism as a subversive cult.

References

- (1) On Celsus the Epicurean's anti-Semitism please see my article; *'The Jew as Untermensch: Celsus the Epicurean on the Jews'*, which is available at the following address:
<http://semiticcontroversies.blogspot.com/2011/05/jew-as-untermensch-celsus-epicurean-on.html>.
- (2) Porph. Abst. 1.14
- (3) For example: Solomon Ganzfried, *Kitzur Schulchan Aruch*, 4; 5
- (4) I will be going deeply into the origins of Freudian psychoanalysis within Judaism in detail at a later date.
- (5) Porph. Abst. 1.14
- (6) Brian Hesse, Paula Wapnish, 1997, *'Can Pig Remains be used for Ethnic Diagnosis in the Ancient Near East?'* in Neil Asher Silberman, David Small (Eds.), 1997, *'The Archaeology of Israel: Constructing the Past, Interpreting the Present'*, 1st Edition, Sheffield Academic Press: Sheffield, pp. 251-253
- (7) Richard Hess, 1993, *'Early Israel in Canaan: A Survey for Recent Evidence and Interpretations'*, *Palestine Exploration Quarterly*, Vol. 125, No. 2, p. 138
- (8) Porph. Abst. 1.14
- (9) Brian Hesse, 1990, *'Pig Lovers and Pig Haters: Patterns of Palestinian Pork Production'*, *Journal of Ethnobiology*, Vol. 10, No. 2, pp. 195-225. This is in spite of the fact that Porphyry himself was of Phoenician origin and spent part of his life in and around the port of Tyre.
- (10) Porph. Abst. 2.26
- (11) Ibid, 1.12-14
- (12) In spite of his infinite credulity Montague Summers' extremely detailed and learned work is still the best run-down of satanic and witch real and alleged practices in my opinion. See Montague Summers, 1946, *'Witchcraft and Black Magic'*, 1st Edition, Rider: London and Montague Summers, 1994, [1925], *'The History of Witchcraft'*, 1st Edition, Senate: London.
- (13) The issue of animal and human sacrifice in Judaism will be treated in a separate article as it is much too complex and distracting to go into here. A comparative and useful treatise to consult on this matter; however indirectly, is Dennis Hughes, 1991, *'Human Sacrifice in Ancient Greece'*, 1st Edition, Routledge: New York and as a companion volume for context please see Michael Cosmopoulos, 2003, *'Greek Mysteries: The Archaeology and Ritual of Ancient Greek Secret Cults'*, 1st Edition, Routledge: New York
- (14) Joseph. Ap. 2.8
- (15) Porph. Abst. 2.26
- (16) Hom. Il. 1.450-470
- (17) As has been suggested to me in correspondence there is evidence in the Tanakh for just such a practice. For example Ex. 24; Lv. 27; Ez. 20; Jgs. 11
- (18) Geza Vermes, 1990, *'The Dead Sea Scrolls in English'*, 3rd Edition, Penguin: London, pp. 6-7; 51-52
- (19) John Allegro, 1959, *'The Dead Sea Scrolls'*, 3rd Edition, Penguin: London, pp. 114-116; John Allegro, 1985, *'Physician Heal Thyself...'*, 1st Edition, Prometheus: New York, p. 17
- (20) Porph. Abst. 1.14
- (21) The Sefer Yetzirah (or *'Book of Creation'*) makes explicit use of astrology for example and is one of the earliest Jewish texts extant. It is also a widely referred to text in Jewish mysticism that Saadia Gaon; for example, wrote a famous commentary on also using astrology in

combination with philosophy to support the Sefer Yetzirah.

(22) I have covered the Atenist theory in summary in my article; '*Strabo on the Jews*', which is available at the following address: <http://semiticcontroversies.blogspot.com/2011/05/strabo-on-jews.html>.

In Brief: Strabo and Female Jewish Circumcision

Wednesday, 1 June 2011

It has been brought to my attention by a reader that Strabo 16.2.38 should read as follows:

'From superstition arose abstinence from flesh, from the eating of which it is now the custom to refrain, circumcision, cliterodectomy, and other practices which the people observe.' (1)

The Greek; regarding cliterodectomy, I am informed translated literally means '*excisions*' and refers to the female body: therefore the translation of '*female circumcision*' would have perhaps been more apposite as the use of '*cliterodectomy*' forces one to think a moment about what that suggests and look it up in a dictionary for confirmation. '*Cliterodectomy*' might be technically accurate, but it doesn't convey the same point as the more meaning '*female circumcision*' would.

The possibility that jews were engaging in this practice; now thankfully largely relegated to sub-Saharan Africa, as a companion ritual; much like the Bat Mitzvah is the female companion to the male Bar Mitzvah, to the mark of the covenant. If you think about it: it makes a perverted sort of sense in that if the male jew bears the mark of covenant then so should the female jew, but the female jew hasn't had a mark of any kind for so long that people seem to have forgotten about the possibility of this having originally been the case.

I will write further on this in future, but it might be a while as this is new even to me and I am not persuaded it was necessarily the case as I can't think of any direct or implicit references to it in the jewish literature.

References

(1) Strab. 16.2.38

Erich Bischoff contra Hermann Strack: A Forgotten Chapter in anti-Semitic History

Saturday, 4 June 2011

Like most students of the jewish question I am well aware of Professor Hermann Strack; Protestant theologian and specialist in Hebraica, who wrote the classic defence of jewry against the charge of ritual murder or the '*blood libel*'. (1) This eloquent and learned defence has often been; and continues to be, quoted and cited in jewry's defence on this score. (2)

What I was unaware of however; and I haven't seen any reference to this in literature so I can only presume it has been either left out or has been forgotten over time, was that Dr. Erich Bischoff; the anti-Semitic academic expert on theology and jewry, who argued that jews could read some of their own works; most notably certain passages in the Zohar, as injunctions on behalf of collecting gentile blood for ritual purposes, was in fact a disciple and student of Strack's. (3)

We can see this in one of Bischoff's first published works that I have been able to locate; '*Jesus and the Rabbis*', (4) which takes a detailed look at jewish traditions concerning Jesus. (5) In it Bischoff is not injudicious towards the jews, but takes; much as Strack himself did, strong offense about the various claims made about Jesus by the jews and points out that such traditions can be overcome, but not easily. Bischoff however tells us that his relationship with Strack was that of disciple with his master (6) and it is further confirmed by Strack's contribution of an afterword to the work. (7) It also happens to have been published as part of a series of monographs by Strack's own Institutum Judaicum in Berlin!

It seems that between 1906 and 1922; the year of Strack's death, that Bischoff further developed his thought regarding the jews and seemingly unencumbered by Strack's need to convert jews to Protestant Christianity by being friendly with them. Bischoff went somewhat further and argued that the jews had rendered themselves; via serving their own interests, contrary to Germans and Germany. (8)

It is quite possible; even probable, that the pivotal event in Bischoff's scholarly development towards an actively anti-Semitic position in regards to jews was the first world war. As this helped to fuel the fire of German nationalism and the flowering of anti-Semitic thought in the wake of the Protocols of Zion and the Bolshevik revolution was helped along by this increasingly strident nationalist sentiment among gentiles as well as the rapid spread of militant forms of Zionist and Marxist ideology among the jews. (9)

We can see the culmination of Bischoff's anti-Semitic intellectual development regarding the issue of jewish ritual murder in the publication of his forgotten demolition and critique of his mentor Strack's case for the defence: '*Das Blut in jüdischem Schriftum und Brauch*'. (10) This makes sense of Bischoff's later appearance as the principal witness for the defence in the attempted libel suit against Julius Streicher and '*Der Stürmer*' for arguing that jews have committed; and do commit, ritual murder for religious reasons. (11)

Bischoff's standing as an highly-qualified expert and his then recent publication of a work that argues just what Streicher had done tells us why the German court dismissed the case against Streicher without resorting to the standard intellectual cop-out of arguing that the judge/court was anti-Semitic or '*biased*' in some way used by some authors to make up for a lack of research on their part. (12)

The reason that Bischoff seems to have been forgotten by anti-Semites seems to be, because his writings on the subject of jews were only ever available in German and because of a considerable gap in the literature on anti-Semitism of this period relating to Hermann Strack, Julius Streicher

and Theodor Fritsch: Erich Bischoff has simply been largely forgotten. (13)

It is somewhat bemusing to note that Alan Steinweis in his recent defamation of anti-Semitic scholars of this particular period seems not to even have known of Bischoff's existence even though he discusses work in which Bischoff's work is cited on numerous occasions! (14) That said his work has fortunately been noticed by the odd specialist. (15)

I will be commenting extensively on Bischoff's work in the future and quite possibly translating some of it into English. Bischoff was certainly one of the very best anti-Semitism has ever had to offer; along with Karl Georg Kuhn and Gerhard Kittel, on the subject of the inhumanity and insanity of Judaism.

He deserves to be remembered as one of the greatest minds that anti-Semitism has ever produced rather than being simply consigned to obscurity.

References

- (1) Hermann Strack, Henry Bloch (Trans.), 1909, *The Jew and Human Sacrifice: An Historical and Sociological Inquiry*, 1st Edition, Bloch: New York
- (2) For example in Jonathan Frankel, 1997, *The Damascus Affair: "Ritual Murder," Politics, and the Jews in 1840*, 1st Edition, Cambridge University Press: New York, p. 468
- (3) Arnold Leese, 1938, *My Irrelevant Defence*, 1st Edition, Imperial Fascist League: London, p. 5
- (4) Erich Bischoff, 1905, *Jesus und die Rabbinen*, 1st Edition, Schriften des Institutum Judaicum: Berlin
- (5) Peter Schäfer, 2007, *Jesus in the Talmud*, 1st Edition, Princeton University Press: Princeton echoes many of Bischoff's judgements however implicitly and sometimes against his own explicit reasoning.
- (6) Bischoff, *Jesus und die Rabbinen*, Op. Cit.
- (7) Ibid, pp. 104-107
- (8) I infer this from Bischoff's association with Theodor Fritsch after the First World War as this was Fritsch, the Reichshammerbund and Hammer Verlag's general position on the matter. I can see nothing in Bischoff's corpus of work to suggest otherwise.
- (9) See for example Albert Lindemann, 1997, *Esau's Tears: Modern Anti-Semitism and the Rise of the Jews*, 1st Edition, Cambridge University Press: New York, pp. 100-101; Robert Lougee, 1962, *Paul de Lagarde 1827-1891: A Study of Radical Conservatism in Germany*, 1st Edition, Harvard University Press: Cambridge, pp. 245-252
- (10) Erich Bischoff, 1929, *Das Blut in jüdischem Schriftum und Brauch*, 1st Edition, Hammer Verlag: Leipzig
- (11) Leese, Op. Cit., p. 5
- (12) Randall Bytwerk, 2001, *Julius Streicher: Nazi Editor of the Notorious Anti-Semitic Newspaper Der Stürmer*, 1st Edition, Cooper Square Press: New York, pp. 126-130
- (13) E. Klauke, 2011, *Theodor Fritsch (1852-1933): The 'Godfather' of German Antisemitism* in R. Haynes, M. Rady (Eds.), 2011, *In the Shadow of Hitler: Personalities of the Right in Central and Eastern Europe*, 1st Edition, I. B. Tauris: London has realised much as I did a few years ago that Fritsch has barely even been studied (although he has been noticed and commented on in passing by specialists such as Peter Pulzer, Fritz Stern and Richard Levy) by

scholars of anti-Semitism in spite of his central importance to giving it much of its intellectual basis and popularising it as well as his important role in helping the NSDAP achieve power and enhancing Goebbels' anti-Semitism for example. Klauke has promised a biography of Fritsch, which should make interesting reading although it will be no easy task considering the amount of correspondence Fritsch had and also how much he himself wrote in his periodicals.

(14) Alan Steinweis, 2008, *Studying the Jew: Scholarly anti-Semitism in Nazi Germany*, 1st Edition, Princeton University Press: Princeton

(15) David Biale, 2007, *Blood and Belief: The Circulation of a Symbol between Jews and Christians*, 1st Edition, University of California Press: Los Angeles, pp. 132-135

The Adventures of 'Foreskin Man'

Sunday, 5 June 2011

Yesterday my wife called me and told me that she'd just seen an article in the New York Daily News that stated; and displayed images, of an anti-circumcision comic book that is being produced in California. When I got the chance I took a peek at the Daily News; New York's version of the Soviet daily *'Pravda'*, and I burst out laughing right then and there. (1)

The comic book; called *'Foreskin Man'*, (2) carries a cartoon version of a blonde; obviously Aryan, superhero fighting a corpulent, bloody beast; *'Dr. Mutilator'*, that could reasonably be interpreted as a Jew. The Jew; of course, is dressed in a doctor's coat with blood spattered across it.

Another image carries a malevolent and gaunt (alright somewhat unrealistic there as most rabbis of any denomination seem to be habitually obese) Hasidic rabbi; *'Monster Mohel'*, with a satanic grin on his face obviously approves of the bodily mutilation of all and sundry. Who has a Jewish goon; complete with a kippah, side-locks and an uzi, called *'Jorah'* who helps him and Dr. Mutilator in their quest to lop foreskins off helpless male children.

The group responsible for this praiseworthy foray of anti-Jewish imagery into the world of modern cartoons is called *'MGMBill'* (2) based out of San Diego. *'Foreskin Man'* is the brainchild of three people: Matthew Hess, Gledson Barreto and Ian Sokoliwski. Barreto seems to have written and designed the comic, while Sokoliwski took care of the colouration. (3)

Interestingly they are based out numerous different locales with Hess in San Diego, Barreto in Brazil and Sokoliwski in Canada, which suggests to my mind that all have a strong aversion to the rite of circumcision and forced mass circumcision in particular. From what I can see all three individuals involved have liberal credentials and quite probably are either pro-homosexual or have homosexual urges, but at the very least they are being logical in that belief system and opposing a barbaric practice in spite of all the pressure on them.

'Foreskin Man' is obviously a very clever bit of Public Relations in that it attracts a lot of attention to their cause and campaign. It is also fairly obvious that they expected to be called *'anti-Semitic'* and almost seem to have counted on this fact by the obviously Jewish imagery they

are using. As Goebbels himself realised; and indeed this was the secret of much of his success as the Gauleiter of Berlin, one of the keys to a propaganda campaign is to get constantly talked about in the way you want to be discussed as that brings the oxygen of publicity to your cause.

The campaign for MGMBill is essentially part of the controversy surrounding San Franciscans sticking two fingers up at the self-chosen and demanding the jews follow the same laws and rules as everyone else by outlawing the barbaric practice of circumcision. This has caused the volume of kvetching in California to go up by several decibels as jews scream '*anti-Semite*', '*Nazis*', '*holocaust*' in quick succession with little actual effect as the San Franciscans seem to be; for once, digging their heels in for the good guys and literally kicking the jews where their foreskins used to be.

The Anti-Defamation League of B'nai Brith; who obviously have a vested interest in lopping off foreskins the practice of which gave birth to their name, thinks it has found the obvious way to '*prove*' to everyone that this is a '*Nazi conspiracy*' against jews (and the next '*holocaust*' is round the corner if people don't send them lots of money now) in '*Foreskin Man*'. So they have been redeploying their resources to character assassinate anyone and everyone who gets involved with the anti-Circumcision bill as the Anti-Defamation League; rightly, believes that such actions are the '*thin end of the wedge*' as it; along with other recent actions such as moves to ban the equally barbaric practice of Shechita, (4) gives a legal basis and precedent for future anti-jewish action.

The problem the Anti-Defamation League is now facing is two fold:

A) The drying up of the rivers of jewish gold that have sustained it for so long to such an extent that it is having to get on the '*Charity Walk*' circuit and is trying to recruit gullible goyim to defend the jews by giving it money.

B) That they have called '*anti-Semite*' too many times which has caused it to lose much of its previous vim and vigour as a charge.

Can the Anti-Defamation League adapt and overcome?

Possibly, but while the first problem is relatively easy to remedy: the second problem requires so massive a change and cutting back on the corporate strategy it has for so long successfully used that I doubt that the Anti-Defamation League will take the actions necessary to rectify the situation in their eyes.

In fact I would suggest that as time goes on we will see an increasingly frustrated Anti-Defamation League screaming '*anti-Semitism*', '*Nazi*' and '*Holocaust*' to a dwindling audience of rabid Israel Firsters, while; in fact, public intellectual discourse begins to accept some basic anti-Semitic positions much as it has already done with the popularisation of the '*Israel Lobby*' argument.

It appears that for all their frothing and spittle-flecked rage and paranoia: the jews might have got this one somewhat correct.

Anti-Semitism is back and this time it is seriously pissed off.

References

- (1) http://www.nydailynews.com/news/national/2011/06/04/2011-06-04_jewish_groups_blast_foreskin_man_comic_books_overly_antisemitic_images_on_circum.html [Last Accessed: 04/06/2011]
- (2) <http://foreskinman.com/> [Last Accessed: 04/06/2011]
- (3) <http://mgmbill.org/> [Last Accessed: 04/06/2011]
- (4) The kosher method of slaughtering an animal.

In Brief: An Early Origin for Dzhugashvili equating ‘Son of a Jew’

Sunday, 5 June 2011

Recently re-reading Jerry Z. Muller’s *‘Capitalism and the Jews’* I was surprised by a reference to an early claim that Dzhugashvili equated *‘Son of a Jew’* in old Georgian. I reproduce the passage in full:

‘Were one to accept solely the definitions of anti-Semites , one might end up counting even those with no historical link to Jewry, such as Joseph Stalin, whose real surname of Dzhugashvili, according to one expatriate Ukrainian anti-Semite, is Georgian for “son of a Jew.”’ (1)

As I have already covered in an earlier article this is unfortunately complete nonsense as the two words for jew in old Georgian are *‘Ebraeli’* and *‘Uriya’* obviously nothing to do with Dzhugashvili the origin of which has remained obscure in spite of Simon Sebag Montefiore’s efforts to pin down a meaning for it. I have already stated that the name to my very limited understanding of old Georgian best translates as *‘son of steel’* not *‘son of a Jew’*, which makes sense of his later adoption of *‘Stalin’* (i.e. man of steel). I also pointed out that Maurice Pinay’s assertion that it meant *‘son of Djou’*; although far more plausible than *‘son of Jew’*, had no evidential backing either. (2)

It is interesting to note this precisely, because I had previously asserted in line with others who had looked into the matter that the origin of claim came from how Dzhugashvili is pronounced in the English language. I am pleased to say that I was incorrect in this assertion and that the claim does have a longer evidential basis than just being a recent innovation; as I had thought, in fact if Muller is right then it places the claim in the Ukrainian nationalist and anti-Semitic Diaspora in the 1920s/1930s , which makes perfect sense if we understand that Russian and Ukrainian claims of this kind about the leaders of the Soviet Union were not uncommon and varied widely in their substance, but not in their aim i.e. to prove that the Russian Empire had been seized by a bunch of marxist jews. (3)

The one problem with Muller here is that he does not cite an actual source for his assertion (in spite of it making sense) or give the name of the Ukrainian who originally made it: so I have

taken the liberty of writing to him to ask him from whence he took the information as it is obviously of interest.

If we find an originating source then we can look to see if they had a source for their claims and also see if this isn't yet another myth purported by anti-jewish White Russians and Ukrainian nationalists that has no foundation. I'd hope that it has some evidential basis, but based on my experience with East European sources of this kind: I very much doubt it.

References

- (1) Jerry Muller, 2010, '*Capitalism and the Jews*', 1st Edition, Princeton University Press: Princeton, p. 137
- (2) <http://semiticcontroversies.blogspot.com/2009/02/was-josef-stalin-jewish.html>
- (3) Michael Kellogg, 2005, '*The Russian Roots of Nazism: White Émigrés and the making of National Socialism 1917-1945*', 1st Edition, Cambridge University Press: New York, pp. 219-243

The Socialist History Society obsesses over Jews (again)

Monday, 6 June 2011

Sometimes in this life we find it is impossible not to question what we see, read and hear. I had one such moment when I read the latest edition; May 2011, of the '*Socialist History Society Newsletter*'. Aside from the mealy-mouthed excuses from Dr. Francis King about why he can't work to a timetable like the rest of the world (ironic for a Marxist really): I find it bemusing that we have yet another two mentions of jews in this newsletter.

I haven't catalogued the amount of mentions of jews in the Socialist History Society newsletter as yet, but I am beginning to think it might be worth doing as it is truly remarkable that a bunch of quite intelligent men and women; some ostensibly European and some not, would decide to spend so much time in their pages talking about a '*small religious minority*' who they deny having a '*chosen*' status.

It is truly bizarre unless one takes into account the historic overrepresentation of jews in the Communist Party of Great Britain and the fact that East London was from the 1880s till the 1960s a proverbial potpourri of jewish radicals from the marxists and anarchists to Zionists. (1) It was also home to some of the more radical anti-Semitic groups in Britain such as the Nordic League. (2) Related to this we find an obituary to a member of the tribe who claimed to be a '*champion of the underprivileged*'; one '*Wolf Wayne*', in the last pages of this issue of the newsletter. (3)

I doubt '*Wolf Wayne*' was this particular member of the tribe's given name when he was spat out bawling into this world, but it is also quite possible that his jewish parents decided to give their little budding Karl Marx a leg up in the gentile world by not giving him a name that sounded like he'd just turned up from deepest, darkest Poland complete with caftan and side-locks.

The little darling is recorded by Morgan to have been a '*lifelong communist*' who like several communists from the Socialist History Society I have noted on seems to have decided that the women of the tribe just aren't the right type of meat for him. So our dear Wolfie decided to '*marry out*'; or seems to have done, given his wife's name (surname not given) was '*Beryl*', which without seeming too sweeping isn't a name I have come across much in the British Jewish community in this period.

Apparently Wolfie's '*strong secular beliefs*' didn't stop him identifying as a Jew and being a founding member of the '*43 Group*', which was essentially a group of Jewish thugs who had formerly been employed by His Majesty's government to torture and kill Germans, but now decided to use their publicly funded training to do exactly the same to patriotic Britons who didn't want their country turning into Sodom and Gomorrah.

I always find it rather strange that a Jewish communist is somehow allowed; by other communists, to believe that identifying as both a Jew and a communist is somehow orthodox, while if a European communist identifies as a European and a communist then he is somehow heterodox. (4) I am sure some leftist out there will suggest it isn't contradictory, but then I wonder how much the average leftist; or even their dedicated thinkers who spend hours studying the proverbial tea leaves, (5) knows about Judaism and the fact that Jews is defined biologically (not by any other means) by both Judaism and Jewish culture. You can't be Jewish in Judaism if you aren't born a Jew, but Marxism asserts you can!

So how can you be both? Well you can't, but Wolfie among others seems to have thought otherwise, but it would appear that Wolfie was more interested in his fellow members of the tribe than his fellow communists. We can ascertain this from the fact that his eulogy was given by two fellow circumcised ones: his nephew Mike Wayne (of Brunel University) and one Dr. Stephen Amiel.

So where is the universal proletariat now then Wolfie?

References

- (1) Possibly still the best general study of this is William Fishman, 1975, '*East End Jewish Radicals 1875-1914*', 1st Edition, Duckworth: London
- (2) Richard Griffiths, 1998, '*Patriotism Perverted: Captain Ramsay, the Right Club and British anti-Semitism 1939-1940*', 1st Edition, Constable: London, pp. 109-111
- (3) David Morgan, '*In Memory of Wolf Wayne*', Socialist History Society Newsletter, May 2011, p. 14
- (4) This is directly suggested by David Morgan, '*Celebrating a Modern Socialist Historian*', Op. Cit., p. 10
- (5) Or as the Jewish leader of the SHS; Eric Hobsbawm, put it in order to put an end to this leftist astrology: '*Marx and Engels didn't tell us how to create the revolution*' (I paraphrase). But Eric you know as well as I do that both Marx and Engels held that the concentration of capital in the hands of the ruling capitalist class and the impoverishment of the petit-bourgeois would naturally lead to the revolution (via the politicization of the working class because they would have Marx and Engels put it in '*The Communist Manifesto*': '*nothing to lose but their chains*') per the

assumptions of their theory of dialectical materialism.

In Brief: Karl Liebknecht not a Jew?

Tuesday, 7 June 2011

I was browsing through the working papers on the Social Science Research Network and I came across a noteworthy work in progress by Nico Voigtländer and Hans-Joachim Voth, which was posted on May 27th of this year entitled: *'Persecution Perpetuated: The Medieval Origins of Anti-Semitic Violence in Nazi Germany'*. (1)

As I was reading and mulling their presentation I happened to look at n. 14 on p. 8 of their working paper and I read the following in relation to the Marxist leader Karl Liebknecht with surprise:

'Luxembourg and Liebknecht led the USPD, the ultra-left wing of the socialist party (SPD). Liebknecht was widely (and incorrectly) believed to be Jewish.' (2)

I admit I haven't kept up with the literature regarding Karl Liebknecht as he holds little interest for me outside of his being a favourite target of anti-Semites and the German radical right in the 1920s and the 1930s (as well as; along with Rosa Luxembourg, being a mythological figure for the KPD in the same period and the SED later). However this surprised me and as the authors don't give the origin of this assertion I can't see if it has a decent grounding in the evidence.

That said a little bit of checking lead me to Liebknecht's father; Wilhelm Liebknecht, who was definitely German, but his wife; Liebknecht's mother, was something quite different her maiden name being Reh. It is Liebknecht's mother who is the potential jewess; especially as jewishness is largely carried maternally according to Judaism, as I can certainly find jews; specifically Czech ones, with the surname Reh. (3)

However I am finding it difficult to show definitively that Liebknecht's mother was a jewess as there appears to be a real dearth of literature on the subject on the web and from what I can find there appears little actual evidence of a jewish origin for Liebknecht's mother other than her unusual name; which doesn't appear in Benzion Kaganoff's *'Dictionary of Jewish Names'*, (4) and her family's left-wing and radical political credentials. Nor does Karl Liebknecht appear in Geoffrey Wigoder's *'Dictionary of Jewish Biography'* as a jew (5) in spite appearing in Rosa Luxembourg's entry, but as a gentile. (6)

I'll have to have a look at the literature, but I thought this would surprise a great many people as I myself believed him to have been so. However I am certainly not going to rule him out as being a jew at this point as it might just be a case of presumption not evidence per se on the part of academia.

References

- (1) http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1824744 [Last Accessed: 05/06/2011]
- (2) Nico Voigtländer, Hans-Joachim Voth, 2011, *'Persecution Perpetuated: The Medieval Origins of Anti-Semitic Violence in Nazi Germany'*, Unpublished Working Paper, p. 8
- (3) For example the Czechoslovak Jewish Committee's May-June 1945 Bulletin (No. 14) contains reference to several jewesses surnamed *'Reh'*.
- (4) Ben Zion Kaganoff, 1978, *'A Dictionary of Jewish Names and their History'*, 1st Edition, Routledge & Kegan Paul: London
- (5) Geoffrey Wigoder, 1991, *'Dictionary of Jewish Biography'*, 1st Edition, Jerusalem Publishing: Jerusalem, pp. 304-305
- (6) Ibid, pp. 313-314

A Jew gets stereotypical about Jewesses: Anthony Weiner's Faux Pas

Tuesday, 7 June 2011

I learn from RadarOnline that Anthony Weiner; a jew, has been caught lying about his *'sexting'* a *'middle-aged'* jewess about fellatio. (1) I usually would chalk this down to another jew thinking he is Hashem's gift to the rest of humanity: it does after all come with the territory when your ancestral religion and culture tell you that you are the chosen of an omniscient and omnipotent tribal god with a serious anger management problem.

Weiner texted a picture of his genitals in *'grey underwear'*; well it could have been worse although not much worse, to said jewess on Twitter and was so thick as to post it to the whole world. Whoops eh Anthony: your *'hot date'* turned into political suicide didn't it?

Weiner is also recorded to have said: *'wow a jewish girl who sucks cock! this thing is ready to do damage.'* (2)

Now Weiner; having lied to the world and told them that a *'hacker'* had sent the picture, is trying to say that it *'doesn't matter'* that he managed to tell the world about his sexual preferences and the fact that jewesses have issues with jewish male members. I half expected to see a reference from Weiner that jewesses don't like to swallow jewish sperm either.

Forgive me for being somewhat crude, but I find this genuinely hilarious especially as Weiner has the chutzpah to try to claim this in no way matters to the public. It is good to know that jews think that they have sex with anything that moves and that there should be no consequences for them what-so-ever.

However there are three things that are worth drawing attention to in regard to Weiner's statement:

- 1) Jewish thinking revolves primarily around themselves not the jewish community as a group.
- 2) Jews think that female gentiles are proverbial whores.

3) Jewesses are regarded as a special kind of woman by jews: worthy of more respect than gentile women.

In the first point we can see that what Weiner has done is essentially for his own pleasure and his own ego. He doesn't care what anyone else thinks; as confirmed by his later chutzpah, as long as he feels that he is the messiah in person and that every woman on the planet wants to have sex with him. (3)

In effect Weiner is boasting to the '*middle-aged*' jewess that he has had numerous female partners; jewish and gentile, and that she is a rare kind of jewess precisely because she is willing to perform fellatio with him.

The necessary implication of this statement; and the second point, is that jewesses are less '*dirty*' and '*sexually experimental*' than gentile women in the bedroom. The contempt is found in this implication in the context of the fact that Weiner is pleased to find a jewess who wants to perform fellatio and necessarily regards a jewess who performs fellatio as being superior to a gentile woman who performs fellatio.

This is our third point and it is fairly obvious from what Weiner has said; in this publicly aired bit of pillow talk, that he holds the gentile women he has bedded to be manifestly inferior; one could almost say like mere soulless animals, to the jewesses he has bedded.

Not exactly the most flattering implication for Weiner is it?

Why is Weiner digging his heels in?

Well the answer is simple: he thinks he is Hashem's gift to women and likewise we may extrapolate he believes himself to be Hashem's holy priest for the American voters so that they can know Yahweh's will manifest through him.

The jews are nature's ultimate experiment in individualism and egocentrism.

References

- (1) <http://www.radaronline.com/exclusives/2011/06/weiner-used-jewish-sexual-stereotype-facebook-sexting-partner> [Last Accessed: 07/06/2011]
- (2) Ibid. I've restored the probable original sexual term from RadarOnline's '*bleep*' insert.
- (3) I am reminded of the inverse claim made by a jewess who spends most of her '*memoirs*' talking how good the sex was with jews and how gentiles are to blame for her failures in life. Specifically see Reva Mann, 2008, '*The Rabbi's Daughter: A True Story of Sex, Drugs and Orthodoxy*', 2nd Edition, Hodder: London.

Two old anti-Einstein Opinions

Saturday, 18 June 2011

Now although I oppose those who seek to claim that Einstein was a fraud and more specifically a plagiarist I found two opinions cited in a old work that I have recently read which I thought would be worth reproducing if only to point out that not everyone in physics generally agreed with Einstein till the 1950s and 1960s. As well as to remind people in general of them as much old work is forgotten unjustly (although sometimes justly) and it is worth remembering it even if it is incorrect from the current state of knowns and unknowns in science.

They are as follows:

'Einstein interprets an identical equation, derived by some unknown mathematical process, as indicating and establishing a 'new' law of gravitation and the existence of a fourth and even a fifth dimension! But, in making this interpretation, he completely overlooks, or forgets his fundamental assumption in regard to time and time units. He overlooks the fact that his variable, hypothetical relativity time, the time to which his equation applies, differs from the ordinary time of astronomy., and that a century of mystic Mercurial time will not be 100 years of earthly time.

Now in support of his theory of variable time, Einstein has cited certain definite observations of physics and of astronomy, and has asserted that, on account of these observations, we 'must' accept the theory, no matter how it may conflict with our ordinary common-sense ideas.

The supposed astronomical proof of the theory, as cited and claimed by Einstein, does not exist.'
(1)

- Professor Charles Lane Poor

'Einstein is neither astronomer, mathematician nor physicist. He is a confusionist. The Einstein theory is a fallacy. It is based on a glaring error of which Einstein is aware but which he refuses to recognize.... The Einstein theory that the ether does not exist and that gravity is not a force but a property of space can only be described as a crazy vagary, a disgrace to our age.' (2)

- Professor Thomas Jefferson See

References

(1) Edwin Marshall Hadley, 1931, 'T.N.T.', 1st Edition, Tower Press: Chicago, p. 68

(2) Ibid, pp. 68-69

Jewish Sexual Predators: John Henry Mackay and Benedict Friedlaender

Saturday, 18 June 2011

John Henry Mackay; a second or third rate anarchist '*intellectual*' depending how you want to look at him, is a rather unknown figure even inside the vile world of homosexuals and not the best known figure among anarchists either. However Mackay's friends and correspondents like

Friedrich Ebert, Emma Goldman, Benjamin Tucker and Magnus Hirschfeld are well-known to many.

In spite of the title of this article: Mackay was not actually jewish and was born to a Scottish father and a German mother. Neither of who had any jewish ancestry as far as I can discover. The interest for us comes from Mackay's contacts and supporters: many of whom were jews and; as I have said, fairly well known both in their own day and to students of history today.

Mackay; as the title indicates, was a sexual predator and to be precise a pederast. His choice of victim was male and usually between thirteen and fifteen. (1) Mackay used to hang around the streets, popular sources of amusement and public swimming pools (particularly in and around Berlin) to find his victims whom he would then approach and try to persuade the victim that they were desperate to be raped by him. (2)

Mackay would also spend considerable amounts of money to gain the trust of the mothers of his victims by giving them clothes, paying for some of their son's schooling etc. (3) It is thus positively revolting that the then President of Germany; Friedrich Ebert, offered Mackay '100,000 marks' as a gift from the German state for his literary activities. (4) This in spite of the Prussian Police's strong (and correct) suspicion that Mackay had been publishing paedophilic and pederast propaganda through his jewish publisher: Bernhard Zack.

Mackay is somewhat unusual for a paedophile and pederast in that he didn't keep his activities on this score particularly secret and they were well known to his anarchist and/or homosexual friends. (5) However Mackay did make a belated attempt to conceal his almost daily excursions to sodomize young boys from the rest of the world (6) to avoid 'hurting' the anarchist movement by giving its opponents even more ammunition to use against it. (7) Although this was somewhat difficult as the first homosexual periodical; *'Die Eigene'*, was openly both anarchist (of the variety advocated by Max Stirner) (8) and homosexual with the occasional plumbing of the depths of *'intellectual'* cretinism via suggesting that raping children was nothing to do with the state. (9)

'Die Eigene' was variously associated with the school of thought espoused by Magnus Hirschfeld; who was jewish, who claimed that there was a *'third sex'* and that homosexuality was superior to heterosexuality. Magnus Hirschfeld; with whom Mackay was acquainted in turn, reviewed some of Mackay's *'Books of Nameless Love'*; how he styled his pederasty and child exploitation, in publications associated with him and his disciples followed suit. Their pronouncements on Mackay's work; under the pen name *'Sagitta'*, were various but none condemned Mackay or paedophilia in any significant way, shape or form.

Indeed one of Mackay's close friends and one of Magnus Hirschfeld's major confreres; Benedict Friedlaender, who also happens to have been jewish, was positively voluminous in his praise for Mackay and was part of Mackay intimate paedophile circle who met frequently to discuss their exploits, share tips and possibly even share their child *'boyfriends'* with each other. (10) I don't know of any work that suggests that Friedlaender was actually a paedophile himself, but his exhortations for *'Greek love'* (11) and his close association with three paedophiles; Mackay, Dobe and Harwig, suggests precisely that.

Unless we can show that Friedlaender explicitly rejected pederasty (12) then we must conclude that the likelihood is that he; like so many jews expounding doctrines about '*free love*' and '*Greek love*', was also a pederast and raped male children much as Mackay, Dobe and Harwig did. (13) It also noteworthy that Friedlaender shared both Mackay's jewish publisher; Bernhard Zack, who was charged and found guilty on numerous separate occasions for publishing homosexual and paedophilic material and Mackay's anarchist principles. (14)

I find it difficult to imagine that famous anarchists; with whom Mackay and Friedlaender were acquainted, such as Emma Goldman (15) would not have known what these two individuals were up to as I have already pointed out that their homosexuality and pederasty were fairly well known among the anarchist and/or homosexual community (the two being somewhat interchangeable both now and then). (16)

Indeed both Mackay and Friedlaender criticised Magnus Hirschfeld's development of the '*third sex*' theory (17) and attacked his strategy of '*trying to be respectable*' (or '*bourgeois*' as they put it) by attempting to legitimise and then legalise homosexuality while distancing it from paedophilia and pederasty that have justly long been linked with it. (18)

In response to Hirschfeld's '*bourgeois campaign*' Mackay with Friedlaender's financial backing (19) began his attempts to form his own campaign for the '*understanding*' of paedophilia and pederasty. (20) Mackay's attempt; which presumed that there were numerous paedophiles and pederasts out there just '*waiting for a voice*', was wholly unsuccessful and resulted in his; ironically for an anarchist of the Max Stirner school, ego being crushed by his absolute failure. (21)

Friedlaender further lent his financial muscle to publishing a large edition of a cheap pamphlet by Mackay titled: '*Gehör! Nur einen Augenblick!*' (literally: '*Listen! Only a Moment!*') This pamphlet was a smorgasbord of '*arguments*' derived from Stirnerian anarchism in support of the '*freedom*' of male pederasts to sexually abuse male children based on the assertion that they were capable of understanding what they wanted. (22) This is; of course, a typically cheap argument used by paedophiles and pederasts as a group to claim that they are '*doing nothing wrong*' and there is '*no harm*' involved as the child '*consents*' (and more over '*enjoys*' being abused).

Kennedy attempts to claim; on a similar basis, that to suppose that Mackay's paedophilia and pederasty lead him to become an anarchist in order to justify his mental illness and explain why society as a whole opposes both the idea of it and the act itself. Indeed he goes so far as to claim that to argue as such is '*simplistic*', which I would point is a common point of departure for those engaged in sophistry in support of preconceived notions and ideas. Kennedy would have it that it the other way around: Mackay was a paedophile and a pederast because he was an anarchist who loved '*freedom*'. (23)

This reasoning is absurd because it presumes that if anybody was to '*love freedom*' they would love anything and everything down to the nth degree: in fact the more they '*loved*' the more they would '*break free*', which shows that Kennedy is engaged in using circular logic to try and

justify the indefensible. As in order to be *'free'* one has to *'love'*, but in order to actually *'love'* one also has to be *'free'*.

Kennedy however contradicts his own stated reasoning later when he asserts that Mackay claimed that *'society'* was to *'blame'* for the behaviour of male prostitutes (which he frequently used), which is clearly a case of Mackay blaming society for rejecting his mental illness as abnormal/criminal behaviour when Mackay regards it as normal/legal behaviour. (24) Thus Mackay concluded (quite correctly per his logic) that the problem was society itself, because it would not let him rape and sexually molest children: society had to go and a new society built that did. Mackay obviously saw the culmination of his own situation in this reasoning and chose to become an anarchist in order that his abnormal/criminal sexual orientation should become normal/legal.

Fortunately Mackay's pamphlet; in spite of its jewish financing, was yet another outright failure as he mailed over a thousand copies to fairly randomly selected individuals he thought might *'share'* his tastes and several hundred more to different newspapers, magazines and journals. Frustrated by a lack of reviews and positive feedback Mackey proceeded to mail more than a thousand copies (again funded by Friedlaender) to the same number of Protestant youth groups in northern Germany. This predictably provoked a response, but not the one that Mackay was expecting as the pastors weren't; by enlarge, prepared to allow their young charges to become the victims of a particularly vile sexual predator like Mackay. This also led to not a few court convictions and more fines for Mackay's jewish publisher: Bernard Zack. (25)

Mackay himself died in early 1933; just days after the accession to power of Adolf Hitler and the NSDAP, of a heart attack in his doctor's surgery. Had he lived I think we can say with some reasonable measure of assurance that he would have been tried, convicted and graced the hangman's noose in fairly short order.

That said the example of Mackay I have given here clearly illustrates the general link between the jews and the promotion of abnormal sexuality as many of the key players in both the anarchist thought and life of Mackey were jews. Indeed even those he opposed; but who were *'fellow travellers'* in terms of abnormal sexuality, were also frequently of jewish origin such as the famous Magnus Hirschfeld.

The question that I intend to answer a later date is what is the extent of this and just how reasonably can we make the assertion of jewish deviant sexuality being either the rule or much more significant per 100 jews than 100 Europeans. Also just how big a role did jews play in the so-called *'sexual revolution'* which included the decriminalization of homosexuality and the advent of mass pornography. This will come in due time, but I thought to give the readers of SC a taste of what is to come on this score.

References

- (1) Hubert Kennedy, 2002, *'Anarchist of Love: The Secret Life of John Henry Mackay'*, 2nd Edition, Peremptory Publications: San Francisco, p. 28
- (2) Friedrich Dobe, 1987, *'John Henry Mackay als Mensch'*, 1st Edition, Edition Plato: Koblenz,

p. 60

(3) Kennedy, Op. Cit., p. 26

(4) Dobe, Op. Cit., p. 19

(5) Kennedy, Op. Cit., pp. 9-10; 17

(6) Ibid, pp. 30-31; 43

(7) Dobe, Op. Cit., p. 5

(8) David McLellan, 1980, *'Karl Marx and the Young Hegelians'*, 3rd Edition, MacMillan: London, pp. 117-135

(9) Kennedy, Op. Cit., pp. 9-10

(10) Dobe, Op. Cit., p. 53

(11) The idea of *'Greek love'* has long been a theme in homosexual propaganda in trying to mask their abnormal and destructive sexuality by an appeal to tradition.

(12) He nowhere condemns; and indeed could be construed as supporting it on occasion, it in his two major statements on the subject i.e. Benedict Friedlaender, 1904, *'Die Renaissance des Eros Uranios: Die physiologische Freundschaft, ein normaler Grundtrieb des Menschen und eine Frage der männlichen Gesellungsfreiheit in naturwissenschaftlicher, naturrechtlicher, culturgeschichtlicher und sittenkritischer Beleuchtung'*, 1st Edition, Bernhard Zack: Berlin and Benedict Friedlaender, 1905, *'Entwurf zu einer reizphysiologische Analyse der erotischen Anziehung unter Zugrundlegung vorwiegend Homosexuellen Materials'*, 1st Edition, Spohr: Leipzig.

(13) Dobe, Op. Cit., p. 53

(14) The most accessible of his anarchist writings is Benedict Friedlaender, 1901, *'Marxismus und Anarchismus'*, 1st Edition, Calvary: Berlin.

(15) Kennedy, Op. Cit., p. 8

(16) Ibid, p. 17

(17) Ibid, p. 9

(18) An excellent; although now dated, and highly detailed study of these kinds of tactics as used by homosexuals and their lobby organisations maybe found in Enrique Rueda, 1988, *'The Homosexual Network'*, 1st Edition, Devin Adair: New York.

(19) Kennedy, Op. Cit., p. 17

(20) Ibid, p. 9

(21) Ibid, p. 21

(22) Ibid, p. 17

(23) Ibid, p. 23

(24) Ibid, p. 41

(25) Ibid, p. 18

Lies, Damned Lies and Stephen Jay Gould

Sunday, 19 June 2011

The late Stephen Jay Gould; jewish palaeontologist, public intellectual and marxist, has just received a lot of fresh attention in the science community as one of his specific claims from his odious book *'The Mismeasure of Man'* (1) has recently been re-examined and found to be utterly

spurious. (2) This seems to have surprised quite a few scientists, but for those of us in the ivory towers who are race realists and hereditarians it comes as little surprise.

That it comes as little surprise might raise an eyebrow for many, but Stephen Jay Gould's *'The Mismeasure of Man'* has long been ripped apart by hereditarians and proven to be a work of conscious deception on Gould's part. Indeed Pearson has shown (3) that Gould's involvement in Marxist causes; such as Students for a Democratic Society (along with his celebrated jewish confrere Richard Lewontin who still regularly writes for Trotskyite rags such as the *'New Left Review'*), has meant that Gould's conscious deception in relation to the inheritance of intelligence and behavioural traits in humans can fortunately be documented.

Naturally it is normally very difficult to convincingly document an individual; particularly an academic, actively distorting their work for a preconceived cause unless they write about it and it can be demonstrated that they have allowed personal conviction to form their conclusion before their review of the evidence has actually begun. However Gould was; like Lewontin, prolific in his support of Marxist causes and his involvement with far left politics is not even a subject for contention. Pearson also informs us of the fact that Gould and Lewontin were both also involved in the SDS campaign of intimidation against evolutionary scientists and socio-biologists who disagreed with their *'science for the people'* pseudo-Lamarckian (or neo-Lysenkoist) approach to human biological and behavioural studies.

This has allowed the identification of Gould as a politicised scientist in the same sense that Bullert has shown Gould's fellow-travelling jewish predecessor Franz Boas to have been. (4) Ironically Gould was caught out by the exactly the same thing that has happened to Boas years after their respective deaths: someone went back and checked their skull data. Boas was discovered several years ago; by one of his own followers no less, to have simply lied about his data and that lying can only have had a political motive as Boas openly used that lie to attack what has been called *'racist approaches to anthropology'*. Now Gould has been found out to have been doing almost exactly the same thing in his work and perhaps even worse than Boas in that unlike Boas Gould claimed to be objective.

That said Gould's partisans have been quick to try and save the reputation of their jewish master and have suggested (5) that Gould *'proves his point'* by being wrong. This is easily pin-pricked per the discussion above precisely because their argument asserts two obvious fallacies:

A) What Gould did was unconscious manipulation.

B) Nobody believes in Morton's *'cranial capacity equals intelligence'* now anyway.

In the first instance Gould cannot be said to have just made a mistake or unconsciously manipulated the data, because if you read the paper as written by Lewis et al it is very clear that Gould suppressed and modified Morton's own data. Now if this was a case of unconscious bias you'd expect something more akin to just not mentioning the sourcing Morton used or interpreting his data incorrectly, but Gould does far more than that according to Lewis et al: he simply makes up Morton's data to fit his case.

That isn't '*unconscious bias*' dear boys: it is '*conscious manipulation*'. There is one hell of a difference and notably if you claim that Gould was just being '*unconsciously biased*' then why; I wonder, don't you mention his long term involvement in anti-hereditarian politics in explicit support of his Marxist beliefs?

You can't have Stephen Jay Gould without his openly professed beliefs: stop trying to have your cake and eat it at the same time!

As for the second instance: sorry chaps, but people do still argue this in peer-reviewed scientific journals (6) although we can understand why you claim they don't and simply use the epithet '*racist*' to describe anyone who opposes your egalitarian nut jobbery.

However lets perform a little thought experiment here to show how silly (and unscientific) such a position is to take: if one presumes that say Albert Einstein faked his mathematical proofs for the Special Theory of Relativity and this was discovered by several scientists who then published a critique in a scientific journal. Would this therefore mean that we should not go back and re-evaluate all our thought based on Einstein's Special Theory of Relativity? Of course it does, because if as a scientist one discovers that the basis for ones work; i.e. Einstein's theory, was not conceived via the scientific method; but for other reasons, then it suggests that the entire theory needs to be re-tested and re-evaluated as a whole in order to make sure that all the inferences, deductions and experiments based on it are scientifically correct.

I find it utterly nonsensical that professedly honest scientists would try to run away from something so obvious, but then I suppose I can agree in a sense Gould was right. Scientists do have '*unconscious bias*' and that bias is shown not in what Gould did, but what his supporters are now doing to try and limit the damage to their jewish master's reputation!

References

- (1) Stephen Jay Gould, 1981, '*The Mismeasure of Man*', 1st Edition, W. W. Norton: New York
- (2) <http://www.plosbiology.org/article/info%3Adoi%2F10.1371%2Fjournal.pbio.1001071> [Last Accessed: 18/06/2011]; Arthur Jensen, Hans Eysenck, Bernard Davies, John Phillipe Rushton among other have long argued that this was the case, but were ignored largely because of Gould's popularity.
- (3) Roger Pearson, 1997, '*Race, Intelligence and Bias in Academe*', 2nd Edition, Scott-Townsend: Washington D.C.
- (4) Gary Bullert, 2009, '*Franz Boas as Citizen-Scientist: Gramscian-Marxist Influence on American Anthropology*', The Journal of Social, Political and Economic Studies, Vol. 34, No. 2, p. 209
- (5) <http://www.cogsci.nl/blog/miscellaneous/154-skull-measuring-or-how-stephen-jay-gould-proves-his-point-by-being-wrong> [Last Accessed: 18/06/2011]
- (6) <http://www.evolution.com/articles/cranial.html> [Last Accessed: 18/06/2011]

Stone the Bitch!

Tuesday, 21 June 2011

I learn from Ynet that a Jerusalem ultra-Orthodox jewish court has decided to '*get medieval*' with its punishments (well more than usual anyway). Rather than putting beehives in the dock: they have arbitrarily sentenced a dog to death by stoning. (1) The reason for this weird sentence is that the rabbinical judges at the court; presumably a Beth Din, suspect '*the hound was the reincarnation of a famous secular lawyer, who insulted the court's judges 20 years ago.*' (2)

This is bemusing as it suggests that ultra-Orthodox are still living in a world reminiscent of the less intelligent discourse in the Islamic lands and to a lesser extent in the medieval era in Europe. It is somewhat to be expected because in the ultra-Orthodox the tendency is towards mysticism (Cabbalism) as opposed to legalism (Talmudism) that is more prevalent among the Orthodox. (3) This focus on mysticism; especially on the idea of the interplay of phonetics and numerology, means that a lot of very strange ideas have an odd attraction to the ultra-Orthodox in particular the mystical ideas behind reincarnation in the Hindu sense that seems to have introduced itself into jewish thought. A little like how jewish texts frequently warn of how easy it is to overlook a spot of blood in an egg's yolk thus immediately rendering it treif as opposed to its assumed kosher status.

The reincarnated dog apparently '*scared the court's visitors*'; although why is unstated other than the general observation that I have made that jews as a rule aren't inclined to be animal lovers, and '*refused*' to be kicked, insulted and otherwise shooed away by the kvetching ultra-Orthodox.

One of the panel of judges; as in rabbinical courts decisions are nearly always made by a panel of '*learned rabbis*', then had a brainwave: he decided that the dog must be the '*reincarnation*' of said secular lawyer who had been '*cursed*' by the rabbis some twenty years before. Although I am somewhat surprised the rabbis knew said secular lawyer was dead unless they'd kept tabs on his health or killed him.

Whatever maybe the cause of the rabbis intimate knowledge of an opponent's health: the judge decided that the secular lawyers had been brought back as a dog; being a treif animal in Judaism, as a judgement by Yahweh for his offense to the rabbis (as the rabbis had apparently cursed the secular lawyer to come back as a dog). The sheer audacity of the rabbis to implicitly claim that Yahweh; supposedly omnipresent and omniscient, is only the paid piper, while they call the tune is a good example of the sheer chutzpah so common in Judaism, but yet so little known outside of it and to those who follow its literature.

How the rabbis recalled that they had precisely cursed the secular lawyer to become a dog is; of course, not stated, but never-the-less lets not let the strangely specific and yet utterly implausible nature of jewish memory get in the way. One may observe however that jews don't appear to have the best memories as they seem to frequently claim; in relation to the holocaust and other historical events, the physically impossible and then make very loud claims to be above nature when one asks so inappropriate a question as to how they can do the physically impossible.

Well they are the '*chosen*' of Yahweh right? They apparently do greater things than us mere

mortals daily.

The rabbis; apparently '*offended*' (one notes the implication that if a jew is offended he is allowed to kill the offending party), decided to pass judgement (again) on the reincarnated dog and ordered the dog stoned for which purpose they recruited the local jewish children. After all jewish children are apparently suitable for being the executioners of the enemies of the ultra-Orthodox. The dog; just having a touch more common sense than most of his accusers, decided to run off at this point and was hotly pursued by bloodthirsty jewish children. One can only hope the dog managed to make the court impure so the ultra-Orthodox had to spend a lot of time and effort making everything kosher once again.

To cap it all off the chief rabbi of the court; Avraham Dov Levin, decided to lie to the world (when it got picked up by both world's press agencies) and claim that it hadn't happened at all, but was caught with his hand down his chazan's wife's blouse when one of the court staff confirmed that it had occurred to a Hebrew language Israeli newspaper independently of him.

One wonders where Daniel Pipes, David Horowitz and Robert Spencer are now screaming about the '*barbarity*' and '*evil*' of '*stoning*' in the modern age?

Oh wait... it is jews doing the stoning not Muslims.

After all can't be consistent in our criticism if jews are involved can we?

References

- (1) <http://www.ynetnews.com/articles/0,7340,L-4082843,00.html> [Last Accessed: 18/06/2011]
- (2) Ibid.
- (3) Probably still the most concise and readable introduction in English to this very strange intellectual landscape is Gershom Scholem, Ralph Manheim (Trans.), 1965, '*On the Kabbalah and Its Symbolism*', 1st Edition, Routledge and Kegan Paul: London.

Rabbi Nachum Shifren: 'Serve the Jews or Die'

Tuesday, 21 June 2011

I was recently alerted to the presence of a video on Youtube (1) of an orthodox rabbi (2) Nachum Shifren; addressing a gathering of the '*English Defence League*' (which might be better known as the '*Israel Defence League*'), from Los Angeles. (3) It is one of those videos that makes you feel unclean and creates a great desire to promptly take a bath.

In it Rabbi Shifren lectures his audience; who from the general tenor of the remarks they make aren't likely to know their halakhah from their sharia, on how there is a '*war going on*' between Islam and the West. (4) He also hints that the war isn't per se about religion, but rather between the Arabs and the '*White race*'. (5)

The fact that Rabbi Shifren admits he isn't a '*paragon of virtue*' (6) is noteworthy in the sense that at least he isn't lying; either outright or by omission, on that score and he certainly isn't kidding about '*lacking virtue*'.

Interestingly Rabbi Shifren quite spectacularly fails to inform his audience of honest; but supremely gullible, Britons of what he must himself believe in being an orthodox rabbi. More precisely that the jews are the link between the world and the jewish God (which he asserts the Christians also worship) (7) as well as being above non-jews (8) [which is implied by his outright sneer at those who dispute his representing Yahweh's will to the gentiles]. He does however tell us; however implicitly, that the jews are not British or American and have a separate, superior existence. (9)

Indeed he even hints that the jews control the United States (10) as well as the West in general (11) and have dumbed Americans down via television, drugs (12) and Christianity. (13) He even has the (hilarious) chutzpah to claim that he; as a member of a '*religious minority*' of '*five million*' (presumably a rough figure for the amount of official jews in the United States), (14) speaks for all of America. (15)

This would; of course, be rather odd unless we take into account that both Rabbi Shifren's specific remarks and his belief system as an orthodox jewish rabbi indicate that he views himself; as a jew generally and a rabbi specifically, as superior to gentiles.

Some of his specific remarks which are telling in what they leave out; as well as what they leave in, are that he specifically blames the power of Arabs in the West on Christian clergy not putting out a sufficiently pro-jewish message (16) while not even considering apportioning even a tiny percent of the blame for his perception of the current situation on his own people and religion.

Instead Rabbi Shifren's just blames his audience for being '*dumb goyim*' (17) and not following the jewish line diligently enough as well as actually believing some of the central assumptions behind Christianity.

Amazingly the audience is sufficiently clueless as to actually clap Rabbi Shifren when he says this, while he satanically smiles and briefly composes his next magic trick for his proverbial punters. This little trick is amazingly Shifren's claim that those who follow the jews are the '*enlightened*' ones (18), which is not dissimilar to trying to sell the audience a form of new age spirituality whereby if they believe such and such a bit of nonsense they are therefore going to enjoy some special benefit in the afterlife.

Rabbi Shifren doesn't attempt to get his audience to buy into some hilarious nonsense like that propounded by Rabbi Michael Berg of the infamous Kabbalah Center in Shifren's own neck of the woods. Instead Shifren constantly repeats emotion-laden appeals that if the audience don't do something then they will have Muslim overlords rather than jewish ones. (19)

In fact Rabbi Shifren repeats the word '*children*' so much in the course of just a few minutes that one is forced to wonder what Sigmund Freud would have made of it all. That is fairly obvious however in that Freud would almost have certainly claimed that Rabbi Shifren had been sexually

abused by his mothers and was now a paedophile himself (or some such psychoanalytic drivel).

Rabbi Shifren then proceeds to emulate the Chinese Boxers; who practised shadowboxing in the belief that it made them immune to bullets and therefore invulnerable to Westerners, by claiming that those who follow the jews '*cannot lose*' (20) presumably because Yahweh will flood the earth with the serried ranks of his heavenly armies that for some reason can't win without the help of the jews.

Yet Rabbi Shifren goes further and asserts quite openly that all gentiles; represented by Muslims but Shifren does not exclude any non-jew in his remarks and the context in which he places them, who oppose jewish interests should be exterminated (21) as they are '*despotic*' and '*vicious*'. (22)

Shifren tells his listeners that they are '*in a war*' (23) to save the jewish leadership of Western civilisation (24) and quite explicitly tells them to '*take no prisoners*' (i.e. massacre those who oppose the jews). (25) He then goes on to tell his drooling audience that King Solomon; '*the smartest man in the world*' (and a jew of course), (26) has authorized them to totally and utterly hate the enemies of the jews. (27)

It is quite clear that Shifren is exhorting his unfortunately cheering listeners; probably filled with not a little Dutch courage, to go out and murder those who oppose the jews (as can be substantiated from his responses during the question and answer session about guns and how he wants the English Defence League to be armed so they can '*put down the Muslims*'). He then promptly tries to hide behind the intellectual shrubbery of the 1st Amendment (along with Alan Dershowitz when he implicitly advocated using torture to defend Israeli interests), but Rabbi Shifren; being slightly on the porky side, isn't too good with the camouflage and just looks like a cowardly jew exhorting everyone to do what he himself wants to but is afraid he'll get hurt. Or perhaps he is afraid that he will break a fingernail?

Shifren then goes into what has been called; with some justification, '*voodoo history*' where he tries to construct some kind of justification for why it is absolutely necessary to go and kill those who oppose the will of Israel and its impotent '*god*': Yahweh. Apparently we are told that there is a vast Muslim conspiracy with millions upon millions of petro-dollars at its disposal (28) who have taken control of the world's media (29) and are currently re-editing the history textbooks (30) to include '*30 pages about Islam*' presumably in place of the '*30 pages about the holocaust*'.

Rabbi Shifren; who is obviously somewhat of an am ha-aretz (ignoramus) on the rabbinic scene, then proceeds to contradict himself by claiming that isn't really a Muslim conspiracy at all, but a communist one. (31) He also alleges that a bunch of nebulous and undefined '*leftists*' control the media (32): he pleasantly refers to them as '*lowlives*'. (33) Indeed Rabbi Shifren seems to have forgotten that a very large; and well out of proportion, number of said '*communists*', '*leftists*' and '*Muslim-lovers*' are themselves jews (34) and members of his apparently inconsequential '*five million*'. (35)

Oh dear: Rabbi Shifren's little bit of '*voodoo history*' is coming apart at the edges isn't it?

He's resorting to a variant of the old leftist '*petro-dollar*' canard to finance his imagined '*communist conspiracy*' of mysterious and undefined '*insiders*' in a very similar meme to the line parroted by the John Birch Society after it had ceased to be a patriotic organisation and become merely a '*get even richer quicker*' vehicle by its founder: Robert Welch.

It seems that when the jews create a conspiracy theory they damn well expect the gullible goyim to believe it hook, line and sinker, but when someone has so evil an urge to point out the flaws in this conspiracy theory then they become an '*evil anti-Semite*' until they crawl on their knees begging for repentance, lovingly kiss the jew's feet and finally gain absolution from the self-appointed lords of the universe.

So where is the so-called '*Muslim and leftist controlled*' media bleating about this apparent '*pillar of the jewish community*' advocating genocide and mass murder?

Answers on a postcard please!

References

- (1) http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tplK5Gz3xIo&feature=player_embedded#at=12 [Last Accessed: 21/06/2011]
- (2) Ibid, 05.40 minutes
- (3) Ibid, 19.52 minutes
- (4) Ibid, 06.00; 08.29; 13.53; 14.05; 17.00; 18.34; 20.27 minutes
- (5) Ibid, 10.14 minutes
- (6) Ibid, 05.52 minutes
- (7) Ibid, 09.27; 11.00; 12.10; 13.39 minutes
- (8) Ibid, 12.57 minutes
- (9) Ibid, 18.48 minutes
- (10) Ibid, 06.30 minutes
- (11) Ibid, 08.09 minutes
- (12) Ibid, 14.33-37 minutes
- (13) Ibid, 10.12 minutes
- (14) Ibid, 08.18 minutes
- (15) Ibid, 05.30 minutes
- (16) Ibid, 07.43 minutes
- (17) Ibid, 14.50 minutes
- (18) Ibid, 20.06 minutes
- (19) Ibid, 24.20 minutes
- (20) Ibid, 16.56 minutes
- (21) Ibid, 14.25; 15.11 minutes
- (22) Ibid, 06.50 minutes
- (23) Ibid, 06.00; 08.29; 13.53; 14.05; 17.00; 18.34; 20.27 minutes
- (24) Ibid, 09.27; 11.00; 12.10; 13.39 minutes
- (25) Ibid, 06.14 minutes
- (26) Ibid, 17.33 minutes

- (27) Ibid, 17.37; 18.34 minutes
(28) Ibid, 06.55 minutes
(29) Ibid, 06.39 minutes
(30) Ibid, 09.38-42 minutes
(31) Ibid, 10.05 minutes
(32) Ibid, 06.40 minutes
(33) Ibid, 11.46 minutes
(34) On this see Benjamin Ginsberg, 1994, *The Fatal Embrace: Jews and the State*, 1st Edition, University of Chicago Press: Chicago; David Zurawik, 2003, *The Jews of Prime Time*, 1st Edition, Brandeis University Press: Hanover and Paul Buhle, 2004, *From the Lower East Side to Hollywood: Jews in American Popular Culture*, 1st Edition, Verso: New York.
(35) http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tplK5Gz3xIo&feature=player_embedded#at=12 [Last Accessed: 21/06/2011], 08.18 minutes

An Alleged Jewish Holocaust in 1918

Thursday, 23 June 2011

I recently came across a pamphlet published towards the end of the First World War about the treatment of the jews by the occupying Germans in Eastern Europe. I reproduce here my notes on the subject as it is worth others picking this theme up more although it has already received an notable treatment by Don Heddeshimer in recent years.

To wit:

Notes on Abraham Wallenstein, 1918, 'Jews and Germanism', 1st Edition, George H. Doran: New York

On p. 3 Wallenstein argues that *'especially harsh treatment has been deliberately imposed upon the unfortunate Jews living in the territories conquered by Germany.'* Wallenstein goes on to claim that the jews have been especially the butt of the war (offering no actual rationale for doing so but rather simply taking it as read). He then goes on to state that the *'restrictive legislation and active persecution'* under the Tsars was and is preferable to the German occupation.

On p. 4 Wallenstein goes on to claim that German actions are a *'deliberate anti-Semitic policy, the object of which would appear to be either to secure the support of the existing anti-Semitic party, which, at any rate in Poland, is an extremely large and powerful, by diverting against the Jews the unpopularity that is resulting from the policy of brutal repression'*. We should note here that Wallenstein is anticipating anti-German and *'holocaust'* propaganda by over twenty years and is making exactly the same kind of arguments that are used today by jews, philo-Semites and *'holocaust'* promoters.

On p. 5 Wallenstein claims that because there is an alleged prohibition on sending food to towns from the country without first giving it to the German authorities: it is an anti-Semitic conspiracy

to starve all the jews to death, because the towns are where the jews are! Wallenstein doesn't explicitly state this, but rather is the only possible interpretation of the implications of his argument. On p. 6 Wallenstein claims that a neutral consul (no reference, name and/or country of origin provided); who had apparently seen these conditions for the jews only himself, had stated that in his own country that dogs were fed better than the jews in Poland. Well so they might: for Germany had only been at war and blockaded from food shipments for four years! Do the jews expect five course banquets?

Wallenstein (again on p. 6) writes that various unnamed jews in America who have '*escaped*' from these conditions confirm this... Well they would wouldn't they as to confirm it would mean a greater chance of staying in the US as refugees as well as potentially allowing them to make money by telling their grand old tale of suffering a-la '*holocaust survivors*'.

Wallenstein again claims by implication on p. 7 that the Germans are deliberately starving the jews of food and general necessities; such as bedding, as well as deliberately overcrowding them into hospitals. Even if true; which I doubt, this again points to the atrocity propaganda thesis in that it makes no allowance for the fact that Germany had been at work and blockaded for four years and was itself starving by this point.

On p. 8 Wallenstein claims that dead and dying jews are found in almost in every [jewish] household as well as often in the streets. Wallenstein also claims that the amount of dead jews are swamping the cemeteries and that the grave diggers are routinely working all night on pp. 8-9. Wallenstein on p. 9 also claims that jewish females are '*forced*' to loiter around military barracks in order to sell their bodies for food.

In yet another anticipation of atrocity propaganda from twenty years later: Wallenstein writes on p. 10 of the jews being conscripted as '*forced labour*' (more like actually being given a job to do that involved manual labour rather than them mouthing off at each other and hondling (lit. negotiating) with each other in the street as Wallenstein implies on pp. 12-14 where he spills a large amount of ink complaining that jews are forced to actually do a days work) and raw materials being confiscated (which is standard economic policy in war time and in particular with the jews as it prevents them selling them on the black market).

On p. 10 we find a particularly unfortunate mistake by Wallenstein in that in the midst of complaining that the Germans (again anticipating jewish atrocity propaganda of more than twenty years later) go into cafes and forcibly substitute marks for the patron's roubles. This Wallenstein claims; for some bizarre reason, devalues the rouble (which shouldn't be in use anyway considering that the mark was the German currency and Poland was now part of the German Empire). Then Wallenstein makes his mistake: he tells us in no uncertain terms that '*commerce is practically in their [i.e. jewish] hands, and they have no redress.*' (p. 10) Oy vey! What an anti-Semite!

Wallenstein; again on p. 10, then proceeds to accuse all Germans with no distinction whatsoever of inherited anti-Semitism (this is directly implied on p. 11) by arguing that the Germans are peculiarly responsible for all the '*personal indignities and brutalities*' suffered by jews in Poland.

On p. 11 Wallenstein blames the Germans for having a '*bewildering mass of laws, rules and regulations*', which the jews he claims didn't understand and thus didn't observe them. Wallenstein doesn't not that the jews; being indisputably legalistic by nature, probably fully understood these new rules and promptly started to try and find loop holes through which they could crawl. Wallenstein on pp. 11-12 also manages to blame the Germans for fining the jews as this '*depleted*' the '*small stock*' of '*shekels*' that the jews had. As if it were the Germans fault that the jews broke the law! The jews; who Wallenstein informs us were very poor and oppressed, were supposedly ruined by the German policies, but they still; after some time under these policies, were able to supposedly contribute 600,000 marks to the German cause in a '*forced*' communal loan. Quite something for a bunch of '*ruined*' and '*poor*' individuals and communities: no?

I wonder where we have heard all of Wallenstein's claims before?

Yes in the orthodox holocaustian literature: strange that isn't it?

In Brief: Why the term 'Anti-Semitism'?

Thursday, 23 June 2011

Recently I have noticed criticism of the use of the term anti-Semitism without the quotation marks around it i.e. '*anti-Semitism*' rather than anti-Semitism. The argument of those who attack this usage ; i.e. without the quotation marks, seems to be based on the amusing notion that it is a '*term of our enemies*' and that therefore one has to claim it is inaccurate or baseless by placing quotation marks around it (which incidentally confirms the philo-Semites argument about anti-Semites if they hadn't noticed).

This is a nonsensical argument really as it assumes that a term's meaning is indelibly fixed and does not change or evolve over time. Interestingly the term anti-Semitism that is now used today as a pejorative against people was actually originally a positive term when it was coined and popularised in Germany in the 1860s and 1870s. Indeed the pejorative term then wasn't anti-Semitism, but rather jew-baiter which later morphed during the 1930s to the 1950s into red-baiter in the Anglophone world.

In essence what has happened since 1945 is that the jews and philo-Semites have taken the term anti-Semitism and applied their meaning to it. To assume that this means that the term's meaning is now poisoned and we are unable to change it is quite absurd .As the homosexual lobby has managed to change the pejorative term '*faggot*' to be a positive homosexual term: much as negroes have taken the pejorative term '*nigger*' and turned it into a positive term in negro culture.

To therefore assume and/or argue that one cannot take a word's connotation back or change its meaning into something positive to your point of view is absurd and those who argue such should look to both their books on history and propaganda theory.

It is about time those who claimed to be opposed to the jews started to have a revolutionary ('*can do*') rather than a reactionary ('*can't do that*') attitude. The world is full of possibilities and only those who grasp the bull by the horns will ever be able to ride the tiger...

Throwing the Jew down the Well

Friday, 24 June 2011

I learn from the BBC that the seventeen skeletons recently discovered down a medieval well in the English city of Norwich have been positively identified to be those of jews and moreover they include what is reasonably presumed to be whole families. (1)

Naturally everyone's ears pricked up when the time period was pinpointed to the 12th or 13th centuries in Norwich: this is because this would date the bodies to around the time of the ritual murder of William of Norwich, which is the first ritual murder case that we have detailed information about.

That said the BBC's declaration that the '*most likely explanation is that those down the well were Jewish and were probably murdered or forced to commit suicide*' is rather perfunctory given that what hasn't been established is if all the bodies were pushed down the well at the same time. We need to bear in mind here that the medieval world was a very violent place and murders were not uncommon and throwing your victim down a well to get rid of the evidence was a fairly common practice at the time.

What the BBC are doing is drawing a link between the time that the jews lived, that we know the jews were being attacked at this time by locals (although this; in spite of the BBC's insinuation, was nothing particularly unusual) and the famous William of Norwich ritual murder case. This is unfounded very simply, because it has not been demonstrated (merely presumed [which is understandable but not satisfactory]) that all the bodies are those of jews (only seven were successfully tested), that the bodies were all dumped in the well at the same time and that these bodies are in any way linked to the anti-jewish feeling in Norwich at the time.

Sue Black goes a long way out of acceptable academic standards when she compares this discovery with ethnic cleansing as she claims happened to the jews in the well. She draws comparisons to all the old horror stories: '*bayoneting babies*', '*mass executions*' etc. Black should know better than to do that as she is prejudicing the discussion by using emotive language from the modern era to describe an event or series of events based on little to no actual evidence.

Indeed this is rather nicely demonstrated by a more detailed article about how this premise of the bodies being part of an anti-jewish massacre came about in so far as we are told that:

'In addition Jewish historian, Professor Miri Rubin confirmed to Dr Xanthe that the 13th Century was a time of religious persecution for the Jewish community: "In the late 12th and 13th Century as Europe becomes more Christian there was a real deepening of this sense of

Jewish evil, so it is a picture of worsening and ultimately the age of expulsions."

These historical facts together with: natural death ruled out; the confirmation that the bodies being most likely of a Jewish family; the fact that neither Jewish or Christian communities would have treated members of their communities in such a disrespectful way at burial, leads Professor Sue Black to reach the conclusion that foul play of some kind was involved – either a mass murder or self inflicted death is likely.' (2)

Lets think about this for a moment: the basis of the claim that this is the result of a wholesale anti-jewish massacre has been established based on Rubin's testimony; I won't call it evidence, that the time was one of '*persecution*' for jews because Christians were becoming more Christian. This is; like Black, simply prejudicing the discussion by applying wide generalities to a very specific situation: now just because we find some jews in a well who may or may not have been murdered (suicide has not been ruled out) because they were jews (which hasn't been proven either merely presumed) it does not therefore mean that they died as part of an anti-jewish massacre as Black et al seem desperate to assume.

The central piece of evidence for assuming such a massacre seems to be the location of the well as it was a '*few hundred yards*' from a '*thriving jewish community*'. This sounds absolutely compelling doesn't it?

Think again: medieval Norwich was a fairly small place and a '*few hundred yards*' is actually quite a substantial difference in the terms of the settlement itself as one can easily ascertain by consulting Lipmann's '*The Jews of Medieval Norwich*'. (3) In essence what Black et al are probably doing here is presenting an a priori conclusion; based purely on the identification of the bodies as being jewish, as if it was a logical series of deductions from the evidence.

We can show this by the fact that Black et al have immediately abandoned their own stated possibility of a suicide or another rationale for the deaths (without evidence for doing so) and gone straight to the most extreme conclusion of the bodies being a bit of medieval ethnic cleansing of the self-chosen.

I always find this kind of academic blundering to be fairly amusing, but in this case it isn't quite so entertaining because it falls within the purview of my own research and I find it very hard to believe how irresponsible scientists and historians can be when something fits their preconceptions of the world resulting in them blabbering off half-cocked about the matter without first going through the properly scholarly channels of gaining a general consensus.

I will be coming back to the case of William of Norwich and the expulsion of the jews shortly so I feel able to end my very short rejoinder to Black et al here.

References

1. <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-13855238> [Last Accessed: 24/06/2011]
2. <http://www.medievalists.net/2011/06/23/bodies-of-17-jews-from-medieval-norwich-may-have-been-mass-murder-victims-scholars-believe/> [Last Accessed: 24/06/2011]

3. V. D. Lipmann, 1967, *The Jews of Medieval Norwich*, 1st Edition, The Jewish Historical Society of England: London, pp. 11-48

A 'Vile Nazi': Moi?

Friday, 24 June 2011

I was today sent an email by one '*Ben from Canada*'; one of '*MootStormfront*'s' members, about my notes on Abraham Wallenstein's book claiming that he'd criticised my notes (one would have presumed in the usual standards for academia as MSF members make much pretension about their abilities) which asked my response to his criticism. I responded; as is my custom, that I would be happy to debate in the usual fashion of mutual posting (i.e. the standard way anyone debates anyone else without things like forum dog piling going on).

This caused something of an outburst from '*Ben from Canada*' who couldn't understand why I wouldn't disadvantage myself, risk my anonymity and be personally attacked on his '*forum*'. This was bad enough; as my experience with MSF's membership's intellectual honesty is not good as it is, but I then happened to read his '*criticism*' of my notes; which didn't mention they were summary notes (strange that), on Abraham Wallenstein's 1918 '*Jews and Germanism*'.

Not only did '*Ben from Canada*' fail to appreciate the context of what I wrote he also misrepresented my points by declaring I was '*talking about X*' when in fact I was only ever talking about what Wallenstein wrote. This is the general tenor of '*Ben from Canada*'s' remarks in that he takes what I said out of context and tries to make it mean something different so he can claim anything and everything about me as a person. Not the best way to start off a debate: is it?

'*Ben from Canada*' seems also to have a strange idea of what scholarship is in that he begins his criticism by implying I hadn't read the pamphlet I said I had. Oh really Benny boy: then how did I magic up my notes? Oh that's right I invented them out of whole cloth according to you: right?

He misses the implications of Wallenstein's claims; regarding the fact that jews must have necessarily been over-represented in towns for example, and declares (hilariously) that you can't draw an inference like this from his text. He also amusingly declares that '*scholarship wasn't as tight*' in 1918, which is bemusing for precisely the fact that Benny boy doesn't understand that scholarship evolves and so does method and opinion: it is not a static entity. So please don't try to claim; by necessary consequence, that some how we are more '*objective*' now than we were in 1918: the tools and techniques have changed as has the amount of criticism available, but that doesn't mean we are any more objective now than we were in 1918.

That said Wallenstein's work is not one of scholarship, but one of wartime propaganda. Yet Benny boy claims to have read the work in question and that I haven't: yet he fails to note this and instead goes off half-cocked about how I have '*misrepresented the text*'. I'll tell you what '*Ben from Canada*': why don't you spend the time that you've just done attacking me for arguments you imagine I made in summary notes (not the '*in-depth analysis*' you seem to think I thought I was making) in actually reading what I wrote and then comparing the necessary

implications of Wallenstein's statements as a propagandistic text against what I wrote.

You just proved why I refuse to debate *'MootStormfront'* members: you are not out to debate you are out to smear, lie and libel anyone who you believe to be remotely opposed to your egalitarian nut jobbery.

This *'vile Nazi'* has your number: kiddo.

Semitic Controversies

2011 Issue

(Second Part of 2011 – From July to August)

Edited by Karl Radl

<http://semiticcontroversies.blogspot.com/>

Contents

Christopher Jon Bjerknes refuses a Live Debate

From the Archive: Gerald L. K. Smith's 'Jews in Positions of Great Power'

Jewess insults Norwegian Dead

From the Archive: Extracts from 'The Patriot'

In Brief: Scott Hahn's Faux Pas

Goodbye and Good Riddance to Amy Winehouse

In Brief: A Liberal who hates Israelis

More Kosher goings on at the Socialist History Society

The Holocaust is just round the corner...

Israpundit promotes 'real' Holocaust Fiction

'Studies on the Left' and the Jews

Haaretz gets something right (for once)

Glen Beck, the Fogels and the Palestinians

J-Wire on the Paedophilia epidemic among the Jews

Erick Stakelbeck's Faux Pas

Beware Jews Bearing Gifts

Of Jewish Capital

American Renaissance defends Kevin MacDonald?

Stopping Here

Christopher Jon Bjerknes refuses a Live Debate

Wednesday, 27 July 2011

Hans; a contributor to Semitic Controversies, recently emailed jewish (if one believes his interview with fellow jew Henry Makow) anti-Einstein kook Christopher Jon Bjerknes and challenged him to defend the views he so frequently posts about on a live, recorded debate via Skype. Bjerknes and Hans of course have some history as Hans is one of Bjerknes' major detractors and has replied to all Bjerknes' arguments while Bjerknes has consistently spluttered about the need to '*read his book*' (we have) and not backed up his claims. Indeed Bjerknes has been caught outright lying several times by Hans: principally concerning his supposed two academic supporters whose work contradicts what Bjerknes claims are their own privately expressed views on the subject. Bjerknes is; of course, eerily silent on their expressed views but voluminous about their alleged private ones (which only he seems to '*know*' about).

So after a bit of intermittent responsa with Bjerknes Hans decided to suggest a live exchange where neither he nor Bjerknes would be able to dodge points or not respond without being forced to concede. Bjerknes' response to Hans was simple: '*Fuck off!*'

Make of that what you will, but it says more about Christopher Jon Bjerknes than mere description ever could...

From the Archive: Gerald L. K. Smith's 'Jews in Positions of Great Power'

Saturday, 30 July 2011

The late Gerald L. K. Smith was one of the best-known and most popular anti-Semites in modern American history, but oddly has been little remembered as a superb speaker and an upright and honest man regardless of what one thinks of his religious and political ideology, which were both rather mediocre in terms of offering solutions rather than problems. Smith was the leader of the notorious Christian Nationalist Crusade which was at the peak of its popularity in the 1940s and 1950s when it published its journal: '*The Cross and the Flag*'. This popularity has helped in the writing of several academic biographies of Smith: the best of which is Glen Jeansonne's offering. (1)

That popularity was largely based on Smith's intuitive grasp of the essentials of good propaganda, his own considerable personal charisma and his ability to work hard even when all seemed lost. I reproduce here a rare pamphlet of Smith's '*Christian Nationalist Crusade*' (from my own personal collection of anti-Semitica) that was mailed out to potential supporters and general members of the public between 1962 and 1963 (indicated by the references to the fall of Khrushchev and President Kennedy still being in office).

It may help to demonstrate to those who use Pierce's '*Who Rules America*' that their argument would be far more powerful if they took their reader back not only to the present state of jewish

power but into its past extent to demonstrate that this is not only not a new issue (although Smith is incorrect with hindsight [Khrushchev's successor] in some of his assertions but in others he is eerily prophetic [Kissinger's power in the U.S. government]), but that Jewish power has been at its growing and is at its height in America at a time when America is at its proverbial knees by general mis-governance and the lobby-based politics favoured by many of those responsible for its current state (who happen to be significantly Jewish I might add).

To wit:

'Worth Noting

A Jew, Arthur Goldberg, former Secretary of Labor, just appointed to U.S. Supreme Court. Is still the determining factor in the Labor Department. A compatriot of the Moscow-trained Reuther.

A Jew, Douglas Dillon (family name, Lapowski) is Secretary of the Treasury in control of all American money. Comes from international banking house of Dillon-Read & Co – chief stockholder, Bernard Baruch.

A Jew, Newton M. Minow, has been appointed to control all communications, including radio and television.

A Jew, Pierre Salinger, controls all news going in and out of the White House. President Kennedy cannot issue a public statement except by way of Salinger.

A Jew, Mortimer Caplin, has been named Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and has authority over all income tax matters.

A Jew, Sydney Weinberg, notorious manipulating financier of New York City, is responsible for many of the appointments, including the Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara. It is not generally known that Sidney Weinberg is now the most dominant personality inside the Ford Motor Co.

A Jew, Jake Arvey, rules the Illinois political machine that has produced Adlai Stevenson and his ilk. It was Stevenson who was a character witness for Alger Hiss when the Hiss treason machine was being exposed.

A Jew, Felix Frankfurter, though retired, is the controlling personality in the Supreme Court of the United States. Earl Warren is his puppet.

A Jew, Paul Ziffren, trained and sponsored by the Jew boss Jake Arvey, controls the California machine. Most appointments being made in California, including the Postmaster General, have been sponsored by both Ziffren and Arvey.

A Jew, David Sarnoff, heads the NBC network, which controls the lion's share of television and radio output.

A Jew, William Paley, heads the Columbia network, second only to NBC in power and influence. Out of this influence comes the man who was picked to crucify the late Joseph McCarthy – Edward R. Murrow – who controls all information sent out by the United States to the world.

A Jew, U.S. Senator Jacob Javits of New York, although posing as a Republican is collaborating completely with Arvey's puppet, Senator Douglas of Illinois, and Greenfield's puppet Senator Joseph Clark of Pennsylvania, in a campaign to add Section 3 to the Civil "Wrongs" Bill. Should Javits, Clark and Douglas be successful in this diabolical diversion from Constitutional precedent, patriots could be imprisoned without trial by jury for opposing mongrelization and for defending Christian tradition. The evil application of such a measure would completely destroy the basic patriotic leadership operating in our Nation today.

A Jew, Arthur Schlesinger, is considered one of the most enigmatic and influential men in Washington today. He is an instructor at Harvard University. During the lifetime of McCarthy he wrote an article in the New York Post in which he suggested that McCarthy be liquidated the way Roosevelt liquidated Huey Long. The implication was a bit grisly in view of the fact that Senator Long was assassinated. Schlesinger is now serving Kennedy under the title "Presidential Advisor."

A Jew, Paul Samuelson, is the President's chief advisor involved in the spending and handling of Government funds.

A Jew, Wilbur J. Cohen, a University of Michigan Professor, has been added to the Kennedy brain trust as assistant Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare. He will be responsible for 40% of President Kennedy's domestic program. When Congress begins to hold hearings on bills dealing with this 40%, Cohen will be the chief spokesperson for this legislation.

Added to the above names is a long list of Jewish names running into the hundreds. Below we add only a few in order that the reader may get some idea of the terrific stranglehold on Governmental affairs which has been affected by the aggressive Jew.

Adam Yarmolinsky – Defense Dept.

Seymour F. Wolfbein – Labor Dept.

W. Willard Wirtz – Labor Dept.

Jon O. Newman – Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare

Samuel Westerfield – Dept. of Treasury

Seymour Harris - Dept. of Treasury

Edward M. Bernstein - Dept. of Treasury

Edward Gudeman – Dept. of Commerce

Rowland Burnstan – Dept. of Commerce

Max Isenberg – Dept. of State

Theodore Tannenwald – Dept. of State

James Loeb, Jr. - Dept. of State

Walt W. Rostow - Dept. of State

Abram Chayes - Dept. of State

Mordecai Ezekiel – Dept. of Agriculture

Louis Falk Oberdorfer – Dept. of Justice

Jack Rosenthal - Dept. of Justice

Maurice Rosenblatt - Dept. of Interior

Edward Weinberg - Dept. of Interior

Andrew Oehmann – Dept. of Internal Revenue

Nathan Feinsinger – Labor Fact Finding Commission

Simon H. Rifkind – Railroad Commission

A.H. Rosenfield – Civil Rights Commission

Paul A. Freund – Civil Rights Commission

Philip Elman – Federal Trade Commission

Rabbi Jacob Joseph Weinstein – Equal Employment Commission

Fred Lazarus, Jr. – Equal Employment Commission

David Cole (Cohen) – Missile Space Labor Commission

Mrs. Charles Hymes – Commission on Status of Women

Ben D. Dorfman – Tariff Commission

Adrian S. Fisher – Disarmament Administration

Henry A. Kissinger – Military and Diplomatic Policies

Lee White – U.S. Information Agency

Milton Philip Semer – Federal Housing Home Finance Administration

Jerome B. Weisner – National Planning Association

Jerome Springarn - National Planning Association

Benjamin V. Cohen - National Planning Association

Dr. W. K. H. Panofsky – National Planning Association

Marx Leva – National Planning Association

Walter W. Heller – Economic Advisor

Morris Abram – Peace Corps

Ralph Lazarus – Peace Corps

Thomas C. Sorenson – U.S. Export-Import Bank

Harold F. Linder - U.S. Export-Import Bank

Herman Kahn – Archives

Hans A. Adler- Administrative Assistant to President Kennedy

Theodore C. Sorenson - Administrative Assistant to President Kennedy

Solomin Barkin – Special Reports

M. L. Frankel – Special Reports

Robert S. Benjamin – U.S. Committee for U.N.

Seymour J. Ruben – International Cooperation Administration

D. C. Goldberg – Committee on Government Operations

Lawrence Levy, Jr. – Ambassador to NATO

Adolph Berle, Jr. – Ambassador to OAS

Maurice M. Bernbaum – Ambassador to Ecuador

Ralph Paiewonsky – Governor of Virgin Islands

Philip M. Klutznick –U.N. Economic-Social Council

Bernard Segal – Screening Committee for Judicial Appointments

Meyer Feldman – Special Counsel

Hans A. Adler – Special Counsel

Sidney Heiman – White House Historian

Robert Morris Morgenthau – U.S. Attorney, New York

David M. Satz, Jr. – U.S. Attorney, New Jersey

Note: Shortly before this went to press, the report came out of Moscow to the effect that Khrushchev's successor has been named. He is now second in command and his name is Benjamin E. Dymshits. He is a Jew. Several American Jewish journals have boasted of this fact.'

References

- (1) Glen Jeansonne, 1988, '*Gerald L. K. Smith: Minister of Hate*', 1st Edition, Yale University Press: New Haven. Other notable work on Smith is his own autobiography of sorts Gerald L. K. Smith, 1978, '*Besieged Patriot*', 1st Edition, Self-Published: Eureka Springs; Isabel Price, 1965, '*Gerald L. K. Smith and anti-Semitism*', Unpublished MA Thesis: University of New Mexico and Leo Ribuffo, 1983, '*The Old Christian Right: The Protestant Far Right from the Great Depression to the Cold War*', 1st Edition, Temple University Press: Philadelphia.
- (2) Gerald L. K. Smith, n.d., '*Jews in Positions of Great Power*', 1st Edition, Christian Nationalist Crusade: Los Angeles

Jewess insults Norwegian Dead

Sunday, 31 July 2011

In my daily digest from Israpundit; a land lacking in lucidity although not lunacy, I noticed the following '*offering*' from what is presumably a jewess named Laura (as if she isn't jewish she may as well be). I will reproduce her very short article (literally a paragraph) (1) and do a little bit of deconstructive surgery on it as I think this hook-nosed member of the tribe has more than

earned it.
To wit:

'Norway's ambassador to Israel distinguishes between the terrorist attack in his country and "palestinian" terrorism against Israel.'

And rightly so: in the one case you have a stable state; Norway, that has existed for centuries which has now suffered a terrible and horrific terrorist attack from within while on the other hand you have a 'state' that was formed after the last World War, against the will of the actual inhabitants of the territory and created by both a campaign of terrorism (you know the Irgun, Stern gang and the ilk) and genocide (Plan Dalet) which is attacked regularly by the actual inhabitants in retaliation for destroying everything they own and most of any reason to have a fairly normal life.

'He justifies terrorism against Israel as being due to "occupation".'

Well what else do you call somebody invading, taking your ancestral land and saying 'mine' dear?

Or perhaps you are proposing to give all of the United States to either Negroes and/or 'native Americans' on precisely the same logic?

'Occupation of its own country?'

Occupation of another country dear: it has a name as much as jews like you love to claim it doesn't. It is also is a lot less arbitrary as 'Israel' (with all the implications that has in Judaism) given that's its historical name as a territory.

'What a cretin.'

How so? The only one proving yourself to be an absolute fool and a cretin to boot here is you deary.

'This double standard is morally reprehensible.'

What 'double standard' you mean distinguishing between people committing acts of terrorism as opposed to acts of resistance against a state that is hell bent on killing them?

'But then again Norway and most of Europe lacks any moral compass.'

Oh really? So ethnic cleansing is morally acceptable is it? If you aren't doing it then it is morally reprehensible? Well that's news to me, but then I don't believe in absolute morality and then use subjective morality as you evidently do: perhaps because I have a higher IQ than chimpanzee apparently unlike yourself.

'Nothing will alter Norway's vehemently anti-Israel attitude.'

Most people don't actively seek to be ethnically cleansed although you seem to think they do.

'So let's take a page out of the liberal playbook and discuss the "root causes" of this massacre and what Norway has done to anger Anders Breivik.'

You've already taken several pages out of a playbook, but I am not entirely sure whose it is. Begin's perhaps? I am not sure.

'Perhaps the Norweigan ambassador should consider that the islamic invasion of Norway'

How do Muslims cause mental illness?

I know their call to prayer is irritating in the early hours, but I had no idea it could actually cause people to think they communed with God. But surely it makes people think that then should we all be Muslims as they have the *'divine truth'* or some such infantile prattle?

'and the leftists enabling of it is what drove this madman to mass murder.'

How can you *'drive'* a man to mass murder if he is already quite mad?

Answers on a postcard please!

'Perhaps some introspection on the part of Norway'

Ah so they should find their souls and do a little bit of Israeli-style ethnic cleansing then?

Good to know that the Israelis have a *'moral compass'* even if it is operating in a completely different moral dimension: isn't it?

'and its liberal multicultural policies is in order and for them to understand what the far left Norwegian government'

How can a government be of the *'far left'* and *'liberal'*?

Hmmm: contradiction in terms there Pinocchio.

Incidentally how has multiple cultures anything to do with it? You mean multiple biological groups as otherwise you are engaging in a little bit (well a lot actually) of evolution denial.

'has done to breed the likes of Breivik.'

So basically you are calling Norwegians in general evil.

Nice Laura nice.

References

(1) <http://www.israpundit.com/archives/38260>

From the Archive: Extracts from 'The Patriot'

Wednesday, 3 August 2011

As a collector of anti-Semitism it is not uncommon (unfortunate as it is) for me to come across publications of which little is known in the historical record. One such publication is *'The Patriot'*, which was a weekly political magazine associated with the anti-Communist and quasi-Fascist side of the Conservative Party of Great Britain. It appears to have been written for by such anti-Semitic luminaries as Nesta Webster and had not a dissimilar following to staunchly Christian anti-Semitic publishing houses in Britain such as *'The Britons'*. It also seems to have been linked with *'The Boswell Publishing Company'*, which was then a major far-right publishing house associated with Webster.

The single edition of *'The Patriot'* that I own comes from November 7th 1935 (Vol. 29, No. 717) and suggests a periodical of long duration, but I can find little mention of it in a scan of the literature on the subject. It has two items that I think are of interest to the readers of SC.

To wit:

'Revolutionary Jews and the Elections

A new form of interference with the right of free speech has appeared at the numerous Conservative meetings now in full swing in London, and which will continue until the eve of the poll. Jewish hecklers go from meeting to meeting all over London, trying to force Conservative speakers into declarations of hostility to Fascism. On several occasions Conservative speakers have had so little self-respect as to endeavour to rid themselves of this nuisance by saying something against Fascism. Conservative speakers, however, who point out that Fascism is not an issue of the General Election, and refuse to be bullied into discussion, are abusively interpreted. At a Conservative open-air meeting in North-West London, two Jewesses arrived with a string of type-written questions about Fascism here and abroad. They insisted on their paper of questions being read by the Conservative speaker, and on his firm refusal announced they would not allow the meeting to proceed until he did so. They became greatly abusive and in the end were removed by the police from the audience.' (1)

'Aliens in Wales

Sir,

Regarding the trouble with the miners in Wales, nothing appears in our newspapers about the alien revolutionaries, men who are well known in other countries as dangerous anarchists, who have been allowed to live in Wales during recent years.

For the names and descriptions of these men see "The Alien Menace," Chapter X. (2)

Yours Truly,

A. H. Lane.' (3)

References

- (1) *'Revolutionary Jews and the Elections'*, The Patriot, 7th November 1935, p. 362
- (2) He probably means his own book: A. H. Lane, 1934, *'The Alien Menace: A Statement of the Case'*, 5th Edition, Boswell: London. This work had gone through an edition more less each year since its original publication by Lane in 1928, which is impressive in and of itself.
- (3) *'Aliens in Wales'*, The Patriot, 7th November 1935, p. 374

In Brief: Scott Hahn's Faux Pas

Thursday, 4 August 2011

I happened to be reading a book recommended to me by one of my ardent Christian friends by the relatively famous American Calvinist-turned-Catholic theologian Scott Hahn today when I spotted the correct; but to jews borderline anti-Semitic, remark that:

'For Jews, God acts as a father to His chosen people, but his fatherhood does not precede their creation or election.' (1)

Doesn't that therefore mean that the jews are biologically the children of their God (i.e. an elect) and thus are superior to those who are not born of that supposedly holy nation?

One thinks Dr. Hahn should remember that only *'evil nazis'* think such apparently *'evil'* thoughts about the self-chosen...

References

- (1) Scott Hahn, 2006, *'Ordinary Work, Extraordinary Grace: My Spiritual Journey in Opus Dei'*, 1st Edition, Doubleday: New York, p. 20

Goodbye and Good Riddance to Amy Winehouse

Thursday, 4 August 2011

As I am sure everyone didn't want to know the modern messiah of jewish popular music; Amy Jade Winehouse, died in uncertain circumstances last Saturday the 23rd of July 2011 in the UK. The way the popular media reacted around the world was predictably both absolutely shameless; especially at the time period that the tragic deaths in Norway occurred, and bemusingly lacking

in factual substance. When John Lennon died a writer in the nationalist periodical *'Liberty Bell'* pointed out that despite the media hysteria that accompanied Lennon's death: it was a positive event rather than a negative one for nationalists as he wouldn't be spreading his *'one world'* poison throughout Europe any more.

I agree with that writer's analysis regarding Lennon and it is tempting to make a not dissimilar conclusion about Amy Winehouse's death except that Lennon was truly famous and to this day has a strong fan-base and identity independent of his Beatles fame. However Winehouse has neither the fame (many who heard the hysterical tears of jewesses like Kelly Osbourne and jews like Mark Ronson [who also happened to be Winehouse's producer] undoubtedly wondered who this *'Amy Winehouse'* was in the first place) nor the identity independent of her music to survive the initial wave of crocodile tears from the other members of the competing tribe who either made money off of her or for some reason felt a *'deep connection'* to a well-known drug-addled, drink-sodden and generally violent and domestically abusive jewess.

Amy made two albums and both sold rather well, but since she became *'famous'* with her album *'Back to Black'* she had also been in a terminal decline in the public eye and attracting attention not for the alleged *'beauty'* of her singing or the originality of her songs (which are pretty foul even by the standards of say gangsta rap) but for being the drug-addled, drink-sodden and generally violent and domestically abuse jewess that the same media that reported it has now suddenly forgotten about.

Instead we receive numerous articles in both the American and European press about how *'awful'* it is that such a *'talent'* died *'so young'*. As well as a lot of hot air about drug addiction and the suffering (oy vey!) of Amy's parents with their drug-addled and drink-sodden daughter.

Now usually I am sympathetic to such cases precisely because I've seen people suffer on account of addictions like these, but one can just simply ask what has the Winehouse family done to deserve that?

The answer is not very much as they more or less allowed their daughter to go to rock and ruin (pun intended) in spite of all the kvetching and demands for privacy they are giving to the media. The family know *'the business'* intimately as daddy Winehouse is something of a Jazz artist. So if the family is in the Shoah business then surely they should be in the best position possible to control a daughter in the same business: nu?

While the Norwegian police were fishing for bodies in a lake and picking up the pieces in Oslo: the international media has largely decided that Aryans don't actually matter and to devote their attention and largess to a jewess who anybody with the slightest bit of brain power realised was probably going to die young from the legal and illegal substances that she imbibed on a fairly regular basis: although we don't know officially why Winehouse died yet: we can safely assume it was caused directly and/or indirectly by her notorious substance abuse.

Why even bother wasting time on her?

Well obviously a jewess is worth far more in the scale of the things that 92 dead Norwegians:

isn't she?

And jews wonder why people don't like them very much...

In Brief: A Liberal who hates Israelis

Friday, 5 August 2011

Being the well-travelled person that I am I frequently have the sometimes great and other times dubious pleasure of meeting a lot of different people from many different races and political schools of thought. I happened to come across a young European lady (in her early 30s) who is something of an adventurer at heart and quit her job to wander around the world exploring. After a lengthy chat about numerous things from train travel in Russia to the Inca civilisation she happened to get onto the topic of the Middle East. She expressed her admiration for Islamic culture and how respectful it was and so forth. I pointed out that while I didn't wholly agree: I did find Islamic architecture to be extremely beautiful.

We also talked of the various countries in the Middle East we had been in on our different travels: I happened to mention that I had no wish to go to Israel as I found the entire country objectionable. She then perked up a bit and launched into what I only describe as a long tirade against Israelis, which caused me to smirk quite a bit. One of her points that I heartily agreed with was the Jewish (well for her Israeli) need to expose themselves and shock others at the earliest possible opportunity as well as their disregard for any authority or tradition so long as it suited them to disregard it.

She happened to relate; by way of example, of a story about her experiences in the Far East where a number of Israeli women had been in her trekking party and were told quite explicitly that nudity was considered a great offense to the locals who were strongly Islamic.

So what was the first thing the Israeli women did?

They went to the nearest beach and stripped off till they were in the nude in full views of the shocked locals and spent the day running around '*showing off*' their bodies to nobody other than a group of annoyed Western women and shocked locals. These Jewesses clearly didn't see it to their advantage to stick to the local customs and decided to do whatever they liked as there was little disadvantage and much perceived advantage to doing so (i.e. annoyance of non-Jews who won't be seen again against showing how '*wonderful*' their bodies are to all and sundry creating sexual desire and envy thus giving them an ego boost).

She ended by declaring quite openly that she would oppose and loathe all things Israeli all her life.

It just goes to show that anti-Semitism isn't some abstract created in a Jew-less vacuum, but rather a product of Jewish behaviour and interaction with non-Jews.

More Kosher goings on at the Socialist History Society

Monday, 15 August 2011

When I originally joined the Socialist History Society a few years ago I did so to aid my academic research into Marxism and those who believe in it (well sorry take it seriously). I wasn't really expecting the society; which is circa 240 members strong (including something of an international membership of which I am part), to really be quite as kosher as it has been. The most recent newsletter; that of August 2011, (1) has just come through the international postage system and it like its predecessors is absolutely chock-a-block full of whining about the self-chosen of Yahweh or jews kvetching about something or other.

Aside from a cover article on page one by the redoubtable Mike Squires (who is actually one of the nicest of all the SHS' coterie of out-of-date and overweight '*revolutionaries*') that hilariously (or not if you don't have my slightly morbid sense of humour) spends two printed columns whining about how negroes were '*mistreated*' by the evil '*imperialists*' during the Mao Mao uprisings in Kenya. (2) Squires makes quite the hullabaloo about how supposedly '*100,000*' Kenyans were '*tortured*', '*sodomised with broken bottles and vermin*', '*raped*', '*castrated*' and/or '*set alight*'. Squires; of course, doesn't seem to have noticed that that is all a little bit incredible and seems to hold to the theory of evidence attested to by some of those he would attack in the 1940s and 1950s '*red scare*' whereby any story about communists (in this case 'evil white imperialists') could be believed precisely because the 'evil' party could and would do anything.

I would also point out that; of course, Squires doesn't mention the rapes of British and European women, the butchering of families (who had done nothing more than live in Kenya), the carving up by the deranged Mao Mao of any negro who happened to work with a British or European family and so forth. Of course such deaths matter not when you are Marxist: for the evil imperialist is not a human being but an abstract parasite.

Oh the irony of Marxists pretending that superstitious negroes (the Mao Mao made their own primitive guns which usually killed them when they tried to shoot anyone with these technological marvels) are part of the '*global proletariat*' and rising against the '*evil imperialists*'. Is there any end to the delusion of those who actually believe Marx's secular halakhah? I bet Moor (Marx's nickname) is chuckling in his grave as even he stated that he was certainly not a Marxist (meaning he wasn't interested in following but rather leading).

Aside from general appointments the SHS' jewish co-chair (June Cohen) has stepped down to be replaced with an ostensible gentile (Greta Sykes) although Cohen will apparently still be very much an active part of the society. (3) In spite of losing this kosher face among the committee we find that two new jews have wormed their way into the higher echelons of the SHS. Charlie Pottins; who at first glance you'd never think was a jew, has been moved in to replace Professor Willie Thompson (who like the rest of the SHS' membership and leadership seems to have a double or triple chin [odd for de-classed intellectual proletarians: no?]) in the SHS committee and is explicitly mentioned to be a long-standing member of the '*Jewish Socialists' Group*' (an

SHS affiliate). (4)

The other member of the indomitable tribe who has popped into power is Deborah Lavin: a jewess who spends her time being a third-rate playwright and the rest of it far more successfully writing interesting and quite original work on some neglected aspects of Marx and his life. (5) Lavin has apparently been given the responsibility; without any apparent sense of irony, of making sure regular '*collections*' are made at meetings. In spite of her tribe's habit in Eastern Europe of forming the proverbial bourgeoisie between the Polish and German aristocracy and land-owners and the Slavic peasants on the other and for whom the latter got so annoyed they took just about every opportunity to unleash pogroms on Yahweh's little lovelies.

Eric Hobsbawm; the jewish Stalinist who is the SHS' honorary chairman, also deigned to address the SHS in conjunction to his advertising his rather odd book: '*How to Change the World*' (which we will review on SC in due course). He seems to have offered a few anecdotes and some observations about the SHS' predecessor: the Communist Party Historians Group. (6) However the decrepit jew seems to have been somewhat out of his usual form and not gone in for the usual '*kill the bourgeoisie*' rhetoric that he has gone in so much for at past events and historically. So much so that Robert Conquest; the preeminent historian of the Soviet purges, labelled him an outright apologist for left-wing atrocities and Slavoj Zizek's (a Marxist himself) characterisation of the leftist intellectual apologist for Marxism who lives in the West and says his heart is in the USSR (or whichever Marxist country he/she admires most) is most befitting in Hobsbawm's case.

As an aside we have an article by David Morgan; who seems to be the SHS' version of the village idiot (but being Marxists they have elected him as part of the leadership), (7) has included a write-up of a local historians presentation on the East End: all three of the ladies concerned are obviously overweight (again what happened to the proletariat that is struggling to make ends meet?) and one of them; Janine Booth, looks like she has downs syndrome but obviously doesn't (as she is intellectually quite able). (8) Booth seems to also be something of a communist activist which probably accounts for something of why the socialists and communists habitually fail at most things they do (aside from living on another intellectual planet from the material universe their bodies reside in).

However to not seem ungenerous to Booth: who truth be told can't help looking as she does the other two ladies (both of whom seem to have strongly left-wing politics implied by Morgan's descriptions) are not exactly female models either as Samantha Bird has a double chin (and looks like she's going for the triple) and Sarah Wise looks like she's been at the jellied eels once too often. I am shocked to report that for once in the newsletter there is no mention of the jews particularly as the East End was filled with '*working-class communists*' all with literal or proverbial side-locks and kippot. (9) I would point out briefly that some of the best local history of the East End of London maybe found in an unusual genre; the Jack the Ripper literature, notably in Paul Begg's recent opus on the subject (the '*Ripperologists*' having no axe to grind tend to be far more objective than any '*local historian*' with a fetish for Marx). (10)

In spite of my amazement at the lack of the mention of the heavily jewish communist locals in the East End we find more '*myths*' about jews being confirmed by the long-time communist

activist and trade unionist Bill Brooks. Brooks mentions the jewish communist Sid Kaufmann to the following effect:

'There were other British Communists besides me in Singapore, notably Sid Kaufmann who I first met on a troopship to India. Sid was an NCO who worked at General HQ.' (11)

So what was that about jews hiding behind the lines and being afraid of combat Bill? Oh yes that's right: it is an '*evil Nazi stereotype*' with no semblance to the reality isn't it? It is a shame that the editors of the newsletter are so utterly incompetent; as they've managed to edit out the second half of Bill Brooks interesting plunge into communist treachery (pp. 12-13 are the same as pp. 14-15). Perhaps they have had a printers strike again over poor working conditions?

Regardless Brooks makes another indiscreet admission when he tells us why nasty nationalists like us don't like communists very much and consider them to this day to be subversives when he tells us that the communists in the British army gave the Malayan communist '*resistance*' all the maps the British were using allowing the Malaysians to kill as many of Mike Squires' '*evil imperialists*'. (12)

What are the Marxists going to say to Bill Brooks' outright confession that Communists are subversives? Accuse him of being a reactionary? Let's hope so: a good party squabble is better entertainment than Hollywood's depleted stable of films these days.

Also for some reason the SHS has seen fit to reproduce a second (or is it a third?) hagiographic obituary to Wolf Wayne: a Polish jew who was a communist activist (apparently not a very successful one) and a member of the '*43 group*' who as I have noted before effectively went around in packs beating up and/or seriously injuring anyone they '*suspected*' of being in any way opposed to the rule of the chosen of Yahweh. We find the typical claims that he was discriminated against because he was jewish and that he was as '*English as anyone*' (13) as well as the surprising factoid; left out by other hagiographers, that Wayne was captured by the Germans who apparently didn't send him to Auschwitz in spite of knowing he was a jew (as implied by Wayne). (14)

My word is Mike Wayne (Wolf's jewish nephew now a Professor at Brunel University) denying the '*holocaust*'? Apparently so if you believe his fellow members of the tribe like Deborah Lipstadt who view any deviation from holocaustian orthodoxy as '*denial*' (of something although what is rather unclear), which to be sure Wayne has now committed.

In the last part of the newsletter we see the jew; Mike Wayne, cropping up again promoting some amateur film-making he did in the latest (although now largely passed) leftist fetish for all things Venezuelan under Hugo Chavez, (15) but as one leftist with a bit more intelligence than most put it: I don't see Soviets spring up so how on earth is Chavez a socialist? It hasn't stopped the indefatigable Mike Wayne though: he just has to tell the world about the paradise that is Venezuela a bit like how CPGB writers portrayed the Soviet Union as a literal worker's paradise. They were of course either fools or tools and even more likely: both. It is too early to identify at which end of the idiot spectrum Wayne falls into, but rest assured we shall know presently.

Can a society of avowed egalitarians and socialists get any more kosher?

It is an infinite possibility.

References

- (1) Socialist History Society Newsletter, August 2011
- (2) Mike Squires, *'The Same Old Imperialism'*, Socialist History Society Newsletter, August 2011, p. 1
- (3) David Morgan, *'Still Needed: The Critical 300'*, Socialist History Society Newsletter, August 2011, p. 3
- (4) Ibid.
- (5) She has a forthcoming biography of Eleanor Marx's sometime husband; Dr. Edward Aveling, to be launched onto the controversial world of Marx research later this year or early next and she has had a noteworthy paper published by the SHS around the conflict between Karl Marx and the then celebrity atheist Charles Bradlaugh (the original Richard Dawkins) [Deborah Lavin, 2011, *'Bradlaugh contra Marx: Radical versus Socialism in the First International'*, Socialist History Society Occasional Publication No. 28: London].
- (6) David Morgan, *'Still Needed: The Critical 300'*, Socialist History Society Newsletter, August 2011, p. 2
- (7) For other Marxist village idiots being promoted and allowed to do enormous amounts of damage see Helen Yaffe, 2009, *'Che Guevara: The Economics of Revolution'*, 1st Edition, Palgrave MacMillan: London (she doesn't seem to realise how much of an idiot she shows Che to have been in spite of her selective use of only official Cuban sources and that she personally identifies with the Castro regime [she is also a jewess as an aside]) and Sean McMeekin, 2003, *'The Red Millionaire'*, 1st Edition, Yale University Press: New Haven where he recounts how devout Marxists turned bandit anarcho-capitalists during Lenin's NEP era as part of his excellent biography of the USSR's propaganda tsar in the West.
- (8) David Morgan, *'East End Episodes'*, Socialist History Society Newsletter, August 2011, pp. 4-5
- (9) Still one of the best works on this is William Fishman, 1977, *'East End Jewish Radicals 1875-1914'*, 1st Edition, Duckworth: London and Fermin Rocker's, 1998, *'The East End Years: A Stepney Childhood'*, 1st Edition, Freedom Press: London. The latter is a first-hand account (Rocker being the son of German anarchist intellectual Rudolf Rocker and his jewish wife) but has little in the way of anarchist nuttury in it and is eminently readable even witty at times. It is also worth noting that Fishman is also a jew and has long been aligned to jewish *'anti-Fascism'* in Britain (he idolises the *'Battle of Cable Street'* for example).
- (10) Paul Begg, 2005, *'Jack the Ripper: The Definitive History'*, 2nd Edition, Pearson Longman: New York
- (11) Bill Brooks, *'Malayan Journey'*, Socialist History Society Newsletter, August 2011, p. 13
- (12) Ibid.
- (13) Mike Wayne, *'Obituary: Wolf Wayne'*, Socialist History Society Newsletter, August 2011, p. 11
- (14) Ibid.
- (15) Socialist History Society Events 2011, Socialist History Society Newsletter, August 2011, p. 20; <http://www.bishopsgate.org.uk/content/1483/Socialist-History-Society-at-Bishopsgate->

The Holocaust is just round the corner...

Monday, 15 August 2011

Well sorry it isn't, but according to one Rivkah Rybak (a jew unsurprisingly) it is and they have created an [entire website](#); possibly the most hilarious thing I've read for a few weeks (it claims to be an organisation but I seriously doubt it), devoted to '*proving*' this and warning the jews that OMG another six billion jews are going to get gassed by FEMA.

Sorry you've got to laugh and it goes to show the types of jewish insanity that those of us; like myself, who live among the jews see on a fairly regular basis. You could also read Richard Rosenthal's, 2000, '*Rookie Cop: Deep Undercover in the Jewish Defense League*', 1st Edition, Leapfrog: Wellfleet, which contains not dissimilar insanity but this time with added paranoia plus guns and explosives.

Israpundit promotes 'real' Holocaust Fiction

Tuesday, 16 August 2011

I found the below in my digest from the land of lunacy that is Israpundit and I thought I'd share:

'GONE TO PITCHIPOI is an extraordinary true story of a Jewish boy on the run in wartime Poland. It is an inspiration to read and a testament to the will to live and the courage to endure. Too young to be deemed fit for slave labour the boy is marked for certain death. Yet, he clings to life in a breathtaking journey from the depth of human despair to the hand of the guardian angel that saves him, time after time, from his deadly encounters. To keep ahead of his pursuers, Rubin must run and hide in ghetto cellars or he prowls in derelict buildings or slinks like a bog-rat in the nearby marshes.

Hounded at every turn, the boy drifts from place to place and now assumes a new role. Armed with a baptismal certificate he hides behind the mask of the 'Aryan' boy Stefek. After a hazardous journey he reaches Warsaw to be reunited with his elder sister. Encountering narrow escapes from the Nazis but they resolve to fight on to survive. By the end of July 1944, the sound of Russian guns become clearly audible in Warsaw and the boy dreams of celebrating his Barmitzvah in freedom. Meanwhile, the Polish Uprising erupts and instead of his Barmitzvah initiation, he undergoes a baptism of fire in the Warsaw inferno.

This riveting and richly detailed 'adventure' story with its unpredictable twists and turns is set against key events in the war. Rubin, alias Stefek, comes over as a likeable and daring 'rascal' who tells his story with a keen eye for detail and with such sensitivity that it will touch the hearts and move the spirit of his readers for a long time to come.' (1)

True it is an advertising blurb that has been posted by one of the self-chosen as if it was something unique, but I would make the observation that this is supposed to be a '*true story*' but it is also apparently an '*adventure story*'. One would be remiss if one did not point out that this kind of '*true fiction*' is precisely what just about every piece of holocaust survivor testimony I have ever had the displeasure to read is.

One only need ask oneself how on earth a survivor can remember all the detail decades on and then write a book or lecture about it with how fickle we know human memory to be. It invents, it changes, it forgets and yet we are supposed to believe it because it comes from the mouths of the self-chosen lords of the universe?

Yet it is on this testimony that the orthodox holocaustian view rests: nothing more and nothing less, so why do professional historians who know better than to take people's word for things believe them? Well it is easier (and much better for your bank balance) to believe than to be sceptical.

Sorry I am not buying into that: if this '*Rubin*' is any more real a '*holocaust survivor*' with a true tale to tell than the lady who supposedly lived with wolves (and was taken seriously by professional holocaustians for decades) then I am Donald Duck.

Or should I say quack quack?

References

(1) <http://www.israpundit.com/archives/38710> [Last Accessed 15/08/2011]

'Studies on the Left' and the Jews

Tuesday, 16 August 2011

'*Studies on the Left*' was one of several radical '*new left*' journals published in the late 1950s to the late 1960s: it was published by Marxist radicals who were associated with or employed by the University of Wisconsin. It was highly influential in reopening Marxist intellectual discourse in academia after the supposed '*red scare*' era. (1) Indeed it was quickly labelled as a major communist and intellectual subversive threat by the US government (2) who; had they been stronger, should have suppressed it and kicked its authors out from behind the intellectual shrubbery of academic freedom of speech. The journal itself folded in 1967 and was succeeded by '*Socialist Revolution*' and then '*Socialist Review*' both of whose editor and guiding light was one James Weinstein: who as you can probably guess was a member of the tribe.

In many ways '*Studies on the Left*' can be equated as being the American counterpart of the '*New Left Review*' in Britain, which did precisely the same thing in British intellectual discourse and allowed peaceniks, beatniks and Marxists of various stripes to run around marketing their utopian intellectual wares to all and sundry without the checks of either party discipline (well known to rigorous in the official communist and socialist parties) (3) or social sanction.

Of note to us are the names attached to producing the journal and those directly associated with it. I'll list them for the sake of completeness:

Editorial Board

Lee Baxandall (also founded *'The Naturist Society'*): gentile.

Joan Bromberg: jewess.

Matthew Chapperon: gentile.

David Eakins: gentile.

Dena Goldberg: jewess.

Arthur Hack (Professor of English at the State University of New York): jew.

Eleanor Hakim: jewess.

Irwin Klibaner: jew.

Saul Landau (writes for *'Counterpunch'*): jew.

William Rouff: gentile.

Stephen Scheinberg (author on Canadian jewry): jew.

Martin Sklar: jew.

Carl Weiner (possibly associated with Gratz College): jew.

James Weinstein (edited *'Socialist Revolution'* and *'Socialist Review'*): jew.

Associates

Martin Pierce (of the University of Minnesota): gentile.

David Simonson (of the University of Chicago): gentile.

Harold Woodman (of the University of Chicago): gentile.

Jerry Barrett (of the State University of Iowa): gentile.

Phil Cummins (of the State University of Iowa): gentile.

Sol Stern (of the State University of Iowa [now a conservative pro-Israel writer]): jew.

Howard Kaplan (of the State University of Iowa): jew.

Samuel Shapiro (of Michigan State University at Oakland): jew.

Now of 14 members of the editorial board of *'Studies on the Left'* 10 were jews: that is a whopping 71 per cent of the whole board being of the tribe. Of 8 associates of the journal 3 were jews, which is a considerable 37.5 per cent.

That is not even considerable overrepresentation that is pretty much absolute dominance for so small a proportion of the American population. One that demands explanation that is not readily given by claims of jews being oppressed (they were a considerable part of the leadership of the anti-communist movement at the same time) and seeking resultant *'radical solutions'*. Indeed we must search elsewhere to find answers to such significant overrepresentation and only in pastures of anti-Semitic theory do we begin to find holistic answers. (4)

Indeed if one were to adopt the sceptical tactic of asking rhetorically whether *'the Irish created 'Studies on the Left''* then one would find oneself devoid of evidence and having to make it up as one went along. However I am sure philo-Semites will find some excuse or another for why jews should be so significantly overrepresented in leadership positions on the far left in general.

References

- (1) Mari Jo Buhle, Paul Bulhe, Dan Georgakas (Eds.), 1998, *'The Encyclopedia of the American Left'*, 2nd Edition, Oxford University Press: New York, pp. 805-806
- (2) The Committee on Un-American Activities, 1960, *'Communist Training Operations'*, Part 3, United States Government Printing Office: Washington D.C., p. 1438
- (3) A readable and comprehensive introduction to party discipline may be found in Frank Meyer, 1961, *'The Moulding of Communists: The Training of Communist Cadre'*, 1st Edition, Harcourt Brace: New York. I should probably note that Meyer was a jew who Revilo Oliver claimed was a friend in one of his recorded speeches on behalf of the John Birch Society.
- (4) Works that are accessible and try to find pro-jewish answers to these questions are for example: Alan Dershowitz, 1997, *'The Vanishing American Jew: In Search of Jewish Identity for the Next Century'*, 1st Edition, Simon & Schuster: New York; Marjorie Lamberti, 1978, *'Jewish Activism in Imperial Germany: The Struggle for Civil Equality'*, 1st Edition, Yale University Press: New Haven and Benjamin Ginsberg, 1994, *'The Fateful Embrace: Jews and the State'*, 1st Edition, University of Chicago Press: Chicago.

Haaretz gets something right (for once)

Tuesday, 16 August 2011

*'Netanyahu's Reagan-Thatcherism was thus anti-Churchillian. For instead of creating an economic and social powerhouse capable of meeting the challenges that surround it, **he created a robber state that serves the settlers, the ultra-Orthodox and the tycoons.** Instead of creating a Jewish, democratic and moral state here, he created a state that shuts out its productive, creative majority. In the name of the market and market forces, Netanyahu atrophied state systems and weakened Israel to a dangerous degree. '*

Source

(<http://www.haaretz.com/print-edition/opinion/netanyahu-s-anti-churchillian-policy-weakens-israeli-society-1.376869>)

Glen Beck, the Fogels and the Palestinians

Wednesday, 17 August 2011

I am informed by the Philadelphia Examiner that pet Zionist toady Glen Beck has arrived in the land of murder and hate (otherwise known as Israel) and has begun a typical hate campaign against those who criticise Israel in any way, shape or form. Whether Beck actually believes everything he says and even understands most of what he says I am not in a position to judge, but in his live show that he broadcast in Israel he made use of the murder of the settler Fogel family by a crazed Palestinian.

Beck claimed that he had visited the settler community of Itamar (the site of the murder) and seems to have been shown the *'bloody walls'* as the IDF/Israeli police couldn't get *'all the blood off them'*. He then typecast the murder of the Fogels as a *'massacre'* and went on to use it as a prop for his agenda of supporting Israel at any cost regardless of whether it is to the benefit of the United States or not.

Part of Beck's campaign is apparently to make the standard Israeli and pro-Zionist claim that *'the media is lying to you'*. Now aside from the sheer irony (and hypocrisy) of a media figure who has made his career based on yellow and highly-partisan journalism with media companies who openly have yellow and partisan journalism as part of their business strategy claiming that *'the media'* (nice use of a rhetorical abstract: no?); of which he is necessarily a part, is (deliberately) lying to its readers/consumers. It is silly to claim that *'the media'* is lying or *'keeping silent'* precisely because the version of events that Beck is telling is obviously pro-Israel.

One can note that Beck's reference to how he has *'been shown'* the house with the *'blood stains that couldn't be washed off the walls'* which is simply a propaganda exercise deliberately conducted by Israel to utilise the murder of the Fogels as part of their on-going media campaign to gain sympathy for themselves and demonise those who criticise (let alone actually oppose) them in any way. In essence: one can say that the Israeli government is cynically using the murder of its own citizens to attack those who do not give the precise version of events that the Israeli government want everyone else to believe.

Beck himself; or rather those who produce him (as he is essentially a political actor and who calls the tune as opposed to who does the dancing is who is important), is using murder as a way to boost his own ratings globally by being all pally with the Israeli government. After all if Beck helps Israel then Israel will give Beck the stories he can use to gain more support from those who support Israel first, last and always regardless of their actual country of origin or whether they are jews or gentiles.

One can see this in the fact that Beck is speaking about the murder of the Fogels in the context of his own 'event': *'Restoring Courage'*, which from the Examiner's report seems to be just an exercise in extreme jewish nationalism (with the usual tearing of garments about the so-called 'holocaust' and irrational screams of *'never again!'*) He will be joined by anti-gentile rabbis and pro-Zionist nutters like the actor Jon Voight.

After all what does Beck actually gain from supporting such anti-gentile jewish nationalism?

The answer is pretty much nothing other than a boost to his ratings and career: Beck likely doesn't care personally, but his producers probably do. Are his producers jews and/or Zionists? Well almost certainly: as why else would they slavishly follow the Israeli government's official line and get Beck involved with extreme forms of Zionism which would (I'd hope) be normally repugnant to him if they weren't a boost for his career and ratings.

However while Beck is warbling about the murder of the Fogels he forgets that the government; and by extension the people, he is supporting and trying to give *'courage'* too has and is involved in well-documented attempts to cleanse the Palestinians out of their ancestral lands. Indeed when you read of killings like that of the Fogels one needs to be aware of the context such acts and that these acts; however much we might disapprove of them, are ones of desperation from people who have little left to lose.

Beck and the supporters of Israel are oh so quick to jump on the Fogel bandwagon to condemn murder by a non-jew of a jew, but yet refuse to get on the condemnation bandwagon at all when a jew murders a non-jew in the context of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Why don't we hear similar tales of blood covered walls and of families slaughtered when Israel launches its periodic ethnic cleansing operations in the Palestinian held zones?

Well apparently according to Beck; or rather his producers, non-jews don't actually matter while jews; of course, are an indispensable, highly valuable and finite quantity. Perhaps Beck ought to just be honest for once?

Who am I kidding though? Beck doesn't write his own material like it as not and is merely a talking head for what those behind him want him to purport. He'd probably do exactly the same if anti-Semitism not philo-Semitism was the dominant zeitgeist.

J-Wire on the Paedophilia epidemic among the Jews

Wednesday, 17 August 2011

I found the following on the Australian jewish news website; '*J-Wire*', and it highlights beautifully the contrast between the handling of the issue of paedophilia among jewish and non-jewish religious denominations. When Catholic priests were alleged to have committed such actions then the media were all over it and the lurid headlines were everywhere. When it is jews of course they don't mention it or use kid-gloves when making a brief report on it. Talk about a double-standard or what?

I reproduce this article for the sake of the record and for other's reference as it is a valuable one to make the point of the widespread (and actually quite well known) issue of child molestation within the jewish and by jews on non-jewish children.

To wit:

'The Jewish Community Council of Victoria has conducted a parent forum on the need to raise awareness within our community of sexual abuse of children.

JCCV President John Searle said: "there is no group of people more precious, more loved, more vulnerable and therefore more in need of protection than our children. Therefore we needed this forum to raise community awareness about the prevalence of child sexual abuse and look at how parents may prevent abuse happening to their children'.

A panel of experts addressed the emerging research and how 'stranger danger' is not the issue for our children. The panel included Sheiny New – Jewish Taskforce Against Family Violence, Mary Mass – South Eastern Centre Against Sexual Assault (SECASA) and Vivien Resofsky – social worker.

The panel, chaired by Searle, reported that the incidence of child sexual abuse in our community is on par with other communities and incidents are on the rise. Facts from the SECASA website show that in the overwhelming majority of instances, the perpetrator is someone known to the victim and commonly from their immediate family such as the father, stepfather, mother's de facto partner, brother, uncle or grandfather of the Victim.

Sheiny New stated that it is critical that children understand that no one is allowed to tell them to keep a secret from their parents. As many children self-blame or have been threatened by the perpetrator, Sheiny said: "look into your child's eyes and let them know that no matter what they do or what is done to them, Mummy and Daddy will always love them." Unfortunately, the perpetrator may be a parent, therefore school programs facilitated by the JTAfV encourage children to speak to a trusted adult until they are believed and action is taken.

Mary Mass said that SECASA receives 30-50 new referrals a week for counselling for both recent and past sexual assault. Mary stated that belief is critical: "You must believe what you children tell you and help them develop the language around personal safety. If your child is uncomfortable with an adult, then do not force them to go with that adult. Believe your child, look for warning signs and speak with professionals who can help to make you make sure your

child is safe”.

Vivien Resofky concluded by saying that parents must talk about it, schools must talk about it and referred parents to Wesley’s World series of books, a parent/child guide to personal safety that she has authored.’

[Source](#)

(<http://www.jwire.com.au/news/protecting-our-children/18327>)

Erick Stakelbeck’s Faux Pas

Thursday, 18 August 2011

According to Europe News one of Glen Beck’s sub-toadies is ‘*off to Israel*’ to be with his master so that they can both have a good old wail at the wailing-wall: although of course they’ll have to get in line with all the orthodox and ultra-orthodox regulars. That in itself isn’t surprising, but Stakelbeck in the process of blogging about his latest bit of irrational love regarding the bandit state makes a very indiscreet admission when he states as follows:

‘Please pray for the success of Restoring Courage and that it can galvanize those who currently support Israel while also winning over many new supporters who will stand with the Jewish people in these perilous times.’ (1)

Now you might ask what the faux pas I have alluded to here is and perhaps rightly so: however if I have learned one thing over the years I have been studying jews it is that nuance in meaning is everything with jews and their supporters.

When Stakelbeck talks of ‘*supporting Israel*’ he then goes on to directly state that the ‘*jewish people*’ is Israel. Now this is perfectly correct in terms of Judaism (although ironically in Christianity this is wholly incorrect and has long been recognised as the sign of a Judaiser [as it effectively asserts that Saint Paul was wrong]), but in making this assertion Stakelbeck falls head first into the charge of anti-Semitism precisely because he is equating the actions of Israel with the actions of the jewish people. This is necessarily so because if one ‘*stands with Israel*’ then one ‘*stands with the jewish people*’ in Stakelbeck’s view, which therefore means that anything that Israel does is identical to what the jewish people have done, are doing or will do.

The problem for Stakelbeck there may be further simplified by pointing that if one equates Israel with the jewish people en toto as he does then it makes Israel culpable for the acts of jewish paedophiles, murders, rapists and so forth in the Diaspora and also makes the Diaspora culpable for the genocide, violence, terrorism and exploitation that is undertaken by the Israelis on a fairly regular basis.

Irony: isn’t it?

Stakelbeck is so clueless as to try to support the state of Israel by effectively calling himself anti-Semitic!

References

(1) <http://europenews.dk/en/node/46348> [Last Accessed: 18/08/2011]

Beware Jews Bearing Gifts

Sunday, 21 August 2011

The Iowa Straw Poll last weekend afforded the jewish national media yet another opportunity to demonstrate what it thinks of implicitly White political positions—namely, those propounded by Texas Congressman Ron Paul. Paul, who came in fifth in the '07 Straw Poll, this year came in a razor's close second to Iowa native and Minnesota Congresswoman Michele Bachmann at a mere 152 votes behind. This was more than double the tally of the third place finisher, Minnesota Governor Tim Pawlenty, who considered his support good enough to quit.

Paul essentially tied for the victory, but unless you are a confirmed Paul supporter (or actively followed the contest outside of the MSM) you'd never have known it.

Enter jew faux-comedian, faux-newsman Jonathan Leibowitz, stage name 'Jon Stewart.'

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QO93P6uz9t8&feature=player_embedded

So, what gives? What does Leibowitz get for playing fair? More importantly, how is this good for jews?

It's good for jews because their primary media (CNN, FOX, NBC, et al.) had acted too blatantly in concert. Leibowitz' show acts as a pressure relief valve. In this case, he takes one for the team.

Everyone knows that the media is biased-'left.' Fox News exists as false opposition in the fake 'liberal'-'conservative' dynamic. When even Fox News is caught participating in a media-wide shut-down operation on Ron Paul, a lot of libertarian-leaning 'conservatives' (and even Kucinich-type white 'liberals') start to think, and a thinking white electorate is never good for jews.

How to salvage the meta-screw-up while keeping the waters sufficiently muddy?

Enter Liebowitz. He's inculcated an image as a sardonic outsider, so he can publicly ride the rest of the jewish herd back in line and stay within character.

Further, if this incident causes a white to take his first hesitant step toward putting 2 and 2 together regarding jewish media control, there's always Liebowitz' swarthy, grinning mug to dissuade him.

After all, was it not a jew, Liebowitz, who stood up for Paul?

Of Jewish Capital

Tuesday, 23 August 2011

Capitalism and Communism are often held to be two very different sides of the same coin and to be fair both are traditionally associated with jews by those; like myself, who are critical of jewry. I find it of particular notice that in a recent series of essays; collected in book form, we find an attempt to explain the jewishness of both these phenomena within the intellectual framework of philo-Semitism. Jerry Muller's '*Capitalism and the Jews*'; (1) the work to which I allude, is rare precisely because it correctly maintains that there is a need to explain the phenomenal jewish involvement in both capitalism and anti-capitalism as separate but interlinked intellectual movements.

Muller to his great credit does not fall into the trap that many other scholars have either blundered into or deliberately jumped in of associating jews with only one of these intellectual movements and attempting to minimise or disregard jewish involvement in the other as has been noted; somewhat too kindly I think, by Erich Haberer. (2)

Haberer argued; and Muller has followed, that one must concede that the jewishness of the jews was a factor in their involvement in radical anti-capitalist (and by extension capitalist) movements rather than something incidental to it (3) as has been argued since time immemorial by philo-Semites and jews. (4) To argue that the jewishness was something essential rather than incidental one merely needs to note that jewish involvement in both capitalism and anti-capitalism has crossed intellectual divides in jewry with religious jews endorsing both in varying degrees at different times as have poor and rich jews a-like. (5)

This would and could not have been the case had jewishness been incidental to the cause of those jews joining either the capitalist or anti-capitalist political movements precisely because had it been incidental then the boundaries between the jewish groups should have been reasonably clean cut as those who were '*underprivileged*' would have joined anti-capitalism, while those who were '*privileged*' would have joined capitalism.

Muller understands and notes this arguing that the split is not so much in the nature of capitalism but in the nature of jewry. Muller argues that capitalism is a '*de-racialising*'/egalitarian force that through the dynamics of the market forces businesses to employ anyone and everyone who is capable to do a specific task at the appropriate standard at the lowest possible cost. Indeed Muller seems to be a believer that man is a product of his environment not his nature, which we can see as a weakness as Muller does not recognise; implicitly or explicitly, that the jew has been able to sell his historic high level of literacy and legalistic intellect in order to assist businesses where-as a Mexican or a negro has much less to offer as a general rule of thumb so accordingly have had a more difficult time to achieve '*emancipation*' as the capitalist incentive would; in Muller's logic, be less.

The time that such '*emancipation*' would become an incentive for businesses to support it is when the market is too cut-throat and laissez-faire; such as in the current globalised economy, and requires the labour power that it is to exploit to work at an absolute minimum wage. The economic calculation is fairly simple in that if you can reduce the (always expensive) cost of labour then you make more profit and if that means the quality of the product or service is decreased then you will be able to take that economic risk if the combined probability and cost of it occurring is less than the profit that you can make (following the idea of the '*Rational Economic Man*').

Firms; of course, are not perfect and make mistakes as well as take increasing risks with their capital often leading to things to economic depressions where the economy contracts in a form of cautious opposite to the previous bullish attitude. In essence one could type-cast it as a classic scenario of Janisian caution and risky shift if one were feeling bold with the determining factors being the confidence of the investors in their investments and willingness to invest their funds which in turn would be largely determined by the biological origin of the investors.

So if the investor was a jew: they would be inclined towards a high level of long-term risk as they tend to look; as a rule, for the best possible return as opposed to the best possible safest return. A Negro investor on the other hand would tend towards a high level of short-term risk as they tend to think in terms of the maximum possible return tomorrow as opposed to the maximum possible return in the future as the jews do.

My criticism of Muller's implicit denial of biology here is actually referenced by proxy by Muller when he refers to jewish economist Werner Sombart and Theodor Fritsch's synthesizing of his argument, which Muller (who I dare say probably hasn't read the work of Fritsch's to which he refers) has the unfortunate presumption to refer to in negative terms. (6)

I should also note in passing that Muller gets the title of Fritsch's 1913 work wrong and claims it was '*Die Juden im Handel und Das Geheimnis ihrer Erfolge*' ('*The Jews in Commerce and the Secret of their Success*') when he should be aware that it was in fact '*Das Rätsel des jüdischen Erfolges*' ('*The Riddle of Jewish Success*') to which he is referring. I will note as a further aside that Wikipedia has also got this horribly wrong and asserts that the book in question was published under the pseudonym F. Roderich-Stoltheim only in the 1927 English translation, (7) which it was not but rather appeared in the original German with this pseudonym of Fritsch's as the listed author. I am somewhat puzzled at Muller here as it is a silly error for him to make in an otherwise excellent book although the reason seems to be that he is not familiar with Fritsch's actual work and is relying on a biographer of Sombart's for accurate information. (8)

However for all of Muller's intellectual rigour as a historian of ideas he does not convince anyone with his '*criticism*' of Sombart's racial interpretation of economics, Weber's '*protestant work ethic*', Simmel's (who was also jewish economist and socialist) economic determinism or his implicit argument that there is a peculiar jewish '*genius*' at work. This leads him to some fairly far out there (and ignorant) assertions that for example Marx was '*not a jew*'. (9) As according to Muller to accept such '*racist characterisations*' is to agree with critics of the jews and therefore make jews open to criticism and we can't have that can we?

One has to laugh at Muller's rather absurd reasoning here. However to show its absolute folly we can point out that every biographer of Marx's has noted Marx's jewish origin and have nearly always argued that it; in essence, made Marx the thinker he was by making him both highly intellectual and outsider (as Muller's own logic would suggest). (10) This later attitude of Muller's; perhaps explicable by the fact that these are separate essays collected after the fact in a book, is direct contradiction to his earlier attitude that we must identify and understand jewishness as part and/or the whole of the cause of jewish involvement in both capitalism and anti-capitalism. (11)

Muller cannot take jewishness into account as a factor, but then change jewry's own definition of jewishness to being the Christian definition (i.e. religious confession rather than family lineage) as that is putting words in Judaism's mouth. Muller would do well to pick up a decent work on Judaism and look up the issue of 'who is a jew' in halakhah where he would find; I suspect to both his surprise and alarm, that Judaism defines 'who is a jew' in fairly strict biological; not simply confessional, terms.

Muller does however correctly point out that Marx; if contextually understood, was not being anti-Semitic (as is frequently and incorrectly alleged) in his '*Zur Judenfrage*' (12), but rather was using a familiar and commonly understood stereotype that he himself knew to be generally true to make himself understood. As Muller points out the jew as usurer has been a common and not wholly untrue characterisation of the jewish '*contribution*'; as Cecil Roth would have it, '*to civilisation*' and when '*Die Ewige Jude*' called the jews an economic parasite it was not without factual foundation. (13)

Muller; of course, would reject such parallels but what conclusion may we reasonably draw from the data (14) he has echoed from other sources about the domination of the jew in numerous walks of life as well as their preponderance in the higher echelons of intellectual movements (two of which he is studying)?

Muller would have it that it merely reflects a cultural paradigm and various '*pressures*', but that is just a mealy-mouthed and fairly standard academic excuse for telling us that the '*truth is anti-Semitic*' so therefore a load of academic verbiage is required to cover over the inconvenient reality of what the historical record suggests.

All in all; in spite of its errors of fact and sometimes absurd reasoning, '*Capitalism and the Jews*' is an excellent intellectual crib for anti-Semites looking for respected academic work to buttress existing arguments against the jews. Muller has pulled together quite a lot of data from different areas to create his theory, but unfortunately the theory is not of enduring interest however the compiled data and examples certainly are.

References

- (1) Jerry Z. Muller, 2010, '*Capitalism and the Jews*', 1st Edition, Princeton University Press: Princeton.
- (2) Erich Haberer, 2004, '*Jews and Revolution in Nineteenth Century Russia*', 2nd Edition,

Cambridge University Press: New York, pp. xii-xiii

(3) Ibid, p. xiii

(4) A good example of this is Benjamin Pinkus, 2008, *'The Soviet Government and the Jews 1948-1967: A Documented Study'*, 2nd Edition, Cambridge University Press: New York, pp. 11-22; Benjamin Pinkus, 1988, *'The Jews of the Soviet Union: The History of a National Minority'*, 1st Edition, Cambridge University Press: New York, pp. 76-81

(5) Andrew R. Heinze, 1990, *'Adapting to Abundance: Jewish Immigration, Mass Consumption and the Search for American Identity'*, 1st Edition, Columbia University Press: New York, p. 17

(6) Muller, Op. Cit., p. 60

(7) http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Theodor_Fritsch [Last Accessed: 23/08/2011]

(8) Muller, Op. Cit., p. 234, n. 62

(9) Ibid, p. 137

(10) For example Isaiah Berlin, 1978, *'Karl Marx: His Life and Environment'*, 4th Edition, Oxford University Press: New York, pp. 18-25; David McLellan, 1980, *'The Young Hegelians and Karl Marx'*, 3rd Edition, Papermac: London, pp. 142-143

(11) Muller, Op. Cit. pp. 84-95

(12) Ibid., pp. 35-45

(13) Ibid., pp. 18-20; 25-26

(14) I will post a selection of this as a separate entry on Semitic Controversies.

American Renaissance defends Kevin MacDonald?

Wednesday, 24 August 2011

I learn from the latest edition of American Renaissance magazine that Jared Taylor has somewhat changed his tune on the jewish question since the days when he declared that jews are 'white' because they 'look white'. In the leading article; *'Who are the Haters?'*, Taylor out of all the many victims of the Southern Poverty Law Center of Morris Dees (better known as *'Sleaze Dees'*) choses to cite Kevin MacDonald; a well-known critic of jewry and quasi-racialist, as an example of the attacks on racialists and nationalists in academe.

To quote Taylor:

'Kevin MacDonald is a professor of psychology at California State University at Long Beach, who has written about Jewish influence and behaviour in ways that displease the SPLC.' (1)

Now Taylor could have said this same basic thing numerous different ways without implicitly recognising; as he has by his wording, that jews are an evolutionary group of their own and that there is such a thing as significant jewish influence which Taylor does not contradict. If he wanted to suggest that jewish influence was not significant he merely needed to add a 'supposed' or 'theoretical' before 'jewish influence' to achieve the desired effect.

This is quite the departure from his previous position that 'jews are white' (2) (he presumably still holds to this as Zionist jews regularly contribute to Amren and hilariously claim to be 'white') (3) although he claims that he still greatly admires jews. (4) In spite of this to my knowledge Taylor has never claimed that Israel is a 'white nation' or even particularly

mentioned it in his written work in spite of his correct opposition to Islam as a manifestation of Arab nationalism (and therefore a racial competitor to European racial nationalism). Indeed jews don't even get a mention that I can find (it does lack an index so I have to resort to memory and my reading notes) in his latest work (or any other book of his that I have read): *'White Identity'*. (5)

Taylor is probably resorting to the *'big tent'* philosophy to gain as much widespread support as he can and he would be a fool if he did not realise that a big section of his support and readership are those who are also critical of jews. However Taylor himself does not appear to see anything wrong with jewry per se as he regards them as *'white'* for reasons that escape me: this is in spite of the book that *'converted'* him to racialism having a chapter demolishing the commonly-believed and fashionable claim; from Ashley Montagu (nee Israel Ehrenberg), that *'race didn't exist'* because jews *'weren't a race'*. Baker demolishes both Montagu's general argument (as Taylor recognised) as well as his specific argument that jews weren't a racial/biological group (which Taylor doesn't mention). (6)

I am therefore rather sceptical of Taylor apparent change of heart in his defence of MacDonald and cannot help but see it is as a deliberately conceived stratagem to use the persecution of an academic foe of jewry to carry favour with those who support him conditionally in spite of his close association with Zionist jews like Michael Hart and Michael Levin (both of whom were among Taylor's first academic recruits and have both been heavily praised by him for their respective works).

After all: it is good business sense isn't it?

References

- (1) Jared Taylor, 2011, *'Who are the Haters?'*, American Renaissance, Vol. 22, No. 9, p. 4
- (2) Ian Jobling, 2006, *'Among the Living Again'*, American Renaissance, Vol. 17, No. 4, p. 1; Jared Taylor (*'Thomas Jackson'*), 2006, *'The Black-Jewish Alliance'*, Vol. 16, No. 8, pp. 10-11
- (3) For example in the August issue Robert Greenberg, 2011, *'When Whites Lie to Blacks'*, American Renaissance, Vol. 22, No. 8, pp. 1-7 and Carl Horowitz, 2006, *'Nigerian Fool's Gold: Behind the '419' Scams'*, Vol. 17, No. 2, pp. 1-6
- (4) Jared Taylor, 2011, *'Reply to Dr. Greenberg'*, American Renaissance, Vol. 22, No. 8, p. 7
- (5) Jared Taylor, 2011, *'White Identity: Racial Consciousness in the 21st Century'*, 1st Edition, New Century Foundation: Arlington
- (6) John Baker, 1974, *'Race'*, 1st Edition, Oxford University Press: New York, pp. 232-247

Stopping Here

Friday, 26 August 2011

I've been posting to SC for a couple of years now, but I've come to the recent conclusion that with everything else I have to do in my academic and personal life it just isn't feasible to carry on. I have several book contracts now and keeping up with them and my normal research has

really taken it out of me.

So it has become of question of either stopping SC or stopping my working life and I am afraid there is only one answer to that: stop SC. I will post notices of my books, pamphlets and published articles here as they appear, but I just cannot do as much as I want to in my present circumstances.

If you want to read more of what I write then you can still email me at the SC address to ask opinions etc or for a copy of a work I have written. To give people some idea of what I have in the publishing world at the moment I'll list my contracted work below (I'll add links when they have come out):

To be published:

Karl Radl, 2011, *'The Other Che: The Myth and Reality of an Argentine Terrorist'*, 1st Ed., Historical Review Press: Uckfield (Forthcoming)

Karl Radl, 2012, *'John Marco Allegro's anti-Judaism'*, 1st Ed., Historical Review Press: Uckfield (Forthcoming)

Karl Radl, 2012, *'Sir Richard Burton: Explorer, Scholar and Racialist'*, 1st Ed., Historical Review Press: Uckfield (Forthcoming)

Karl Radl, 2012, *'Anti-Semitism before anti-Judaism: Romans and Greeks on the Jews'*, 1st Ed., Historical Review Press: Uckfield (Forthcoming)

Unfinished work:

Karl Radl, n.d., *'Karl Marx: Myth and Reality'*

Karl Radl, n.d., *'Friedrich Engels: Creator of Marxism'*

Karl Radl, n.d., *'The Nationalists Handbook on the Jews'*

Karl Radl, n.d., *'Savitri Devi: Her Life and Thought'*

Karl Radl, n.d., *'Revalo Oliver: His Life and Thought'*

As they say it is has been great fun, but that's all folks.

Karl,

Semitic Controversies

2011 Issue

(Third Part of 2011 – From November to December)

Edited by Karl Radl

<http://semiticcontroversies.blogspot.com/>

Contents

After Action Report: Appearance on ‘Spingola Speaks’ (21/10/2011)

Byron Roth on Jews, IQ and the Media

An Attack on the Japanese highlights Jewish power in China

Anti-Gentilism in the Sefer Yezirah

Some Tips on Debating Jews

From the Archive: A.K. Chesterton’s ‘Learned Elders and the B.B.C.’

After Action Report: ‘Spingola Speaks’ (18/11/2011)

A Killer Book

The Jewish Chronicle kvetches about Gilad Atzmon

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

Jewish Testimony: Reva Mann

The Jews of the Gulag Archipelago

Jews and Communism according to Louis Budenz

Richard Krebs, Soviet Intelligence and the Jews

How you shouldn’t view the Jews: A Reply to Dr. D (Part I)

After Action Report: Appearance on ‘Spingola Speaks’ (21/10/2011)

Sunday, 27 November 2011

After ending my updating of this blog I received a lot of requests from different people; most of whom I had previously been unaware followed my work, to continue with my updates and work even if it was at a reduced pace. One of those who has followed my work for some time suggested that he put me forward to appear on several radio shows that he regularly listened to so that I could talk about some of my thoughts. I accepted his generous offer and Deanna Spingola contacted me shortly thereafter: last night was the scheduled date for our talk and it went extremely well for the first time I have ever spoken on a radio show rather than a lecture hall. Deanna was a kind and attentive host who coped well with some my personal eccentricities and lack of diplomacy around other people’s beliefs sometimes. (1)

Our discussion was wide-ranging and in some respects looking back on it after Werner’s call into the show: I think that was a mistake on my part, because I thought to cover as much ground as possible in the two hours we had as opposed to covering a much narrower topic in detail. In particular I think that the written email question about the Triangle Waistshirt Factory fire was apposite and I was disappointed that I didn’t know enough about it to be able to address it. I did however point out that it wouldn’t surprise me as Communism of this time did readily engage in such ‘*false flag*’ activities, which have been shown by the evidence of Comintern documents later where they would ‘*expose*’ the FBI’s ‘*malevolence*’ after providing them with false information and documents. (2)

Before my next appearance with Deanna in mid-November: I am going to be doing such research about that particular question and present it on of the segments in the show. I also thought that Werner’s slightly veiled criticism was justified when he talked about the need for statistics and numbers, which I only provided a few of. I will remedy that in future, by talking more narrowly about specific issues as opposed to the generalities. I think that all in all I learned a lot from both the experience and the questions that were asked of me.

I can only hope that those who listened found the experience also to their liking.

References

(1) You can listen to my appearance on the show via the Republic Broadcasting Network’s archives, which are available at the following address:

http://republicbroadcasting.org/?page_id=109

(2) Harvey Klehr, John Earl Haynes, Fridrikh Igorevich Firsov, 1995, ‘*The Secret World of American Communism*’, 1st Edition, Yale University Press: New Haven, p. 126.

Byron Roth on Jews, IQ and the Media

Sunday, 27 November 2011

In the most recent edition of American Renaissance magazine; that of November 2011, we find there is an article by one Byron M. Roth entitled '*The Chosen People*'. I note with amusement that this purports to be a book review of Richard Lynn's most recent work '*The Chosen People: A Study of Jewish Intelligence and Achievement*'. Lynn's work; Roth rightly points out, is a largely dispassionate survey of the issue of jewish IQ levels and why they are often very high. Lynn's thesis itself isn't exactly revolutionary in the field of jewish studies, but it does back up what those of us who work in the field have observed and argued for quite some time. Namely that jews have a strong set of skills in terms of '*getting on*' in a society in that they are more likely to challenge the status quo, be utterly ruthless and also very self-centred.

In some respects what both Lynn and Roth argue; i.e. that jews have an inherent genetic ability to '*get on*', would be best boiled down to the phrase; '*the naked capitalist*', in the sense of capitalism as theorised by one of Lynn and Roth's high IQ jews: Karl Marx.

To explain: Marx's theory of surplus value (his '*great scientific discovery*' according to Engels' funerary oration) and his ideas on the '*contradictions of capitalism*' posit that a capitalist elite (which he could be reasonably argued on the basis of his oft-cited but little understood article; '*On the Jewish Question*', to have understood as a jewish capitalist elite); which he calls the bourgeoisie, would grind down all those below them (the petit-bourgeoisie, proletariat and the peasants) to the point where they would be starving.

Of course Marx's theory of surplus value is somewhat incorrect in that it posits labour adds the value to a product or service as opposed to the product or service having a value in of itself due to its scarce nature and scale of utility. However it does indicate in a general way the basic nature of the jewish high IQ groups in the 19th century as again both Lynn and Roth assert that the immigrants did so well because they were able to outcompete gentiles; and I note Roth's use of the jewish term rather than Europeans or Caucasoids, in a broad range of occupations. However Lynn makes it clear as Roth notes; but tries to downplay it, that jewish IQ does not and cannot explain jewish success alone: to this end Roth cites Kevin MacDonald's work on ethnocentrism among others.

However Roth draws; in his summation of the article, the opposite conclusion of what is discussion to that point inevitably suggests: that jews are a hostile competing group to Europeans/Caucasoids. How could they not be using Roth's own logic? Roth does not inform us, but instead gives us a bit of plebeian rhetoric about the (genetic) '*differences*' between gentiles and jews being miniscule and not worth noting. I am reminded of a not dissimilar claim made by Roth's fellow member of the tribe; Richard Lewontin, who claimed that genetic distance could be expressed appositely in a percentage and therefore there were more differences within racial groups than between them. This was later exposed as completely wrong and referred to; great to his chagrin as his recent article in '*New Left Review*' indicates, as '*Lewontin's fallacy*'.

Surely Roth realises that; in fact, these claims are inevitably reducible to the same basic premise: that it is not what differs, but rather how much.

That is a self-serving claim if ever I saw one as Roth is trying to suggest that jews are not a competing group in spite of being forced to admit that jews are overrepresented five times over

in law and medicine (not dissimilar statistics to Weimar Germany I might add) and do in fact exercise disproportionate influence in the media and academe. I find Roth's assertion; that the teaching positions is where one finds a lack of jews, but then in the research positions in academe there is a veritable traffic jam of the circumcised ones, to be of great poignancy and indeed would state that it conforms to my own experience as well as what the literature suggests is the case. It also happens to imply that jews are primarily interested in prestige and egoistic fulfilment precisely because this is what research positions are in academe: the places of prestige and influence without the need to have to interrupt one's research to teach often half-drunk not particularly interested undergraduates.

Roth even goes so far as to assert that because jews are significantly overrepresented in the quasi-Marxist or kosher Conservative media: it does not mean they control it. Roth's point is quite valid as there is no direct reason to presume that a higher preponderance of one or more groups in strategically vital industries; such as academe, the media, law and medicine, would affect it negatively.

However there is if one takes for granted; as Roth seems to and I myself do, that evolutionary theory must be applied to a social situation to understand the implications of that same situation then Roth's point becomes hypocritical as he is in effect asserting that we must not do this when it comes to jews and yet do this in all other cases (by necessary implication).

The reason that this is hypocritical is simply that if one is seeking to apply the correct assumption; which necessarily flows from Lynn's book, that jews are an evolutionary group or sub-group and have been utilizing positive eugenics to increase their IQ (which is what Lynn argues and others have recently as well) then they are necessarily going to compete with other biological groups or sub-groups as Lynn and Roth both note they do.

So if jews are significantly overrepresented in media control: why would there not be a causal relationship between them and the obsessions that have come to dominate America such as Israel, the '*holocaust*', self-analysis and psychological insecurity not to mention an unhealthy habit of claiming America to be the chosen nation of the Bible?

That is what people actually suggest when they assert that jews '*control*' the media: they don't mean it literally as a rule of thumb, but rather that the media in all of its varieties tends to reflect jewish preoccupations, assumptions, socio-economic ideas and historical myths. That reflection must; if one assumes the reality of race and the impact of biology on forming and informing our perceptions and preoccupations, reflect a direct causal relationship between the jewish thought found in nearly all media outlets and the significant overrepresentation of jews in the running and production of media products and services.

We would be doing Roth injustice not to point out that he is himself jewish and if he is so keen on jewish interests then why does he refer to all non-jews in the simple way of '*gentiles*' as opposed to '*non-jewish Europeans*' or something? I think Roth made a slight Freudian slip there and said what he actually thinks: that jews are decidedly different to Europeans and is currently trying to recruit those who fight for European biological interests to fight for jewish biological interests.

It isn't like that hasn't happened before is it?

The year 1917 rings a bell.

The Bolshevik revolution that declared that the jews as a '*nationality*' would be granted their own SSR and also the Balfour declaration whereby jews were unilaterally awarded territory not yet conquered or owned for a '*homeland*'. In both cases we find that jews presented themselves as a potential wellspring of support to those in power and required in return that they be rewarded with something they saw as beneficial to their interests as a biological group.

Why is it; thus, so outrageous to assert that they would do exactly the same in the current era where they perceive the high-tide of liberalism and cultural Marxism in Europe is leading to a radical nationalist riposte?

Strange how history repeats itself with the jews: isn't it?

An Attack on the Japanese highlights Jewish power in China

Monday, 28 November 2011

Strictly speaking the Far East has never been my area of expertise and nor has it ever been of particular interest to me outside a passing interest in Japan and knowing some basic Japanese. Perhaps it is for the best as having travelled extensively in that part of the world in recent years I found that the image the West has of our Mongoloid cousins is overly utopian and rooted in the assumption that they are just like us. That simply doesn't hold up to any serious examination, which may be confirmed by a reading of Mark Felton's '*Japan's Gestapo*'. (1)

It pretends to be an '*account*'; I refuse to vouch for its reliability for reasons I shall make clear in a moment, of Japanese '*war crimes*' in Asia during the war. Now while I don't doubt that much of what Felton claims occurred; and he himself admits in a roundabout way that the evidence has a tendency to be slim and circumstantial, his sourcing leaves much to be desired especially as although he has used some archival material it is largely in the form of official trial materials and testimonials from survivors plus a sprinkling of pop literature. There is no attempt to cite detailed analyses of the claims or answer the critiques of Japanese scholars who have long disputed the charges; with some justification, of having systematically committed war crimes during and prior to the Second World War.

Now considering that Felton has a PhD; but in American History, and lives in China while lecturing at Fudan University (his wife at a guess is probably Chinese given the observable proclivities of academics for Chinese wives for reasons I am yet to comprehend) with its extremely strict censorship laws regarding history, philosophy and political thought (for example you can't take any non-Chinese approved books or literature to China if you intend to immigrate there). It is therefore hardly surprising that he takes the intellectual low-road of '*it was claimed, therefore it happened*' in his work and thus comes up with what can only be described as an attack

on the Japanese people (especially if one looks at his obsessive publishing record about Japanese 'war crimes').

Aside from this vile form of intellectual prostitution, which appears to involve 'taking one for the team' from Chairman Mao: Felton has said one or two things of interest about Jewish power in China at the time of the Second World War. I have checked his source for his claims (given my previous comments) and it is both reliable and accurate. What he says very specifically is:

'Ellis Hayim, one of Shanghai's fabulously wealthy Iraqi-British Jews who had stayed on in the city after occupation was also arrested. Formerly president of the Shanghai Stock Exchange, Hayim was arrested because he had hosted several pre-war garden parties at his large garden villa dedicated to the Allied nations, and these events had been broadcast on the radio in Shanghai.' (2)

And:

'Another high-profile victim was Sir Elly Kadoorie, Shanghai multi-millionaire and philanthropist, and a prominent member of the rich Iraqi-British Jewish community since the late nineteenth century. The powerful Kadoorie family owned banks, rubber plantations, electric power utilities and real estate, including the famous Peninsula Hotel in Hong Kong. When the Japanese occupied Shanghai they appropriated Kadoorie's vast house, Marble Hall, which sports the largest ballroom in Asia, and then forced Sir Elly and his grown-up sons into an internment camp where he died in 1944 aged seventy-seven. His son survived the war and rebuilt the Kadoorie business empire in Hong Kong.' (3)

Now in spite of Felton's overwhelming and utterly blatant pro-Chinese bias: I would have thought that even so pedestrian an intellect as his might be able to comprehend that if Ellis Hayim had given pro-Allies garden parties and worse still had these parties publicly broadcast then Ellis Hayim was an openly pro-Allies propagandist and therefore an opponent to Japan who were by then part of the Axis powers. I fail to see how this is in the least bit controversial as the Allied powers did precisely the same thing and certainly the British treated their political internees every bit as badly as the Japanese treated theirs: (4) excluding the supposed live vivisections and so forth for a moment.

Or is Felton seriously going to suggest that any sane government would allow those who were manifestly pro-enemy to say what they liked during war time? Does he seriously believe that; irrespective of the torture and awful treatment that was meted out to them for simply having an opinion once in prison, that the British governments interning of Arnold Leese, Oswald Mosley, Archibald Ramsay (then a sitting M.P. no less) and attempted interning of William Joyce was not a sane policy? (5)

Or is he just building a metaphorical house of straw and hoping that a gust of wind called common sense doesn't come along and blow it all over?

As for Sir Elly Kadoorie: I rather think once again it is a case of Felton; quite probably deliberately, misunderstanding the context and point of interning enemy citizens during wartime.

The point is very simply and; ironically, best expressed by the arch-genocidal drunken lunatic; Winston Churchill, when he famously stated '*intern the lot of them*': when queried about the non-political Axis citizens and '*refugees*' (read: jews, communists and an assortment of other subversives) living in the British Empire at the outbreak of war. The logic being simply that the risk of not interning everybody who was recently or still was an enemy citizen was high as espionage agents and spies would almost invariably slip through the net. Thus it was better to be safe rather than sorry.

Felton doesn't bother with such context, but rather just whirls around like a frenzied dervish attacking his chosen target with every bit of information his; rather lacking, research can dig up. Felton might therefore be surprised to read the words of one recent jewish academic; who like Felton seems to have an almost totemic fetish for all things Chinese, M. Avrum Ehrlich who in his '*Jews and Judaism in Modern China*' gives a beautiful definition how jews themselves are while describing Chinese attitudes:

'I questioned the students about this point and asked whether I or any other foreigner could ever become a Chinese citizen. They responded that this would be impossible. I pushed the point: what if my Chinese was fluent, if I married a Chinese person, if I lived in China for forty years, if I contributed greatly to China economically and/or socially, and if I knew the customs and habits of Chinese? The entire class responded that it was impossible. Chinese expect to be welcomed to countries throughout the world, expect to get visas and scholarships, and understand that they will be encouraged to integrate. They expect the right to become citizens of other countries eventually, or to adopt Christian, Muslim or Jewish faith, if they wish, but then, seemingly arrogantly, or at least contradictorily, believe that foreigners could not and should not become a Chinese citizen.' (6)

Now if that doesn't express the crux of the whole issue with jews by simply replacing '*Chinese citizen*' with '*jew*' then I don't know what does. It just goes to show that you often find the most insightful of comments about jews in the oddest places!

References

- (1) Mark Felton, 2009, '*Japan's Gestapo: Murder, Mayhem and Torture in Wartime Asia*', 1st Edition, Pen & Sword: Barnsley
- (2) Ibid, p. 61
- (3) Ibid, pp. 64-65
- (4) See the anti-fascist book that was published during the war with invaluable prisoner and guard testimony included: Guy Aldred, John Wynn, 2007, [1943], '*It Might Have Happened to You*', 1st Edition, Historical Review Press: Uckfield. For a modern scholarly analysis of torture and imprisonment of these men and women see A. W. Brian Simpson, 1994, '*In the Highest Degree Odious: Detention without Trial in Wartime Britain*', 2nd Edition, Clarendon Press: Oxford.
- (5) For a readable introduction to these men and the groups they headed/associated with see Gisela Lebzelter, 1978, '*Political Anti-Semitism in England 1918-1939*', 1st Editon, MacMillan: London.
- (6) M. Avrum Ehrlich, 2010, '*Jews and Judaism in Modern China*', 1st Edition, Routledge: New

Anti-Gentilism in the Sefer Yezirah

Tuesday, 29 November 2011

The Sefer Yezirah; or '*Book of Creation*', is one of the oldest existent texts of Jewish mysticism although the debate on its age has yet to be authoritatively resolved: however to the present author the case for it being mentioned in the Babylonian Talmud is the most convincing. This would date the work to the years after the nominal fall of Rome and the rise of the Byzantine incarnation of the Empire. The traditional claim is that the work was composed by Abraham himself, but this is obviously faulty in line with the time-line briefly outlined above. Another claim; although more plausible if not less fantastic, is that the work was authored by Rabbi Akiva around the same time that he supposedly composed the Sefer ha-Zohar (the '*Book of Splendour*') while up to his neck in nothing but sand in a cave hiding from the vengeful Romans (Akiva had been a prominent supporter of the revolt of Bar Kochba against the Romans). (1)

The work was; in fact, more likely authored by some obscure and now totally unknown Jewish mystic who wished to engage in some irrational speculation based on the then understood text of the Torah with elucidation by quotation provided by selections from what now understand to be the Ketuvim (Major Prophets). This is probably why it has been ignored by some Jewish scholars of the same era such as Yuval. (2)

The Sefer Yezirah itself is very short text compared to other Jewish philosophical and metaphysical work; for example Moses Hayyim Luzzatto's '*Mesillat Yesharim*', and is more comparable in being somewhat '*coded*' thought with the tales of Rabbah bar-bar Hannah or the poems of Solomon ibn Gabirol. It is never-the-less usually divided into chapter and section; like other Jewish religious work, for the purposes of referencing and on this score I have elected to utilise the most common English translation available which is that of Isidor Kalisch originally published in 1877. (3) Readers will find the easiest edition of Kalisch's work to find is that published; ironically enough, by the American Rosicrucian Order as part of their '*Rosicrucian Library*' series. (4) I have elected to replace the spelling used by Kalisch of the Hebrew word for book; '*Sepher*', with the more correct '*Sefer*' as the academic linguistic custom in regard to Hebrew has changed since Kalisch published the work nearly a century and a half ago.

The part of the work I wish to concentrate on is the implicit anti-gentilism found in the Sefer Yezirah; as in most other Jewish religious work, as it has; like much else, been missed by critics of Jewry and Judaism.

The Sefer Yezirah begins with the tried and true forms; although blasphemous to later Jews, of explicitly naming Yahweh (rather than simply '*G-d*' or '*Hashem*') to be the '*King of the Universe*', '*Omnipotent*', '*All Kind*', '*Eternal*' and so forth. Yahweh is also explicitly stated to have '*created the universe*'. (5) We are also told slightly later that Yahweh is both responsible for creating the universe and also bringing about its ultimate end. (6) Although one can tell that the author of the Sefer Yezirah is writing to convince other Jews of the truth of the almighty Jew

in the sky from the reference made to the fact that the reader should; in the author of the Sefer Yezirah's opinion, '*comprehend this great wisdom*' so that Yahweh can be lead to '*his throne once again*'. (7)

This tells us that while Yahweh is supposedly omnipotent over all things: he requires the assistance of the faithful to retain his power over the world. Somewhat similarly to how the devil was developed in Christian thought to somehow have considerable power in a world ruled by an omnipotent and omniscient creator god. (8)

Contradictions have historically been no bar to belief systems if they can be rationalised sufficiently, but it does tend to leave them open to later rationalist/skeptical attack. The identification of the faithful alluded to by the author of the Sefer Yezirah is made crystal clear; after much mystical mumbo-jumbo, when he talks of the first person to comprehend the alleged mystical truisms of which he writes being the jewish patriarch: Abraham. This pleased Yahweh so much that he called Abraham '*friend*' and made a covenant with him. (9)

The covenant referred to is; of course, the central claim of Judaism that Yahweh; omnipotent, omnipresent and generally homicidal, has made a direct contract with the jewish people; note not simply those of '*the jewish religion*', who are those descended from Abraham and later Moses.

When we say the jewish people it would perhaps be best to refer to the entity as it is understood in Judaism: Israel. Israel in Judaism is not a state per se, but rather a direct reference to '*the children of Israel*' aka Abraham's progeny. One can thus begin to see the implication of both what Judaism and the Sefer Yezirah are saying: one biological nation has been chosen above all others, because of whom they are descended from not what they believe.

In essence then it becomes a question of lineage not one of confession: this has been unfortunately confused by the advent of Christianity and Islam both of which use the confession of faith as the prime genus for their identity, while Judaism uses biological heritage. This informs a sense of superiority in Judaism; reinforced by the biological class system outlined explicitly in the Mishnah, that a born jew is far superior to a mere convert who at the very best is a '*jewish soul born into a non-jewish body*' and therefore impure.

This superiority is also implied by the suggestion in the Sefer Yezirah that Yahweh knew Abraham and thus the jews before '*he formed them in his belly*'. (10) This implies the special relationship further described by the Sefer Yezirah to the effect that Yahweh made the covenant of the '*ten fingers*' with Abraham; which is a separate one from the orthodox covenant represented by circumcision (the '*covenant of the toes*'), which is also called the covenant of the tongue.

To understand what the '*covenant of the tongue*' means we have to recall that the author of the Sefer Yezirah is trying to bring jews back to either his specific form of Judaism or Judaism in general; per his earlier statement that Yahweh should be returned to his throne, (11) and looking at the world as one dominated by the unclean gentiles. The Sefer Yezirah is quite clear; although somewhat roundabout, on its requirement for the world. As Yahweh created all things and is the lord of the world (12), but in did so symbolically using the apparently intrinsic power of the

Hebrew alphabet as the '*language of creation*'. (13)

Yahweh also created '*the decade out of nothing*'; (14) by which it is meant that before Yahweh there was nothing: no protons, neutrons or electrons, and the Sefer Yezirah assigns this act of complete creation (not accounting for how Yahweh himself existed) to be analogous with two body parts: the ten toes and ten fingers. The author of the Sefer Yezirah also manages to anticipate the '*holy hand grenade*' sketch of Monty Python fame by a millennia and some loose change when they assert: '*Ten are the numbers out of nothing, and not the number nine, ten and not eleven.*' (15)

The centre of this; i.e. between the '*fingers*' and '*toes*', is held to be the covenant of Abraham; i.e. between Yahweh and Israel, and is thus to rule the decade. The decade itself is outlined as a series of opposites assigned a number in sequence. (16) The sequence is defined by what is '*infinite*' and supposed to indicate the continuous attributes of this world (i.e. good and evil plus the odd additions of '*the beginning*', '*the end*', '*height*' and '*depth*' (17)). The author then goes on to claim that Yahweh rules over each of these absolutely and that the world is Yahweh's '*holy habitation*' with presumably Israel; i.e. the jews, as its guardians and stewards. (18)

The Sefer Yezirah also gives Yahweh the credit for all natural phenomena as all forces of the world '*humble themselves*' before him, and therefore the '*natural forces of the world*' (the gentiles) should '*humble themselves*' before his chosen people (the jews). (19) This interpretation confirmed by a quotation from Ezekiel to the effect that all living creatures should return to Yahweh and therefore gentiles should also pay homage to the jewish god, (20) but presumably through his earthly priesthood unless Yahweh presents himself as a '*whirlwind*' or some such. (21)

This is again confirmed by the Sefer Yezirah's statement of the '*articulate word*' (hence the '*covenant of tongues*') of holy power being the holy spirit meaning both the jewish tradition that Yahweh; in essence, spoke the world into existence and also that the speech of Yahweh (of which are the jews are guardians and stewards) is the '*holy spirit*' that governs the world. (22)

The Sefer Yezirah also offers an origin for the tetragrammaton (the '*four lettered name*' of G-d [YHWH: remember that Hebrew historically hasn't used vowel sounds]) when it claims that Yahweh bound the power of creation and thus magical power in that name by using the power of the Hebrew language. (23) This is; of course, why so much jewish magical and spell lore focuses on the power of names, letters and numbers as opposed to the more sympathetic forms of magical and spell lore used by non-jews. (24) That Yahweh bound up the power of '*air, water, ether and fire*' in the tetragrammaton ('*his great name*') (25) is indicative of the power the author of the Sefer Yezirah feels the jews to have as a people: for they are the custodians; as the covenanted people of Yahweh, of this great power which only they can rightfully unleash as only they have the key to doing so (the mastery of the Hebrew language and the Torah).

This great power; of course, can be used to place Yahweh once more on this throne that sits astride both the people of Israel (the jews) and the peoples of non-Israel (the gentiles). In a sense then the power the jews have been invested with by Yahweh is something they can; and should according to them, use to bring the gentiles back to worshipping Yahweh and by extension his

chosen people (the jews).

The tetragrammaton is even given the power of new creation by the author of the Sefer Yezirah when he states that '*every creature and every word emanated from (the) one name*'. (26) Indeed this ability to create anew is found in jewish literature in the legend of the golem of Prague which supposedly had the ability to sort truth and fiction and also punished the gentiles who asserted; supposedly untruthfully, that the jews could murder children as part of their rites. The golem itself was created using a profound knowledge of jewish mystical lore; the creator usually being ascribed as the legendary Rabbi Jehudah Leow, and the secret of the tetragrammaton (i.e. Yahweh's name). (27)

This is obviously legend, but the belief in the singular jewish ability to create new life from nothing; i.e. a literal act of deistic creation, points to the idea of the covenant and the special chosen nature of the jews in Judaism. As after all; as Hole pointed out long ago in relationship to European witchcraft, (28) it is not so much whether such a thing could really work, but rather that it was believed to do so. So in this sense intent is actually more important than the lack of substance to the attempt.

The author of the Sefer Yezirah; and many learned and unlearned jews after him, seriously believed that the use of the Tetragrammaton could (and should) be used to produce magical and supernatural effects that should be used for either the benefit of Judaism, jews in general or an individual jew in particular. That they sought to use these magical powers against gentiles is shown by the legend of the golem of Prague as well as the Hebrew Chronicle of Prague which asserts that whatever happened in the world to the jews was their fault and that Yahweh punished them and the gentiles solely for what the jews had or had not done. (29) This attitude is directly akin to the idea of the jews as being the centre of all things in this world and the next which is announced by the Sefer Yezirah. (30)

The Sefer Yezirah does manage to somewhat anticipate Calvin's well-known ideas of predestination (31) when it states that Yahweh '*predetermined*' every creature (32), but Calvin and the author of the Sefer Yezirah differ slightly in the end envisioned with the Sefer Yezirah asserting that while Yahweh knows the fate of all (he is after all asserted numerous times to be omnipresent) he allows jews as his covenanted nation to change their individual fate. Calvin; of course, allowed nothing of the kind and logically reasoned in his '*Institutes of the Christian Religion*' that as God is omnipresent and omnipotent he must know the fate of all men before they are all born.

The author of the Sefer Yezirah doesn't have intellectual courage of Calvin; who in spite of rumours past and present was not jewish as far as any scholar can ascertain, as he avoids the necessary consequences of the idea of the omnipresent, omnipotent god he posits; which Calvin endorsed, and merely uses the covenant with Yahweh to assert the jews have a special status with Yahweh. While the gentiles; being lower beings in the eyes of Judaism, are in a predestined mould much like the sheep of the field and the fish in the sea. It is incorrect to assert that the jews look upon the gentiles as actual beasts of the field, but it is not incorrect to assert that jews in practice believe them to be.

All-in-all the Sefer Yezirah is a fairly despicable document, but it has been missed by critics of jews and Judaism in part because it is somewhat obscure. However at the same time obscurer quotations and facts have been brought to light and used by anti-Semites in the past so I see no reason to exclude the Sefer Yezirah from the growing corpus of the anti-Semitic critique of the jews and Judaism.

References

- (1) Martin Goodman, 2009, *'Rome & Jerusalem: The Clash of Ancient Civilizations'*, 1st Edition, Penguin: London, pp. 501-503
- (2) Israel Jacob Yuval, Barbara Harshav (Trans.), Jonathan Chipman (Trans.), 2008, *'Two Nations in your Womb: Perceptions of Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages'*, 2nd Edition, University of California Press: Berkeley
- (3) Isidor Kalisch, 1877, *'Sepher Yezirah: A Book on Creation'*, 1st Edition, L. H. Frank: Bowery
- (4) Isidor Kalisch, 1948, [1877], *'Sepher Yezirah: A Book on Creation'*, 1st Edition, Rosicrucian Supply Bureau: San Jose
- (5) Sefer Yezirah 1:1
- (6) Ibid. 1:6
- (7) Ibid. 1:3
- (8) Discussed by; for example, Brian Levack, 1994, *'The Witch-Hunt in Early Modern Europe'*, 2nd Edition, Longman: New York, pp. 29-35 and Robert Thurston, 2001, *'Witch, Wicce, Mother Goose: The Rise and Fall of Witch Hunts in Europe and North America'*, 1st Edition, Longman: New York, pp. 27-39.
- (9) Sefer Yezirah 6: 10
- (10) Ibid.
- (11) Ibid. 1:3
- (12) Ibid. 6:9
- (13) Ibid. 1:1
- (14) Ibid. 1:2
- (15) Ibid. 1:3
- (16) Ibid. 1:4; a similar list of *'opposites'* is given later in Ibid 4:2-3
- (17) The obvious reasons for these being regarded as *'infinite'* are firstly that the time of the end is to be chosen by Yahweh and only he knows when that will be so it is therefore effectively infinite. Where-as *'height'* and *'depth'* is more of a bad translation of the Hebrew text which would be better loosely translated as *'sky'* to give a sense of the meaning. What the author of the Sefer Yezirah means is that the height to the sky is infinite as the sky is, because one cannot see the end of it.
- (18) Sefer Yezirah 1:4
- (19) Ibid. 1:5
- (20) Ibid. 1:7
- (21) Ibid. 1:5
- (22) Ibid. 1:8
- (23) Ibid.
- (24) In the relatively small scholarly field of the history and practice of jewish magic one of the classics still remains Alexander Trachtenberg's, 1938, *'Jewish Magic and Superstition: A Study*

in Folk Religion', 1st Edition, Behrman's Jewish Book House: New York. Other more modern commentaries still do not rival the clarity and wealth of detail presented by Trachtenberg who ironically enough was a jew with a sense of humour when writing about the absurd and often hilarious theories of his fellow members of the tribe.

(25) Sefer Yezirah 1:8; 2:1

(26) Ibid. 2:5

(27) Moshe Idel, 1990, '*Golem: Jewish Magical and Mystical Traditions of the Artificial Anthropoid*', 1st Edition, State University of New York Press: New York, pp. 295-297

(28) Christina Hole, 1945, '*Witchcraft in England*', 1st Edition, B. T. Batsford: London, p. 16

(29) Abraham David (Ed.), Leon Weinberger (Trans.), Dena Orden (Trans.), 1993, '*A Hebrew Chronicle from Prague, c. 1615*', 1st Edition, University of Alabama Press: Tuscaloosa, for example folio 4a:3 (p.22), which declares that Yahweh forced the King of Prague to punish the jews '*for their iniquities*'.

(30) Sefer Yezirah 1:2

(31) For an excellent summary of Calvin's ideas in and around the concept of predestination see Bruce Gordon, 2009, '*John Calvin*', 1st Edition, Yale University Press: New Haven.

(32) Sefer Yezirah 2:6

Some Tips on Debating Jews

Wednesday, 30 November 2011

Every so often I get asked about why I tend to debate so aggressively with jews and seem to be overly intellectually brutal; to the point of cruelty, with them. I think it is a matter I need to clear up with a short post on the matter.

Firstly let us get one thing absolutely clear: jews are not some abstract opponent; like say the '*Illuminati*', who you can pretend to argue with and '*expose*' but are rather a very real entity with quite real influence and apologists counted not by the dozen, but by the thousand. As such the kook who argues the reality of satanic ritual abuse by mythical secret cults has at worst to deal with a highly-educated debunker who argues with them for fun or ideological/intellectual reasons. However with jews one is facing this '*worst case*' scenario as standard and also the strong possibility of repercussions on one's self from explicitly jewish pressure groups who eagerly decry all things critical of jewry and pressure the unaware into placing critics in personal and social hot water.

As the jew is a real opponent who does in fact have their own state which will protect them and also plenty of fellow members of the tribe with deep pockets and deeper influence; which they can use if they perceive it to be to their benefit to do so. Then it is hardly surprising that serious critics of the jews rarely use their real names in this day and age of jewry rampant.

Secondly my aggressive style is a highly-calculated tactic and based on a lot of experience talking with and debating jews on numerous different subjects: often unrelated to jewry. From this experience and my own research I have gleaned the knowledge that jews specialise in wriggling around in undefined terms, nit-picking and aggressive accusation when in an

argument. The purpose of this; of course, is to force their opponent on the defensive and to justify their arguments to the jew as opposed to vice versa.

Thus in order to counter act this I use a very aggressive and polemical style that maintains; I hope, its intellectual value, entertains the reader and also forces the jew or philo-Semite concerned into an intellectual corner from which there is little chance of escape. Thus when the proverbial jew slaps me I tend to give him an intellectual broken nose in return.

Thirdly the jewish habit of nit-picking and aggressive accusation is so effective as a debating strategy; as a rule of thumb, because it allows the jew to attack the '*lack of knowledge*' and '*ignorance*' of their opponents by finding gaps in their knowledge and understanding then using that as a rhetorical and propagandistic device to discredit them.

Aggressively attacking straight back by highlighting gaps in their knowledge and understanding renders this jewish debating strategy at least null and void if not counter-productive for the jew concerned. This counter-attacking is particularly potent when you can easily demonstrate that the jew's attack on you is actually made from a position of ignorance on their part. This is the way to attack them if you can, but even if you know little about the jewish question: picking up the average jew and philo-Semite's mistakes is fairly easily done by simply taking their claims to their logical conclusions.

Fourthly following this I should highlight that reading a few *standard* books on jewry either from the academic or popular literature will help you immensely in debating jews as you will have a better grasp of the assumptions and ideas that underlies the jew's argument and as such are in a far superior position to eviscerate his claims six-ways-to-Sunday.

Fifthly don't get side-tracked onto irrelevant issues from the original points/theses under consideration as this is a common debate tactic; used by both jews and non-jews, to turn their inferior debating position into an improved and/or superior one. Keep bringing the jew back to the original contention under debate and refuse to get dragged into say the Israeli-Palestinian conflict from a debate originally on the so-called '*holocaust*'. No matter how interesting the diversion might be: don't be fooled. It is a tactic to put you at a disadvantage and their attempting to do so this indicates that their position on your original topic was weakly defended and they are trying to force you to attack them where they are intellectually much stronger.

Finally never go on the defensive when a jew attacks you. When he screams you are a '*Nazi*' don't simply '*deny*' it: chastise him for resorting to name-calling when he knows he is in the wrong and point out that such tactics are the typical resort of jews in general and point to prominent examples of jews using this kind of name-calling to get out of point-on-point debate like Alan Dershowitz and Deborah Lipstadt.

In short when debating jews: give no quarter and expect none in return.

From the Archive: A.K. Chesterton's 'Learned Elders and the B.B.C.'

Thursday, 1 December 2011

Arthur Keith Chesterton; a cousin of the better-known popular Catholic writer Gilbert Keith (G.K.) Chesterton, was one of the greatest intellectuals of his generation: in many respects his abilities as a thinker and a writer outshine even his celebrated cousin's. Chesterton was a member and leader of the British Union of Fascists from its inception till after the Second World War: when he founded the League of Empire Loyalists to fight against the abandonment of the British Empire by the then government. Among other interests Chesterton kept up was the publication of a nationalist literature through the Candour Publishing Company, which also produced a periodical of the same name: '*Candour*'.

Candour often contained Chesterton and others' commentary on the Jewish question and while Chesterton publicly repudiated anti-Semitism after the Second World War he never stopped seeing the Jew as a threat to European civilisation; and specifically the British Empire, that needed to be recognised and dealt with. It may surprise some to know that Chesterton was not a believer in the factual nature of the Protocols of Zion. The article that I reproduce below was written and published by Chesterton in '*Candour*' on the 9th of June 1961. The copy of it that I have obtained is from a reprint of the article in pamphlet form by the Britons Publishing Society in the same year it was published with the addition of a reply to Chesterton and his rejoinder to that criticism. I reproduce the full pamphlet below to bring an excellent piece of anti-Jewish writing back from obscurity and to the forefront of anti-Semitism.

The Learned Elders and the B.B.C.

As the B.B.C. in its wisdom or lack of it has devoted an entire peak listening hour to the subject of the Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion, an opportunity would seem to be offered to Candour to add a few comments to the discussion, and perhaps furnish a corrective for some of the more flagrant excesses of Broadcasting House propaganda, which such an event naturally incubates. Its Director-General, Hugh Carleton Greene, having declared that the B.B.C. would never be neutral where Jewish interests were involved, nobody should have been surprised to discover that the aim of the programme was not merely to present the Protocols of Zion as a forgery but to have them uttered as the melodramatic ravings of a maniac. Whatever may be their origin, the thought behind the Protocols is cool and clear, so that, in attempting to discredit them as "*The Great Lie*", Broadcasting House itself is seen to be by no means unversed in the dishonourable arts of suggestion falsi.

Outright Lying

Indeed, the programme contained some outright lying. For instance, this concerning the Berne trial of some young men who had been charged with distributing the Protocols as indecent literature (which in the pornographic sense they certainly are not): "*The fact that the Protocols were indeed a complete forgery was pronounced fully proved by the court in Berne and later by the court of appeal in Geneva.*" The court of appeal made no such pronouncement. Nor was it, to the best of my knowledge a Geneva court, but the Berne Cantonal Tribunal. The Tribunal reversed the magistrate's finding (about the fact of indecent literature) and ruled that the question

of the authenticity of the Protocols was entirely irrelevant. It added that on this subject it rejected the conclusions of both sides. That, as it happens, is my own position and the position of most other students of the Jewish problem.

When first I read the explanation of Nilus made in 1905, as to how he came by the documents, the thought occurred to me that the evidence was pretty thin and unsatisfactory, not to be accepted without confirmation which in fact has never been forthcoming, and that is still my view. Never for one moment did I suppose that the teachings which they contain were delivered to a Zionist Congress in Basle in 1897, or any other year, by Theodore Herzl. Dr. Herzl, as the Jews rightly affirm, was not that kind of man, although there is evidence that he did not have an uncanny sense of the shape of things to come. But when I later read Jewish attempts to disprove the authenticity of the Protocols my critical faculty was even less satisfied than it had been by the evidence of Nilus, and as for last week's B.B.C. "*exposure*" – it stank to Heaven of mendacity.

The truth is that nobody now living knows for certain when and where the Protocols originated, and sensible people don't care a damn. Broadcasting House, indubitably at the instance of Jewry, made a great mistake when it decided to arrange a programme on the subject, and it may have been a recognition of this fact that led it, in the event, to turn the whole thing into a boisterous melodrama overstepping the bounds of farce. This in turn was also a mistake, for if the Protocols were nothing more than the ravings of a maniac, why should the Jews make repudiation of them so desperately serious a task and why should the B.B.C. devote a whole peak listening hour to the subject?

Because the voice entrusted with speaking the text of the Protocols frequently rose from comically hissing, sibilant whispers to frantic shrieks, thoughtful people with attentive minds must surely soon have surmised that a deliberate attempt was being made to guy or obscure the meaning and therefore would have listened all the more determinedly to the actual words. The event, indeed, was yet another instance of an almost insane overplaying of the Jewish hand. Whatever the effect intended, the effect contrived was one of sustained special pleading and deadly venom.

It is, with submission, impossible for any intelligent person, aware of what is happening in the world, to read or listen to the reading of the Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion without being astounded by their prophetic insight, their knowledge of the weaknesses in Gentile society, their proposed techniques for exploiting those weaknesses, and their adumbration of the methods of securing policy objectives which have either been achieved or are on the eve of achievement. I write "adumbration", because although the spirit animating the Protocols survives intact, the actual mechanisms at the disposal of the policy-makers have progressed far beyond the imagination of the "*Elders of Zion*", whoever they may have been. For example, the B.B.C. itself! The B.B.C. as a weapon is better than hunger. Subtle though the authors of the Protocols were, their successors have in radio and television the means of much greater subtlety. For that reason, perhaps, we should be grateful to Broadcasting House for unconsciously offsetting some of its perpetual poisoning of the public ear by a programme which broke all the rules and of which the "*Learned Elders*" would scarcely have approved. This kind of action, like the Eichmann trial, is the recurring madness of the Jew.

Let me quote some passages from the Protocols, passages the meaning and significance of which cannot be altogether destroyed even by a voice imported by the B.B.C. to suggest gibbering insanity. Here is one which describes a policy end and some part of the means of securing it:

"What form of administrative rule can be given to communities in which corruption has penetrated everywhere, communities where riches are attained only by the clever surprise tactics of semi-swindling tricks; where looseness reigns: where morality is maintained by penal measures and harsh laws but not by voluntarily accepted principles: where the feeling toward faith and country are obliterated by cosmopolitan convictions?"

What form of rule is to be given to these communities if not that despotism which I shall describe to you later? We shall create an intensified centralisation of government in order to grip in our hands all the forces of the community. We shall regulate mechanically all the actions of the political life of our subjects by new laws. These laws will withdraw one by one all the indulgences and liberties which have been permitted by the goyim, and our kingdom will be distinguished by a despotism of such magnificent proportions as to be at any moment and in every place in a position to wipe out any goyim who oppose by deed or word...

Moreover, the art of directing masses and individuals by means of cleverly manipulated theory and verbiage, by regulations of life-in-common and all sorts of other quirks, in all which the goyim understand nothing, belong likewise to the specialists of our administrative brain..."

What is this if not the definition long before 1917 of an objective attained by the Bolshevik regime? Mr. Sydney Salomon, of the Board of Deputies of British Jews, once attacked me with vehemence in the Journal of the Institute of Journalists because I had drawn attention to the Judaic inspiration of, and participation in, that regime.

Authoritative Voice

Yet we have the evidence of a voice more authoritative than my own. *"It would seem almost as if the gospel of Christ and the gospel of anti-Christ were destined to originate among the same people, and that this mystic and mysterious race had been chosen for the supreme manifestations of the divine and diabolical... From the days of Spartacus-Weishaupt to those of Karl Marx, and down to Trotsky (Russia), Bela Kuhn (Hungary), Rosa Luxembourg (Germany), and Emma Goldman (United States), this world-wide conspiracy for the overthrow of civilisation and for the reconstruction of society on the basis of arrested development, of envious malevolence, and impossible equality, has been steadily growing. It played, as a modern writer, Mrs. Nesta Webster, has so ably shown, a definitely recognisable part in the tragedy of the French Revolution. It has been the mainspring of every subversive movement during the nineteenth century; and now at last this band of extraordinary personalities from the underworld of the great cities of Europe and America have gripped the Russian people by the hair of their heads and have become practically the undisputed masters of that enormous empire. There is no need to exaggerate the part played in the creation of Bolshevism by these international and for the most part atheistical Jews. It is certainly a very great one; it probably outweighs all others."* The

author of that passage was none other than Winston Spencer Churchill, writing in the Illustrated Sunday Herald of February 8, 1920. Churchill has no doubt the best of reasons for long ago banishing such truths from his mind.

“Envious malevolence and impossible equality”? The *“Learned Elders”* also speak of these matters.

“The weapons in our hands are limitless ambitions, burning greediness, merciless vengeance, hatred and malice”.

But they understand well enough, and state with frankness that the concept of *“equality”* is also among their weapons.

“In all corners of the earth the words ‘Liberty, Equality, Fraternity’ brought to our ranks, thanks to our blind agents, whole legions who bore our banners with enthusiasm. And all the time these words were canker-worms at work boring into the well-being of the goyim, putting an end everywhere to peace, quiet, solidarity, and destroying all the foundations of the goya states. As you will see later, this helped us to our triumph: it gave us the possibility, among other things, of getting into our hands the master-card – the destruction of the privileges, or in other words of the very existence, of the aristocracy of the goyim, that class which was the only defence peoples and countries had against us. On the ruins of the natural and genealogical aristocracy of the goyim we have set up the aristocracy of our educated classes, headed by the aristocracy of money”.

If that, to the mind of Hugh Carleton Greene, is the raving of a lunatic I can only remark that there is method in it, and little truth!

Economic Warfare

The part played by economic warfare and the manipulation of money is stressed repeatedly in the Protocols:

“We shall soon begin to establish huge monopolies, reservoirs of colossal riches, upon which even large fortunes of the goyim will dependent to such an extent that they will go to the bottom together with the credit of the States on the day after the political smash... The aristocracy of the goyim, as a political force, is dead... but as landed proprietors they can still be harmful to us from the fact that they are self-sufficing in the resources upon which they live. It is essential, therefore, for us at whatever cost to deprive them of their land. This object will be best attained by increasing the burdens upon landed property – in loading lands with debts. These measures will check land-holding and keep it in a state of humble and unconditional submissions...”

What we want is that industry should drain off from the land both labour and capital and by speculation transfer into our hands all the money in the world, and thereby throw all the goyim into the ranks of the proletariat... To complete the ruin of the industry of the goyim we shall bring to the assistance of speculation and luxury which we have developed among the goyim,

that greedy demand for luxury which is wallowing up everything. We shall raise the rate of wages, which, however will not bring any advantage to the workers for, at the same time, we shall produce a rise in prices of the first necessities of life... We shall further undermine artfully and deeply sources of production, by accustoming the workers to anarchy and to drunkenness, and side by side therewith taking all measures to extirpate from the face of the earth all the educated forces of the goyim. In order that the true meaning of things may not strike the goyim before the proper time, we shall mask it under an alleged ardent desire to serve the working classes and the great principles of political economy about which our economic theorists are carrying on an energetic propaganda”.

Quite a number of current trends and developing policies are taken care of in that passage – take-over bids, the rationalization schemes of P.E.P. and Harold Macmillan launched in the ‘thirties, the latter’s election-boast of more and more T.V. sets, washing-machines and refrigerators, galloping inflation, reckless wage claims, the attack on the land, the Socialist masquerade as class-warriors, the recent formation of people’s trusts, the destruction of traditional leadership.

Nor are the Protocols silent about the need to bedevil the public mind by confusionist tactics.

“In order to put public opinion in our hands we must bring it into a state of bewilderment by giving expression from all sides to so many contradictory opinions and for such length of time as will suffice to make the goyim lose their heads in the labyrinth and come to see that the best thing is to have no opinion of any kind in matters political, which it is not given to the public to understand, because they are understood only by him who guides the public. This is the first secret”.

Nobody who has endeavour to persuade people of the dangers confronting them in this disastrous age can fail to pay tribute to the thoroughness with which the job of disorientating public opinion has been performed. Then there is the second secret:

“The second secret requisite for the success of our government is comprised in the following: To multiply to such an extent national failings, habits, passions, conditions of civil life, that it will be impossible for anyone to know where he is the resulting chaos, so that the people in consequence will fail to understand one another. This measure will also service us in another way, namely, to sow discord in all parties, to dislocate all collective forces which are still unwilling to submit to us, and to discourage any kind of personal initiative which might in any degree hinder in our affair.

There is nothing more dangerous than personal initiative: if it has genius behind it, such initiative can do more than can be done by millions of people among whom we have sown discord. We must so direct the education of the goyim communities that whenever they come upon a matter requiring initiative they may drop their hands in despairing impotence”.

Yes, we can also confirm that success in applying the second secret is apparent in every department of contemporary life, even to the extent of so confounding and mentally caponizing

the people that in the United Kingdom they allow tens of thousands of coloured immigrants, many of them evil, to pour into their country every year, in the Rhodesias they prepare the way for Black domination and in Kenya they get ready to flee before the onrush of enfranchised savagery. They have all been mentally bludgeoned out of the use of their wits.

Corrupting Youth

The “*Learned Elders*” believe in starting the corrupting process early:

“We have fooled, bemused and corrupted the youth of the goyim by rearing them in principles and theories which are known to us to be false although it is by us that they have been inculcated...”

In order to effect the destruction of all collective forces except ours, we shall emasculate the first stage of collectivism – the universities, by re-educating them in a new direction. Their official and professors will be prepared for their business by detailed secret programmes of action from which they will not for a moment with immunity diverge, not by one iota. They will be appointed with especial precaution and will be so placed as to be wholly dependent upon the Government...

The ill-guided acquaintance of a large number of persons with questions of policy creates utopian dreamers and bad subjects, as you can see for yourselves from the example of the universal education in this direction of the goyim. We must introduce into their education all those principles which have so brilliantly broken up their order. But when we are in power we shall remove every kind of disturbing subject from the course of education and shall make out of the youth obedient children of authority, loving him who rules as the support and hope of peace and quiet”.

How many universities in the world escape this reconditioning? Pretoria, perhaps. And Stellenbosch. But neither, I would say, for very long.

Then the “Elders” turn their minds to the intelligentsia:

“The part played by the liberals, utopian dreamers, will be finally played out when our government is acknowledged. Till such time they will continue to do us good service. Therefore we shall continue to direct their minds to all sorts of vain conceptions of fantastic theories, new and apparently progressive: for have we not with complete success turned the brainless heads of the goyim with progress, till there is not among the goyim one mind able to perceive that under this word lies a departure from truth in all cases where it is not a question of material inventions, for truth is one, and in it there is no place for progress. Progress, like a fallacious idea, serves to obscure truth so that none may know it except us...

When we come into our kingdom our orators will expound great problems which have turned

humanity upside down in order to bring it at the end under our beneficent rule. Who will ever suspect then that all these peoples were stage-managed by us according to a political plan which no one has so much as guessed at in the course of many centuries?"

Well, certainly the optimists who run the New Statesman, the Spectator and other such papers have no suspicion whatever that the haze of unreality which surrounds them and their readers had its predetermined end.

The Objective

What, to use a colloquialism, are all these plottings of the “Elders” in aid of? They themselves supply the answer:

“By all these means we shall so wear down the goyim that they will be compelled to offer us international power of a nature that will enable us without violence gradually to absorb all the State forces of the world and to form a Super-Government. In place of the rulers of today we shall set up a bogey which will be called the Super-Government Administration. Its hands will reach out in all directions like nippers and its organisation will be of such colossal dimensions that it cannot fail to subdue all the nations of the world.”

There it is – World Government. What are the Common Market, Euratom, the Coal and Steel Community, NATO, SEATO, the Soviet empires, the United Nations, if they are not either steps or alternative lines of approach to One World – a Jew-dominated world?

In truth, however, we do not need the Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion to tell us of these things, which form part of what is now declared policy, further by pressures no longer altogether concealed. I have never based any part of Candour’s case on the Protocols, for the simple reason that I know nothing of their origin and care less. What interests me, and what calls forth my own fighting spirit, is what I have discerned of the organised use of evil to subvert Western civilisation and bring our traditional values crashing to the ground so that a totally different, a blood-chilling and hateful, influence may henceforward dominate the world. The Protocols may be fake, a fabrication, call them what you will. But they are not, as the B.B.C. presented them, mad, in the sense of being divorced from the realities of subversion and revolution. Lacking though they may be in authority, they yet march in step with the unfolding modern conspiracy of which they are a prophetic utterance.

Statesmen like Churchill and Lloyd George, writers like Belloc and Wickham Steed, and editors like H. A. Gwynne; Jews themselves of the calibre of Disraeli and Oscar Levy, have all contributed their testimony to the fact of Jewish power, of which there is now a vast accumulation of evidence.

What we have to watch is that the facts of this power are not derided or rejected as a result of devices such as that the B.B.C. gives a fall hour to knocking down what is for all intents and purposes a skittle, but accords never a split second to those of us who would be competent to trace in actual policy the essential teachings, and many of the mechanisms embodied in the Protocols. If the desire to achieve objectivity animated Broadcasting House, would it not have

taken care to ensure that the programme made provision for a dispassionate assessment of this curious relationship? But then, of course, Hugh Carleton Greene on behalf of the B.B.C. has disavowed the intention of an objective appraisal of Jewish matters. Another test is that not one national newspaper in the land dares to comment on the Carleton Greene dictum or to publish a single line critical of Jewry. Here, surely, is an established fact of power.

Zionism's Supreme End

Two other points are worth answering. The promoters of the B.B.C. programme were no doubt sincere, if ignorant, in putting forward the view that *"the Protocols contradict all that Zionism stands for, above all a national home of modest geographical pretensions for the Jewish people. Zionism was and still is hostile to international Jewry, which was vital to the non-existent Elders."* This, I submit, is nonsense. There is proof that the entire international machinery of Jewry was used to defeat the British Government's attempt to hold some kind of a ring for the Palestinian Arabs, and the United States Government, with virtually every European Government, including that of the Soviet Union, was suborned to this end. General Sir Frederick Morgan disclosed the misuse of UNRRA in the Zionist cause, and later – which may be considered significant – he revealed the Communist espionage network which muscled-in on UNRRA's organisational facilities. No doubt there are some Zionists for whom the State of Israel is the supreme end, but they are not among the more instructed. The informed bear in mind the messianic predictions of their race, and the unique international dispositions of World Jewry enable them the more effectively to press for the establishment of international agencies which they dominate, leading to World Government, which they also intend to dominate. It would be quite unbelievable for a people as astute as the Jews to possess and then leave it to rust for want of exercise. Here again we do not require the Protocols of instruct us.

The second point is this. Those who compiled the B.B.C. programme made the following unwarranted assertion:

"Accusations in ordinary politics are aimed at groups and peoples able to reply because they are real people. When a McCarthy refers to lists of highly-placed traitors who don't exist; when a Fascist demagogue refers to octopus-like conspiracies of un-named because imagined enemies; when weekly journalists try to make their readers' flesh creep with awful stories of conspiring bogey-men called The Establishment, and when forgers report fictitious meetings at which bloodthirsty and annihilating decisions are taken by mysterious and powerful beings, and when the evil of mass suspicion of one race by another is introduced by such means then we are going far beyond the tussle of politics. Since the accused are non-existent, the defence is silent, and suspicion multiplies. We are opening dark places in the mind. We are exciting superstitions and instincts that lie deep in the human nature and which it is the purpose of civilisation to render harmless."

Did McCarthy in fact refer to lists of highly-placed traitors who did not exist? What Congressional records should we consult for the evidence? I do not know in what category Candour is placed, but it can scarcely be said that we fail to name those whose policies we attack. The motive behind the passage is clear enough. It is to suggest cowardice and delinquency in Gentile patriots who feel obliged to take a stand against Jewish power. The

innuendo of cowardice we can laugh at, but the notion that it is the purpose of civilisation to “render harmless” our criticism should be considered in a more serious light. Jews have long cherished the ambition of making comments hostile to their influence illegal and in some countries they have already succeeded. As might be expected, the Protocols, which provided for so much, provide also for this situation:

“In order to destroy the prestige of heroism for political crime, we shall send it for trial in the category of thieving, murder, and every kind of abominable and filthy crime. Public opinion will then confuse in its conception this category of crime with the disgrace attaching to every other and will brand it with the same contempt.”

The Soviet Union has gone much further, making “political crime” (opposition to tyranny?) the worst of all the offences and placing political prisoners at the mercy of the most brutal criminals. Again we see that in more senses than one do events tend to catch up with, and overtake, the pronouncements of the “*Learned Elders*”. On those grounds alone, to attempt to argue a case for the authenticity of the Protocols is a foolish endeavour. What cannot be dismissed as faked are the international policies which relentlessly push mankind into One World, and it is these policies, not the Protocols, upon which we should rely in our fight against the World Government to be.

All to be Controlled

Will Hugh Carleton Greene not allow us just twenty minutes on the air to explain the basis of that fight? Good heavens no! The truth would serve to make us free – and freedom forms no part of the design for the future governance of mankind. All is to be controlled, and the control will perhaps not be so very different from that foreseen by the mysterious “*Learned Elders of Zion*”, quite irrespective of whether they were the Sanhedrin or some gang of Gentile forgers inspired by prophecy.

Broadcasting House Replies

Our leading article in the issue of June 9 was a commentary on the recent B.B.C. programme which set out to prove that the document known as the “*Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*” was a forgery. I expressed our lack of interest in the origins of this strange work, and sought to focus attention instead on the extent to which its precepts have been, and are being, incorporated in internationalist policies, such as the drive towards World Government. And intermediate steps to destroy national sovereignty through merging national will in various functional bodies, which make possible the exercise of military control. I also pointed to the remarkable similarity between the teaching of the Protocols and the ordering of affairs in the Soviet Union, which came into being some years after their publication.

Both Sides

Last week the B.B.C. sent me a letter replying to some of the points made in my article, and for the sake of fairness, not wishing our readers to be made aware of only our own side of the argument, this reply is published in full, together with my further comments. Signed by Mr.

Christopher Sykes, it reads:

"The British Broadcasting Corporation,

Broadcasting House, London W.1.

June 13, 1961,

Dear Mr. Chesterton,

I have read "Learned Elders and the B.B.C." in Candour of June 9. I am the author of the broadcast script to which you take exception. Allow me to make a few observations on your article:

1. First I should point out that the programme was part of a series on fakes and forgeries. The choice of subject indicated an interest in forgeries in general, not any special preoccupation with "The Protocols". There was no Jewish pressure behind the choice of subject. I am not a Jew, nor is the producer or general editor of the series, nor is the head of the B.B.C. department in which I work.

2. As regards the assertion of forgery by two Swiss courts, I own that I have not looked up official records but have been guided by reports by independent authorities (not Jewish ones by the bye). I have understood that as regarding forgery the finding of the first court was upheld by the Court of Appeal while not allowing that "The Protocols" may be classed as obscene literature. If they did reject the conclusions of both sides, I take it that they did so as a matter of legal form, but not in consideration of the weight of evidence.

3. You say that most students of the Jewish question reject the conclusions of both sides. I do not think they would so if they studied the matter for any length of time.

4. It is distressing to find that Sir Winston Churchill was once deceived by the notion that the Bolshevik Revolution was primarily a Jewish affair, but not wholly surprising. Other eminent statesmen, besides that great man, were under this impression at the time. Appearances were deceptive. Later events have shown the absurdity of confounding Communism and Jewry. The Jews seem to have had little influence under Stalin who died, if the accounts of his last illness are authentic, in a somewhat anti-Semitic mood.

5. Those who find “*The Protocols of the Elders*” credible are, I believe, suffering from a state of mind describable as “muddle through simplicity”. There are many shrewd political comments in “*The Protocols*”, and yet more in the original Joly, from which they were copied. Many Governments, many parties, many groups of men have been guilty of many of the abominations in which the “Elders” exulted, and I suppose that, to date, Adolf Hitler and the Nazi Party have been more guilty of more of these crimes in one regime than any other of the thousands of agents of evil of whom we have record. The childish thing about “*The Protocols*”, as about Joly’s satire on Napoleon III, is to ascribe all these crimes to one agency. One sees the same “muddle through simplicity” in some Marxist propaganda: all history as a banker’s plot. I believe that the first person to play this game was the Abbe Barruel who furnished “proof” that the French Revolution was exclusively the result of a Free Mason plot!

6. When I said in the “closing speech for the prosecution” that it was the duty of civilisation to tame certain dark impulses of the mind, I was not implying that all criticism should be silenced, but that it was iniquitous to obtain a following by arousing irrational hatreds, to which most men can be prone.

If you choose to publish this letter you may, but if so I would ask you to publish it in full.

Yours Sincerely,

(Signed) Christopher Sykes,”

Mr. Sykes’s letter is courteous and sincere but not at all well informed. I will reply to his points as he numbers them.

(1) Noted and accepted without comment, except as to enquire whether Mr. Sykes’s services were utilized as those of an expert on “*forgeries in general*” or as those of an expert on Jewish problems.

(2) Why does Mr. Sykes not name his “*independent authorities*”? As they have fed him with wrong information, how much trust does he still repose in them? I cannot compete in thought-reading about what was in the mind of the Appeal Court, but prefer to believe that it meant what it said.

(3) The desideratum, as Point 2 would suggest, would seem to be not length of study but exactness of scholarship!

(4) How does it come about that Winston Churchill was deceived about the Bolshevik Revolution, that M. Oudendyk, Netherlands Ambassador at Petrograd (now Leningrad) during the Bolshevik Revolution, was deceived, that the late Wickham Steed, former editor of *The Times*, was deceived, that Sisson, the American diplomat in Moscow during the Revolution, was

deceived, and that the world had had to await the unsupported statement of Mr. Christopher Sykes to learn about this deception?

It would be illuminating to discover whether Mr. Sykes has ever read the report of M. Oudendyk, dated Sept. 6, 1918, and published as a White Paper by the British Government. I quote from it: *"I consider that the immediate suppression of Bolshevism is the greatest issue now before the world, not even excluding the War, which is still raging, and unless, as above stated, Bolshevism is nipped in the bud immediately, it is bound to spread in one form or another over the whole world, as it is organised and worked by Jews who have no nationality, and whose one object is to destroy for their own ends the existing order of things."* In what way does Mr. Sykes claim to be a better informed person about the Bolshevik Revolution than was M. Oudendyk?

Continued Support

I agree with Mr. Sykes that most of the Jews originally associated with Lenin and Trotsky later lost out to Stalin and went down in his successive purges. Curiously, however, this fact did not lead to the disenchantment of many Jews elsewhere, who continued to support Communist causes from almost impregnable positions in the United States, notably during the Second World War, and who were active in the leadership of the Communist countries behind the Iron Curtain after the war. I also agree with Mr. Sykes about the absurdity of confounding Communism and Jewry. They should never be confounded, which is not to deny the prodigious role played by Jews in the inspiration and promotion of Communism. If Mr. Sykes is still sceptical, he should ask himself what the Jewish Chronicle meant when it wrote on April 4, 1919: *"There is much in the fact of Bolshevism itself, in the fact that so many Jews are Bolsheviks, in that fact the ideals of Bolshevism at many points are consonant with the finest ideals of Judaism"*.

(5) I understand, and sympathise with, Mr. Sykes's statement of his belief that those who find the Protocols credible suffer from a state of mind describable as *"muddle through simplicity"*. To suppose that any single document furnishes the key to immensely complicated political patterns is, to say the least, naïve. But that does not necessarily invalidate whatever there is in the document which is germane to the present world situation. We have to admit that the tendency of the human mind is to oversimplify the problems that confront it, although I confess that few people irritate me more than the person who says: *"Once you have read the Protocols you understand everything"*. The man capable of making that remark is incapable, I venture to think, of understanding much about anything. Nevertheless, although a candle cannot illuminate the entire empire of the night, it is sometimes a useful thing to have in the house.

The reference to Joly's *"satire on Napoleon III"* is misleading, because there is nothing satirical in the Protocols. Napoleon the Third's scope and powers were circumscribed, whereas the potency of World Jewry lies in its position of power in many lands and the fearful dimensions of this power when it is internationally organized. It is childish, as Mr. Sykes says, to ascribe all the world's evil to *"one agency"*: the affairs of mankind are far too involved and complicated to permit of so facile a diagnosis. But if one kind of policy is pursued through the year it is logical to look for the existence of an activating agency dedicated to that purpose. I set no store by the fact that the shadowy *"Learned Elders"* are regarded by some as constituting just such a cabal, but I do set store by statements such as those of Churchill, Oudendyk, Wickham Steed, and the

Jewish Chronicle concerning the fact of Bolshveism, as I set store by the passage about Jewish power in general: *“The influence of the Jews may be traced in the last outbreak of the destructive principle in Europe [1848 – A.K.C.]. An insurrection takes place against tradition and aristocracy, against religion and property. Destruction of the Semitic principle, extirpation of the Jewish religion, whether in the Mosaic or the Christian form, the natural equality of men and the abrogation of property are proclaimed by the Secret Societies which form Provisional Governments, and men of Jewish Race are found at the head of every one of them. The people of God co-operate with atheists, the most skilful accumulators of property ally themselves with Communists; the peculiar and chosen Race touch the hand of all the scum and low castes of Europe; and all this because they wish to destroy that ungrateful Christianity which owes to them even its name, and whose tyranny they can no longer endure.”* The author of that passage was Benjamin Disraeli and it occurs in *The Life of Lord George Bentinck*. Mr. Sykes would scarcely argue that Disraeli was also *“deceived”*. I believe that Mr. Sykes as an honest man will admit the Protocol savour of the quotation, as of many more that could be taken from the works of Disraeli. My chief complaint about his B.B.C. programme is that it never even hinted at the undoubted spiritual relationship of such facts with the pretensions attributed to the *“Learned Elders”*.

Ancient Propaganda!

Mr. Sykes tells us that he sees the same *“muddle through simplicity”* in Marxist propaganda which interprets all history as a banker’s plot. The propaganda must be incredibly ancient, as I have never encountered it during the thirty years I have been giving my attention to these questions. As international bankers of New York, with their Hamburg and Paris affiliates, financed the Bolshevik Revolution, I would have been astonished had I ever read a Marxist attack on finance-capitalism, as distinct from industrial-capitalism. Sisson is only one of several witnesses about the finding by bankers of the money for the Bolsheviks. I quote from his official report to the U.S. government, a letter written in September, 1917, by J. Furstenberg (later under another name a member of the Soviet government) to one Raphael Scholan:

“Dear Comrade,

The office of the Banking House M. Warburg has opened in accordance with telegram from president of Rheinisch-Westphalian Syndicate an account for the undertaking of Comrade Trotsky. The attorney purchased arms and has organised their transportation and delivery up to Luleo and Vardi. Name to the office in Essen and Son in Luleo, receivers, and a person authorised to receive the money demanded by Comrade Trotsky.

J. Furstenberg.”

Max Warburg was a Hamburg banker, the brother of Paul and Felix Warburg, of the Wall Street firm of Kuhn, Loeb and Co., in which they were partners of Jacob Schiff, who later admitted having financed the overthrow of the Czar. Does nothing of all this suggest to the B.B.C. at least something of the claims of the *“Learned Elders”*?

(6) I agree with all my heart that it is “*iniquitous to obtain a following by arousing irrational hatreds*”, although I would dispute Mr. Syke’s contention that most men can be prone to them. There are people who deplore the proved machinations of Financial Jewry, just as there are people who deplore the invasion of our land by coloured migrants. But to deplore is not the same thing as to hate. I am convinced that for the most part hatred, whether irrational or otherwise, is a matter of propinquity. Hatred of and by Jews (or of and by coloured people) is greatest in those areas where they are most closely packed together: in areas where they seldom if ever come into contact very few take any interest in the others’ existence. As for those of us who actively oppose the international influence of Jews, as we oppose the coloured influx, I perhaps speak with some authority when I say that the hate-merchant when encountered is the biggest of our liabilities and (if we know our job) the one whose going from our midst we lose time in expediting. Mr. Sykes will perhaps accept my assurance that a reading of the “*Learned Elders*” does not normally incite hatred and that in any event we are the first to dub as lunatics those who attempt to argue our case on the basis of the authenticity of the Protocols, strange, disturbing and well worth reading though they be.

Candour has here given the B.B.C. the hospitality of its space to set forth its views in full. How long will it be before Mr. Hugh Carleton Greene, Director-General of the B.B.C., returns the compliment by giving me the opportunity of presenting my own views, as here outlined, at a peak (or any other) listening period?

Postscript

That, so far as the British Broadcasting Corporation was concerned, was the end of the matter. No invitation to the writer of this pamphlet to broadcast was seriously expected and none has been received, while Mr. Sykes was unable to reply further or has been restrained by Broadcasting House.

The refusal of this vast Corporation to allow the other side to be heard was also shown in the letter sent by its Solicitor to Mr. A. W. Gittens, of the Britons Publishing Company (which had been mentioned as the original publishers of the Protocols in the United Kingdom) wherein the B.B.C. declined to make the script available on the grounds – not established by experience – that it is not the Corporation’s practice to provide scripts. Fortunately a private recording had been made and served the same purpose.

After Action Report: ‘Spingola Speaks’ (18/11/2011)

Friday, 2 December 2011

After my first radio appearance with Deanna we both agreed that as it had been successful and educational we would have a second chat in the middle of November. The date agreed upon was the 18th and I duly appeared with Deanna on the show. Once again Deanna was a courteous and understanding host: she directed the discussion a lot more than she did in the first show, but I think from her response after the conclusion of the show to me and her actual questions during it

that she just had a lot she wanted to talk about and ask. (1)

We covered a whole gamut of issues once again ranging from the jewish revolts against the Romans and the trans-national jewish conspiracy (read Cassius Dio if you are interested) which was attendant to these revolts right through to Henry Ford and the Protocols of Zion. I felt the discussions were sometimes too general on occasion, but this is to be expected on talk radio I am assured.

We did; however, have the opportunity to discuss neo-conservatism in a little detail and its relation and intellectual debt to Trotskyism and the Fourth Internationale. I pointed out that the core of the neo-conservative ideology is in fact a direct parallel to Trotskyite doctrines and particularly pointed out that neo-conservatives are preoccupied with '*democracy*' and the use of state power to spread that '*democracy*' across the world.

Of course that form of '*democracy*' is defined strictly in terms of neo-conservative rule; supposedly for the national good, but in reality for the spread of their own power and the fall of the supposed '*undemocratic regimes*' that they target. This is; as I pointed out, a direct parallel to Trotsky's major addition to Marxist theory; '*the Theory of Permanent Revolution*', which was developed in the wake of the failure of 1905 revolution (of which Trotsky was a fairly important figure) against the Tsar.

Trotsky; of course, envisioned that once the '*revolution*' was achieved; based once again on the idea of an intellectual elite governing in the name of the '*proletariat*', it would spread like wildfire and the newly incorporated '*red army*' would roll over the world; Europe in his time specifically, assisted by mass risings of the '*toilers*' the '*class conscious workers*'.

I further pointed out that neo-conservative intellectual theory stipulates that the '*undemocratic regimes*' would be toppled as much by external force as by the '*popular rising*' that the assault of an external force would provoke: thus creating a state supposedly governed by the people for the people (aka a '*dictatorship of the proletariat*' scenario), but in fact ruled by an intellectual elite with a vested interest in neo-conservative ideology and beholden to the state that had applied the external force. However I didn't point out that Trotskyism has always been a heavily jewish form of Marxism; aside from the fact that Trotsky himself was a jew, and many of the major theorists of this school have been in fact been jewish: good examples being Ernst Mandel, Isaac Deutscher and Tony Cliff.

When we moved to take calls: Werner once again called and pointed out in some detail that the jews are the centrality of the problem that faces the world today and that the jewish people's claim to be the '*eternal victims*' are simply rubbish. I agreed and responded; with some vehemence, about the issue of the supposed '*holocaust*', the covering up of the Holodomor and the mass-killings of Germans; both in Central and Eastern Europe, carried out by the Soviet Union that barely anyone outside the families of those affected and scholars tend to know about.

The second call was also interesting and pointed out the fact that a central facet of awakening people to the problem presented by the jews is in fact in connecting with their own interests: as the caller noted that he himself had been awakened to the reality of jewish power in his own

pro-gun ownership activism because so many of the prominent spokespeople for the anti-gun ownership movement are/were jewish and obviously so.

All in all once again I thought it was a very educational show for me and allowed me to develop some of the skills that I lack, which include being clearer in the spoken word as to what I am talking about and developing my rhetorical ability. I hope once again that my appearance on '*Spingola Speaks*' was both as interesting and informative to Deanna's listeners as it was for me as a participant. (2)

References

- (1) You can listen to the show at the Republic Broadcasting Network archives, which are available at the following address: http://republicbroadcasting.org/?page_id=109.
- (2) The schedule for Deanna's show and my future appearances can be found at the following address: http://www.spingola.com/radio_schedule.html.

A Killer Book

Friday, 2 December 2011

I am rarely impressed with how history is written by scholars, but for once I am pleased to report that I am truly amazed at how well it can be written when someone takes the trouble to do so. Indeed I would add that Douglas Starr in his '*The Killer of Little Shepherds*' (1) has lit a shining stylistic beacon for historians alongside more mainstream historical figures like Helmut Walser-Smith in how to write factual work with serious scholarship behind it that is yet a joy to read.

Now strictly speaking the work in question has little to do with the jewish question per se, but it does touch on it in passing in particular the protagonist's; Professor Alexandre Lacassagne, involvement in the Tiszaeszlár jewish ritual murder case and the Dreyfus affair. I must confess that in both cases; which I have not had the opportunity to study thoroughly yet, Lacassagne came down on the philo-Semitic side of the fence. Although in the case of the Dreyfus affair: he certainly came down on the factually correct side I believe it is problematic to assert; as Starr implies, that he chose the '*correct*' side because of his expertise in forensics as he specialised in murder and crimes of the body: not in espionage and documents.

Indeed I would assert that Starr goes too far in imputing to Lacassagne a sort of genius for '*knowing the truth by deductions*' indeed Starr does once assert Lacassagne to have been a real-life French Sherlock Holmes. Quite frankly from my study of what Starr has put forward it seems to me that while Lacassagne was a scientist of no mean ability: he was a man of sentimental morals and attachments to what he perceived as good causes.

A good example is the Dreyfus case in that it divided France between the Dreyfusards and the anti-Dreyfusards: it also split the forensics community as Lacassagne thought Dreyfus innocent but Alphonse Bertillon; who was the originator of the finger and ear print methods in forensics

(in addition to creating the system of forensic photography still used today), thought Dreyfus guilty and published extensively on the subject. (2) While it is clear in retrospect that Lacassagne was correct: he was correct only in that he happened to pick the right side through his support of 'good causes' as opposed to a careful study of the facts. Indeed; as Lindemann has noted, the case against Dreyfus was actually a very strong one until the retrial which acquitted him revealed the true culprit. (3)

So why did Lacassagne take an evidenced stand as opposed to an emotional one?

It is indeed somewhat obvious that Lacassagne was very much a man of his time and far from being infallible was rather more so. In part because he allowed his supposed '*dispassionate regard*' for his subject matter to get in the way of his judgement in cases which were strictly speaking outside of his professional area of expertise. His support of Dreyfus seems to me to have stemmed more from his emotions than his scientific judgement: after all we cannot take a man who is an expert or genius in one area and transliterate that across to other areas now can we? Einstein who was sympathetic to the USSR and an ardent socialist was a genius in physics, but yet very naïve politically.

Why should Lacassagne be any different?

Indeed Lacassagne's unconditional support of von Hoffmann's report in the Tiszaeszlár Jewish ritual murder case suggests this much as Lacassagne himself did not consult the relevant facts, but simply republished Hoffmann's report wholesale in his scholarly journal. Whether or not von Hoffmann was actually correct did not seem to occur to Lacassagne; who didn't investigate the facts of the case himself, but rather he simply relied on one well-written specialist report rather than consult the evidence himself. Did Lacassagne consider for example the objections of Otto Glagau to the report that he wrote in July 1883? (4)

No: of course not. For Lacassagne is not quite the omnipotent man of science and reason that Starr portrays him as, but rather he was a fallible human being whom made honest mistakes and got too passionately involved in subjects that were outside his direct knowledge and purview. It is no stain on Lacassagne's great contribution to forensic science that he made mistakes, but yet why must Starr and philo-Semites like him make their subjects out to be all-knowing a posteriori just for making emotional decisions they like?

It is a silly thing to do and in some senses decreases the value of otherwise excellent scholarship, but fortunately it forms only a minor part of Starr's work and thus can be allowed to pass with qualification and clarification. That said I felt the need to stress that just because Lacassagne believed in something does not mean that it was the scientific thing to do at the time or that it was the correct position in terms of the facts either in the light of a hundred years of history or as they were understood then.

It all comes down to that historical mantra (which I paraphrase from von Ranke): never become too involved with your subject. Report your scholarship accurately, but do so interestingly.

References

(1) Douglas Starr, 2011, *The Killer of Little Shepherds: The Case of the French Ripper and the Birth of Forensic Science*, 1st Edition, Simon & Schuster: New York

(2) Ibid., pp. 65-68

(3) Albert Lindemann, 1997, *Esau's Tears: Modern Anti-Semitism and the Rise of the Jews*, 1st Edition, Cambridge University Press: New York, pp. 231-233

(4) Anon., 1892, *Die Juden und das Christenblut*, 1st Edition, Germanicus Verlag: Leipzig, pp. 27-29. Also see Frederik Gaste, 1934, *Die Wahrheit über die jüdischen Ritualmorde*, 1st Edition, Paul Hochmuth: Berlin, pp. 34-42, which goes into some of the background of the case in more detail. A far more recent scholarly debunk of the philo-Semitic myths and a priori assumptions concerning Jewish ritual murder can be found in Ariel Toaff, Gian Marco Lucchese (Trans.), Pietro Gianetti (Trans.), 2007, *Blood Passover: European Jews and Ritual Murder*, 1st Edition, Società Editrice il Mulino: Bologna and Elliot Horowitz, 2007, *Reckless Rites: Purim and the Legacy of Jewish Violence*, 1st Edition, Princeton University Press: Princeton.

The Jewish Chronicle kvetches about Gilad Atzmon

Tuesday, 6 December 2011

The Jewish Chronicle is Britain's version of the famous New York Jewish Daily Forward; although without originally being a Jewish socialist newspaper, however that may be: it in the last few months has become fairly obsessed with the Israeli musician Gilad Atzmon who is basically a leftist Jew with anarchist sympathies as far as I can ascertain. Atzmon is; of course, best known for being the general darling of anti-Zionist campaigners and personally adheres to the belief that the Jews are not a unique people. He recently wrote a book entitled; *The Wandering Who*, which is of course a clever rhetorical play-on-words for the common literary figure of the Wandering Jew. Atzmon was rather impressed by the work of the highly controversial Israeli historian Shlomo Sand: who in his *The Invention of the Jewish People*, argued; incorrectly in my view, that the Jewish people are not a nation at all and are thus not unique at all. (1)

Suffice to say the theory behind it is all based on the leftist denial of the biological/group basis of the nation state and the false reduction to it as an abstract of somehow no abstract humanity: both of which I personally categorically reject.

Now in two recent articles we've had a wave of weird claims from the Jewish Chronicle: in one Jessica Elgot calls him *'anti-Semitic'*, claims he has a *'core racist commitment'* and worse still he apparently believes in the Protocols of Zion and *'holocaust denial'*. (2) Meaning; of course, that he doesn't fall through the proverbial soap box screaming *'it's all a lie'* at the top of his voice with kosher spittle flying everywhere when somebody criticises Jews and Judaism.

But hang on just a cotton-picking minute: Atzmon denies the validity of race as a way to understand people. It is almost his *raison d'être* in terms of his anti-Zionist campaigning and arguments. The logic Elgot and a quoted *'Jewish anti-Zionist'* (read: Labour/Left-wing Zionist) called Tony Greenstein (stereotypical much?) use is hilarious in the extreme. They claim quite

literally that because Atzmon argues that the jews do not exist as a unique, chosen people (i.e. a nation) and; with obvious irony, calls himself a '*self-hating Jew*' (the usual Zionist charge against any jew who utters a word of criticism about the bandit state of Israel) then he is; in fact, '*racist*' because he rejects the existence of a jewish special identity. (3)

Isn't that the quintessential opposite of '*racism*'?

Of course it is, but yet Zionism; which asserts that the jews are a unique people and thus are entitled to a homeland so they stop wandering the earth being supposedly '*persecuted*', somehow is not '*racist*'. As for the charge of anti-Semitism: well once again it is nonsensical as anti-Semitism; as opposed to anti-Judaism, (4) predicates itself on identifying the jews as a biological people and thus as a problem beyond merely their religion. Atzmon obviously isn't that either as he explicitly rejects the nationhood of the jews.

Although to give Elgot and Greenstein a little bit of credit; as their pedestrian intellects surely need a little bit of an ego boost, they are blindly following the well-trodden path of Zionist logical fiddlesticks backed up with not a little chutzpah. (5) They; of course, associate Atzmon's ironic comment as being literal and therefore they reason; with such logic that I am sure Spinoza would rather drink hemlock than listen to them, that if Atzmon hates himself as a born jew (note the bemusing '*racism*') then he must hate jews and therefore be anti-Semitic.

Goodness: aren't Yahweh's holy horrors so bright and far superior to us '*unclean and impure gentiles*'?

You cannot but help finding Elgot's attack on Lauren Booth; who is obviously a little bit of a fruitcake herself as she seriously thinks the Paedophile Prophet (PBUH) was the Messiah (6) and whose only claim to fame is that she is former Prime Minister Anthony (Tony) Blair's sister-in-law, rather absurd. Oh and she happens to be employed by Iranian State Television, which; of course, Elgot alludes to so as to hint at an '*anti-Semitic*' conspiracy against the jews like the good little paranoid jewess she surely is.

One finds it particularly amusing when Elgot throws out the Protocols of Zion canard; (7) as if that actually mattered, about anyone who believes that jews might actually organise themselves not only defensively but offensively as well. (8) Of course; being quite the intellectual prodigy she is, Elgot then manages to; by her own logic, tell us she believes in the Protocols of Zion.

She tells us that jews aggressively monitor those who say critical; let alone negative, things about them (oh and the bandit state of Israel as well) and actively seek to remove their influence from the '*trade union movement, churches and NGOs*' so that the anti-Zionist movement has to '*acknowledge its anti-Semitic demons*' ('*anti-Semitism*'; of course, meaning anything they want it to mean) and therefore become a little muzzled Yorkshire terrier yapping while some ultra-Orthodox Israeli court sentences it to death for being the '*reincarnation of a secular lawyer*'. (9)

I particularly like the '*Amen*' quote from the Board of Deputies to the effect that anyone who criticises Israel has '*no interest in peace and reconciliation between the Israeli and Palestinian*

people.' I therefore presume that both Elgot and the Board of Deputies believe that Israel's persistent killings of Palestinians and invasions of anyone in the neighbourhood are; in fact, aiding said '*peace and reconciliation*'. Perhaps both Elgot and the Board of Deputies actually support a '*Plan Dalet*' type scenario as outlined by controversial Israeli historian; Ilan Pappé, whereby the jews wipe out the locals like a nation of modern King David's?

Oh, but I thought it was all just misunderstood peace and inter-faith love in the land of rape and honey?

I've often observed that jews frequently ask the same question; '*why do people hate us*', when theorising or trying to irrationalise anti-Semitism, but yet they fail to look at the most basic of reasons (and the one with the least assumptions I might add): that non-jewish attitudes to the jews are generally governed by jewish actions and how; as individuals and as a group, jews interact with gentiles. When a jew swindles a gentile it is hardly rational to claim that the gentile is being irrational to dislike jews based on that experience in much the same way as it is hardly irrational to be afraid of sharks because you got attacked by one once.

It is clear that jews are the ones who tend to be irrational and then project that irrationality on everyone else. After all are we not only gentiles and don't have Yahweh's divine ichor pulsing through our veins?

The irony as always is delicious.

References

- (1) Shlomo Sand, 2010, '*The Invention of the Jewish People*', 1st Edition, Verso: New York
- (2) <http://www.thejc.com/news/uk-news/59320/lauren-booths-attack-points-new-split-psc>
- (3) Ibid.
- (4) An excellent summary of the difference; and the need to make the differential, between the two maybe found in Albert Lindemann, 1997, '*Esau's Tears: Anti-Semitism and the Rise of the Jews*', 1st Edition, Cambridge University Press: New York, pp. 23-32
- (5) For a good discussion of the weird intellectual double-standard that exists in Zionist thought; i.e. jews supporting jewish interests is not racist, but anyone else supporting theirs is, see: Ibid, pp. 6-9
- (6) On the Mohammed and Aisha issue see Robert Spencer, 2006, '*The Truth about Mohammed: Founder of the World's Most Intolerant Religion*', 1st Edition, Regnery: Chicago
- (7) Although one well-known anti-Zionist jew; Israel Shamir, has argued in their favour as of late: see Anon., 2008, '*The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*', 1st Edition, Historical Review Press: Uckfield, pp. 5-17
- (8) For an in-depth discussion of this; although they include effective '*god-fearers*' [gentiles who serve the jews willingly] in their discussion, see Stephen Walt, John Mearsheimer, 2007, '*The Israel Lobby and US Foreign Policy*', 1st Edition, Allen Lane: New York.
- (9) I have covered this case of an ultra-Orthodox court sentencing a dog to death by stoning for being a '*reincarnation*' of a secular jewish lawyer here:
<http://semiticcontroversies.blogspot.com/2011/06/stone-bitch.html>

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

By Hans Blackthorne

Wednesday, 7 December 2011

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.' [17]

'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 assimilator 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 Aggada:3 A heathen is executed on the ruling of one judge, on the testimony of one witness, without a formal warning, on the evidence of a man, but not of a woman, even if he [the witness] be a relation. On the authority of R. Ishmael it was said: [He is executed] even for the murder of an embryo. Whence do we know all this? — Rab Judah answered: The Bible saith, And surely your blood of your lives will I require;4 this shows that even one judge [may try a heathen].5 At the hand of every living thing will I require it: even without an admonition having been given;6 And at the hand of man: even on the testimony of one witness;7 at the hand of man:8 but not at the hand [i.e., on the testimony] of a woman; his brother: teaching that even a relation may testify.’ [\[12\]](#).

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 been 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 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]

References

- [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>
- [12] Babylonian Talmud, Tractate Sanhedrin, 57b
- [13] <http://jewishencyclopedia.com/view.jsp?artid=113&letter=L>
- [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>
- [21] Feldman, Op. Cit., pp. 269-270

Jewish Testimony: Reva Mann

Wednesday, 7 December 2011

In ‘*The Rabbi's Daughter*’ (1) 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. (2) She compares her '*once high cheekbones*' and '*beauty*' to her '*dowdy maid*' appearance now.

It is 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. (3) 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 led 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 convert's 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 that 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 questions 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 give 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 gentle 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 gentle 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 act. 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.

References

- (1) Reva Mann, 2008, '*The Rabbi's Daughter: A true story of sex, drugs and orthodoxy*', 2nd Edition, Hodder & Stoughton: London.
- (2) The jewish Sabbath.
- (3) Much of '*The Rabbi's Daughter*' can be essentially summed up 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.

The Jews of the Gulag Archipelago

Thursday, 8 December 2011

Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn's seminal and best-known work is his monumental three volume tome; *'The Gulag Archipelago'*, which has received innumerable peons of praise from both those who claim that the Soviet Union; at least under Stalin and his successors, was not a socialist state and those who are firmly opposed to communism in any form. Solzhenitsyn's work is unfortunately one of those works of literary genius that everyone praises, claims to have read and have; in fact, only read the first hundred or so pages. This problem has been the subject of an attempted remedy by Solzhenitsyn's English language publisher; Harper Collins, who have released an edited and condensed one volume edition that has removed most of what may be termed *'heavy reading'* from the work. (1)

Unfortunately this really hasn't made the work any more readable in English translation and the selection made is rather repetitive at best, which is perhaps the major defect of the work in general. It is a disjointed series of essays around a common theme and perhaps is best described as a method of catharsis for Solzhenitsyn to come to term with his own experiences in Stalin's gulags. On one score however *'The Gulag Archipelago'* is itself extremely useful and that is in its first-hand account of the role of the jews as both prisoners and masters of the Gulag system.

At first you may gawk at this seeming contradiction in terms: how can the jew be both master and prisoner of Stalin's gulags? Well; like the dichotomy between capitalism and communism, this case is also a false one, because much as a jew in Judaism can be both a jew and an atheist it results from a misunderstanding of the quintessential nature of the beast that it is studying. We know that a jew can be an anti-communist and still a believer in communism for which we have numerous examples like Leon Trotsky, Ernst Mandel, Theodor Adorno, Jay Lovestone to speak of merely a few of the better known cases. So why therefore is it so surprising that the jew was both master and prisoner of the Gulag system?

Indeed: as was the case with such jewish communist figures as Zinoviev, Kamenev, Slansky, Yezhov and others frequently the jewish Gulag master or apologist became a victim of the Gulag system itself. It is a delicious irony that the rapacious egoist nature of jews in general expressed itself so beautifully in the horrific surroundings of the Soviet death camps that Solzhenitsyn describes so well. For yesterday's master was tomorrow's slave and when this change in fortune came the attitude of the jews concerned almost invariably suffered a one hundred and eighty degree shift from being all for *'harsh measures against the reactionaries and counter-revolutionaries'* to crying out for human rights under the *'totalitarian'* system that they themselves had only recently been a key element.

When one considers the supposed *'plight of Soviet jewry'* that began to be a Zionist; and often more generally jewish, hobbyhorse from the late 1960s onwards it becomes intelligible that the jews no longer perceived in general that the *'total assimilationist'* position was valid and turned instead to the jewish ultra-nationalism of the Zionist demagogues. Indeed this time was a period of frequent attacks on Soviet institutions by young jews filled with hate and fanaticism for the impudent gentiles who they perceived had; like Pharaoh, imprisoned Yahweh's holy nation and

was preventing this self-chosen people from returning to Palestine (2) in full to terrorise, pillage and murder the native Arab population. (3)

Indeed works of this period; such as Elie Wiesel's efforts (4), make direct comparisons to the plight of the Israelites under Pharaoh and endeavour to suggest that as Yahweh didn't seem too bothered that it was up to the other '*free*' members of the tribe to scream at the top of their lungs about '*persecution*' and then have the; quite literal, chutzpah to invoke the alleged '*holocaust*' against the very people who according to their own historical theories had '*saved*' them from German attempts to make them work for a living. (5)

It thus clear that this change of heart among the jews came from material considerations rather some all-embracing change of heart on their part. If we consider that the essential element in the choice of jewish strategy made by individual jews is one of: '*what do I think is good for jews?*' Then it becomes clear that before the February and then the October revolutions of 1917 the solution to their perceived troubles was debatable because both of the innovative solutions; Zionism and Socialism, were purely theoretical in nature and thus open to considerable elasticity of interpretation. (6)

However with the advent of Marxism-Leninism as a ruling ideology in the Russian Empire; soon to be renamed the Soviet Union, the debating terrain shifted as the jews were a conspicuous element in the new revolutionary government (7) and continued to be so throughout Lenin and Stalin's reign (8) although they did begin to obviously decrease in overt power from the time of Stalin's 1937 purges which swept aside much of the jewish old guard and then most of the rest of the partial de-judification of the USSR was achieved somewhat unintentionally by Stalin's '*rootless cosmopolitan*' and '*Doctor's Plot*' purges. (9) Or to quote Orlando Figes' apposite summary: '*Not many Jews were Bolsheviks, but many of the leading Bolsheviks were Jews.*' (10)

This new debating terrain was altered by the fact that now the socialists had created; and were able to look to, a homeland of their own in the form of the USSR. If the USSR continued its early promise to be a perceived new land of milk and honey for jews then it would prove that the socialist jews had been right all along: however this tie of socialist jewry to the philo-Semitism and fortunes USSR was to prove their undoing with the gradual de-judification of the Soviet Union that was gradually taken place, but most particularly at the high tide of Communism in 1949 when all jewry; even the most rabid Zionist, were publicly thankful to the USSR for '*saving them*' from getting dirt under their fingernails.

It is one of those odd coincidences in history; that happen more often than prefer to think, that Stalin's '*rootless cosmopolitan*' campaign coincided with the desperate physical, intellectual, political and economic terrorism that had been unleashed by the now desperate and zealot-like Zionists across the world in order to create their '*homeland for the jewish people*'. While Stalin was liquidating intellectuals in general; a significant number of whom were jewish, for their lack of revolutionary ardour: the Zionists were busy liquidating the despised goyim who were preventing them from returning to their alleged '*homeland*' and triggering the '*Messianic times*' of jewry's victory in the final battle with the forces of Gog and Magog (the gentile and gentile spirit respectively) in their apparently never-ending battle against the jewish emunah (spirit). (11)

The difference between the two camps at this point was that while socialism had had three decades to prove itself to the jews as a '*land of milk and honey*': it had as yet failed to do so and was; in the jewish view, retracing its steps from the supposed '*progress*' that it had made in emancipating the jews from their alleged '*mass persecution*' in the first place. (12) However Zionism by contrast was in the ascendant as it was marshaling its terrorists around the world to force the British to cede Palestine to them as quickly as possible.

It had; while the Bolsheviks were busy warring with fellow members of the tribe in the Cadets, Mensheviks and Socialist Revolutionaries in Petrograd and Moscow, obtained the Balfour declaration from the desperate British Empire to use their influence and power in the United States to bring that country into the First World War in spite of its isolationist stance. (13) In return; of course, for the British promise to create a homeland for the jews in Palestine and the recognition of the jews as a separate '*nation among the nations*'. (14)

The Zionists had also played a major role in creating the vengeful peace that was the Treaty of Versailles and the creation of the '*League of Nations*' with their '*Bill of Jewish Rights*' (15) as they also did to the Allies and '*United Nations*' the end of the Second World War. (16) Is it thus any wonder with their international network of contacts; including many prominent Soviet jews, (17) that they should not have been increasingly seen as having the superior offering to the socialist jews?

In a sense Pierre Vidal-Naquet is right to assert that Marxism; although it may reasonably applied more widely to socialism, '*never presented itself as a theory and a practice of liberating oppressed minorities*' (18) as the basis of all Marxist thought is the fundamental universal equality of men; (19) even that of Lenin who created the idea of the '*national minority*' as a political expedient, (20) and as such the identification of being jewish; which might have seemed so negative in the days of the Tsarist Pale, (21) became something that jews were; and still are, in many cases unable to break with. (22)

Vidal-Naquet is also correct to assert that with the death of Trotsky Marxism as understood by the jews required a rebirth to be taken seriously as a solution to the problem of their existence once more. (23) He also correctly estimates that the extraordinary timing of; what he believes to have been, Stalin's '*anti-Semitic*' purges in contrast the creation of the State of Israel: all but destroyed socialism as a credible alternative to Zionism in the eyes of mainstream jewry. (24) With that destruction of socialism as an alternative solution to the jewish question: jewry; in general, began its significant turn to Zionism that manifests itself today most odiously in the form of the '*Israel Lobbies*' that have been formed across the developed world from North America and Europe to South Africa and New Zealand.

We can thus begin to see from the foregoing discussion the dichotomy presented to us by the claims that the jew cannot be both master and prisoner of the Gulag system is a false one precisely because the jew's beliefs of the moment are; as a rule of thumb, tied to their material circumstances, but yet in spite of this some jews will always remain clinging to the previous jewish intellectual/political fashion and indeed have continued to be significantly overrepresented in far-left circles to this day with the quintessential difference that in this

instance they haven't created and run the Cheka just yet. (25)

However before and during Solzhenitsyn's days in the Soviet Union's death camps: a substantial segment of the Cheka's organisational descendants; the NKVD and SMERSH, was jewish (26) and certainly many of those who were involved in trying to creatively kill off Solzhenitsyn and his compatriots; including one or two jews who had failed in their intrigues against their tribal kin, (27) were in fact jews (28) and indeed many of the most active of these agencies investigators and persecutors were jews to Solzhenitsyn's recollection. (29)

Evil hook-nosed figures like Naftaly Frenkel; one of the creators of the Gulag system, (30) Aron Solts; a major Soviet literary figure who helped cover up the reality of the Soviet death camps, (31) Ida Leonidovna Averbakh; who was one of the editors of the official Soviet book about the White Sea Canal which was a tissue of lies from start to finish, loom large, but other members of the tribe get a particularly noteworthy and delightfully vicious mention when Solzhenitsyn tells us:

'Yes, and it was quite right for them to set forth on the banks of the canal the names of the six principle lieutenants of Stalin and Yagoda, the chief overseers of Belomor, six hired murderers each of whom accounted for thirty thousand lives: Firin – Berman – Frenkel – Kogan – Rappoport – Zhuk.' (32)

Of course what immediately jumps off the page to anyone familiar with jewish surnames is that four of the six are immediately obvious examples, while the other two; Firin and Zhuk, are fairly common ones as well. I have little doubt that the overwhelming jewishness of those Solzhenitsyn referred to as *'hired murderers'* has also occurred to him as his recent work on the power and massive overrepresentation of the jews in the Lenin and Stalin eras has shown. (33) In spite of the typical accusations of being an *'anti-Semite'* (34) Solzhenitsyn has not uttered or written anything that could be reasonably classed as anti-Semitic; i.e. actively opposing jews as a biological group, although he has written much that has pointed out the historical reality of jewish involvement with events that many jews subsequently wish to try and claim they had no part in.

Solzhenitsyn quite understandably resents the huge suffering he and his fellow prisoners had to go through while the powerful jews sat at home with wives bedecked in jewels, (35) especially as he notes that these same members of the tribe have a *'quarter of a million corpses'* on their hands. (36) One wonders though: where is the outcry is about these deaths?

One recent historian of the camps; Anne Applebaum, has sought to argue that there is a qualitative difference in-between alleged Soviet and Nazi genocides: seeking to maintain the *'unique'* nature of supposed *'holocaust'*. Applebaum's rather contrived argument is that because the Germans *'gassed'* their victims; quite what method the dastardly Germans used is something the orthodox holocaustian scholars cannot seem to be able to work out, in purpose-built *'factories of death'* this mass murder is *'industrial'* in nature and therefore qualitatively different than the supposedly; by necessary implication, less *'unique'* and more *'normal'* methods employed by the Soviets of the bullet to the back of the head.

This claim is simply debunked by putting Applebaum's claim into the medium of an allegory.

If one is a butcher and one wishes to kill a large amount of cattle then we have two choices: one can kill them individually by using a bolt-gun or one can use a mass-killing method like electrocution. If one kills the cattle by using a bolt-gun then is this qualitatively different to using electrocution given that all that has changed is method not how many people were killed or that the results are any different? The cattle are still dead and the objective has been achieved.

Are we therefore; using Applebaum's logic, to assert that the killing the cattle by means of electrocution is '*industrial*' and therefore qualitatively different to using a bolt-gun?

No: we can't. As the method does not make something '*unique*' or not as that is to suggest that the mass gassing undertaken by the Allies and Axis during World War I makes the deaths it caused qualitatively different to those caused by shrapnel, disease and the rifle bullet. That is; of course, intellectually absurd, but it is what Applebaum is actually asserting: that dead gassed jews are just special and the executed goyim are just so-so.

Applebaum's claim is not a new one, but is simply representative of a strain of minimisation of Soviet atrocities (and jewish involvement in them); which Applebaum decries but then endorses by belittling them in the face of the monstrous myth of a jewish '*holocaust*', and the maximization of alleged '*Nazi*' ones. Or as Ellis has pointed out: National Socialist atrocities require the minimum possible evidence to be seen as genuine, while Soviet atrocities require the maximum possible evidence to be seen as genuine. (37) Ellis maybe as credulous as the next historian when it comes to National Socialist atrocities and; for reasons unknown to me, takes Solomon Mikhoels and the Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee; who are responsible for a great many of the '*truths*' of '*holocaust studies*', seriously as '*unbiased sources*' for what happened to the jews during World War II (38) and refuses to even consider other alternatives other than the '*Nazis killed them all*'. (39) However he gratifying displays scepticism when it comes to attempts to whitewash the Soviet Union, which Applebaum defends; perhaps unintentionally, by claiming that killing jews is '*different*' to killing gentiles and is somehow worse.

I rather think survivors of the gulags who are all too well aware of the jewish aspect of the creation, management and sustaining of the system would be rather offended by the implied claim that just because they aren't jewish their suffering is lessened. In fact: I rather think that is what Solzhenitsyn was getting at when talks of how the suffering of the prisoners was covered up the Soviet regime and simply just accepted by the outside world with the exception of a few tearful and lonely voices. (40)

He also notes the irony of Karl Marx's secular halakhah; in this case his '*Critique of the Gotha Programme*', being used by his fellow-traveling members of the tribe to justify working people to death as had not Marx said that what would save men from themselves was productive labour? (41)

He also notes the irony of the '*correspondents from Kem*'; Marxist apologists to a man, justifying these atrocities to their fellows and the wider world. One wonders how many of these apologists were jewish, but going by what we know about the heavy involvement of jews in

Communist parties around the world: (42) one may think that Solzhenitsyn is here subtly attacking the jews and their deluded gentile lackeys for their simple will to believe any '*true fact*'; to use Orwell's famous term, that Moscow wished to throw their way as either a main course or table scraps. (43)

Yet even then Solzhenitsyn documents the fundamental corruption that was rife in the camps (44) and no doubt the jews at their head took more than their fair share of the proverbial plunder not unlike those other members of the tribe and assorted other '*true-believers*' who made a fast-buck out of the '*socialist revolution*' only to skit off back to the United States and Europe when they had made their fortunes. (45) Or as Solzhenitsyn says so well: '*Communists jailed Communists*', but not for corruption or greed rather for perceived or actual ideological deviancy in any form. (46)

Of course some of those jailed or killed for this deviancy were jews, but the majority of them weren't although Ellis seems to see '*markedly anti-Semitic*' signs everywhere in Stalin's regime (47) as does Pinkus, (48) Montefiore (49) and Kostyrchenko (50) although this incorrect interpretation of Stalin's actions has been shown to be lacking in contextual understanding by Smith (51) and I would add: likely conceived as a conclusion a priori for which evidence was then selected. This lack of focus on gentile; and over-focus on jewish, suffering is perhaps not so much to belittle gentiles who suffered; as Applebaum to be sure offers profuse crocodile tears for them, but rather to cover up jewish involvement which once again we have a huge amount of evidence for as Haberer notes. (52)

This cover-up via demands that people; read non-jews, focus on only the '*positive elements*' of a situation is expressed in modernity most offer by Zionists of the ilk of Alan Dershowitz who in his best-known work; '*The Case for Israel*', declared that the alleged '*anti-Israel bias*' should be '*answered*' and '*exposed*'. (53) The idea being; of course, that if one expresses a negative opinion on something the jews have done then one is being irrational because one is apparently taking '*only*' the negative points and not the positive into consideration and thus one is being biased and therefore irrational. One may simply explode this type of silly rhetorical argument by asking the counter-question of both those who minimize or deny the significant jewish involvement in mass murders in service to the Communist cause and those who do similar with Israel: why do you only take into account positive points in your analysis then?

Solzhenitsyn himself surely understands this issue as he himself stresses in his '*The Jews in the Soviet Union*' that to highlight significant and important jewish involvement in communist crimes does not therefore put the entire jewish people the dock. This is correct as far as it goes, but I think we may go a little farther and say that the jewish people are as guilty as those who of their kind who participated precisely because they have knowingly covered up for them.

Is not the person who knowingly obstructs justice in their own interest just as guilty as those who knowingly committed the crimes concerned?

I think so!

References

- (1) Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, 2003, *The Gulag Archipelago 1918 – 56: An Experiment in Literary Investigation*, 2nd Edition, Harper Collins: New York
- (2) Yossi Klein Halevi, 1995, *Memoirs of a Jewish Extremist: An American Story*, 1st Edition, Little, Brown and Company: New York, pp. 135-137; Richard Rosenthal, 2000, *Rookie Cop: Deep Undercover in the Jewish Defense League*, 1st Edition, Leapfrog: Wellfleet, pp. 36-40
- (3) Ilan Pappé, 2007, *The Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine*, 2nd Edition, Oneworld: Oxford, p. xiii; Elliot Horowitz, 2007, *Reckless Rites: Purim and the Legacy of Jewish Violence*, 1st Edition, Princeton University Press: Princeton, pp. 3-4
- (4) Elie Wiesel, 1987, *The Jews of Silence: A Personal Report on Soviet Jewry*, 3rd Edition, Schocken: New York, pp. 4-5
- (5) The revisionist literature on the so-called 'holocaust' is considerable, but for an almost mind-numbingly detailed debunk of the orthodox claims about the most famous 'extermination camp' see Carlo Mattogno, 2011, *Auschwitz: The Case for Sanity*, 2 Vols., 1st Edition, Theses & Dissertations Press: Chicago
- (6) William Henry Chamberlain, 1987, *The Russian Revolution*, Vol. I, 2nd Edition, Princeton University Press: Princeton, pp. 29-40; Erich Haberer, 2004, *Jews and Revolution in Nineteenth Century Russia*, 2nd Edition, Cambridge University Press: New York pp. 9-11; Albert Lindemann, 1997, *Esau's Tears: Anti-Semitism and the Rise of the Jews*, 1st Edition, Cambridge University Press: New York, pp. 425-426
- (7) Robert Service, 2003, *A History of Modern Russia: From Nicholas II to Putin*, 2nd Edition, Penguin: London, pp. 249-250; Isaac Deutscher, 1967, *Stalin: A Political Biography*, 2nd Edition, Oxford University Press: New York, p. 605
- (8) Ibid., p. 608; Nathaniel Weyl, 1968, *The Jew in American Politics*, 1st Edition, Arlington House: New York, pp. 197-207
- (9) Jonathan Brent, Vladimir Naumov, 2003, *Stalin's Last Crime: The Doctor's Plot*, 1st Edition, Harper Collins: New York, pp. 8-9
- (10) Orlando Figes, 1997, *A People's Tragedy: The Russian Revolution 1891-1924*, 1st Edition, Pimlico: London, p. 696
- (11) For example see Zalman Shazar's (then President of Israel) comments in David Ben-Gurion (Ed.), 1966, *The Jews in their Land*, 1st Edition, Aldus: London, pp. 6-7
- (12) Service, *A History of Modern Russia*, Op. Cit., p. 325
- (13) To understand the reasons why this was necessary (the Allies were losing the war and badly) please refer to John Mosier, 2001, *The Myth of the Great War: A New Military History of World War One*, 1st Edition, Profile: London.
- (14) S. Brodetsky, 1943, *The Balfour Declaration: Its Political Significance*, pp. 266-267 in Paul Goodman (Ed.), 1943, *The Jewish National Home*, 1st Edition, J. M. Dent: London
- (15) Howard M. Sachar, 2003, *Dreamland: Europeans and Jews in the Aftermath of the Great War*, 1st Edition, Vintage: New York, pp. 34-42
- (16) Bernard Wasserstein, 1997, *Vanishing Diaspora: The Jews in Europe since 1945*, 2nd Edition, Penguin: London, pp. 29-30
- (17) Joshua Rubenstein, Vladimir Naumov (Eds.), 2005, *Stalin's Secret Pogrom: The Postwar Inquisition of the Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee*, 2nd Edition, Yale University Press: New Haven, pp. 47-50; Deutscher, Op. Cit., pp. 606-608
- (18) Pierre Vidal-Naquet, 1996, *The Jews: History, Memory and the Present*, 1st Edition, Columbia University Press: New York, p. 123

- (19) David McLellan, 1980, *The Young Hegelians and Karl Marx*, 3rd Edition, Papermac: London, pp. 75-77
- (20) Robert Service, 2010, *Lenin: A Biography*, 2nd Edition, Pan: Basingstoke, pp. 468-469
- (21) Vidal-Naquet, Op. Cit., p. 204
- (22) Anne Applebaum, 2003, *Gulag: A History*, 1st Edition, Penguin: London, p. 257; for a non-Soviet example of the same type of behaviour see Ruth Dudley Edwards, 1987, *Victor Gollancz: A Biography*, 1st Edition, Victor Gollancz: London, pp. 215-220
- (23) Vidal-Naquet, Op. Cit., p. 124
- (24) Ibid, pp. 204-206
- (25) Salo Baron, 1964, *The Russian Jew*, 1st Edition, MacMillan: New York, p. 203; Solzhenitsyn, *The Gulag Archipelago*, Op. Cit., pp. 30; 64
- (26) Weyl, Op. Cit., p. 198
- (27) Solzhenitsyn, *The Gulag Archipelago*, Op. Cit., pp. xviii; 8; 37; 115; 143; 167
- (28) Ibid, p.187
- (29) Ibid, pp. 75; 77; 118-119
- (30) Ibid, pp. 187; 196-198
- (31) Ibid, pp. 189-190
- (32) Ibid, pp. 205-208
- (33) Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, 2003, *Die Juden in der Sowjetunion*, 1st Edition, Herbig: Munich
- (34) Applebaum, Op. Cit., p. 9
- (35) Solzhenitsyn, *The Gulag Archipelago*, Op. Cit., p. 199
- (36) Ibid, p. 208
- (37) Frank Ellis, 2011, *The Time of Great Death*, Quarterly Review, Vol. 5, No. 2, p. 70
- (38) Rubenstein, Naumov, Op. Cit., pp. 24-25
- (39) Ellis, Op. Cit., p. 69
- (40) Solzhenitsyn, *The Gulag Archipelago*, Op. Cit., pp. 188-192
- (41) Ibid, p. 215
- (42) Jerry Muller, 2010, *Capitalism and the Jews*, 1st Edition, Princeton University Press: Princeton, pp. 141-188
- (43) Solzhenitsyn, *The Gulag Archipelago*, p. 241
- (44) Ibid, pp. 314-319
- (45) Sean McMeekin, 2003, *The Red Millionaire: A Political Biography of Willi Muenzenberg, Moscow's Secret Propaganda Tsar in the West*, 1st Edition, Yale University Press: New Haven, pp. 123-143
- (46) Solzhenitsyn, *The Gulag Archipelago*, Op. Cit., pp. 336-337
- (47) Ellis, Op. Cit., p. 69
- (48) Benjamin Pinkus, 2008, *The Soviet Government and the Jews 1948-1967: A Documented Study*, 2nd Edition, Cambridge University Press: New York, pp. 2-3
- (49) Simon Sebag Montefiore, 2004, *Stalin: The Court of the Red Tsar*, 1st Edition, Profile: London, pp. 559-561; Simon Sebag Montefiore, 2007, *Young Stalin*, 1st Edition, Weidenfeld & Nicholson: London, pp. 134-135
- (50) Gennadi Kostyrchenko, 1995, *Out of the Red Shadows: Anti-Semitism in Stalin's Russia*, 1st Edition, Prometheus: New York, pp. 14-20
- (51) Jeremy Smith, 2005, *Stalin as Commissar for Nationality Affairs, 1918-1922*, pp. 53-56 in Sarah Davies, James Harris (Eds.), 2005, *Stalin: A New History*, 1st Edition, Cambridge University Press: New York

(52) Haberer, Op. Cit., pp. 149-55

(53) Alan Dershowitz, 2003, *The Case for Israel*, 1st Edition, John Wiley: London, p. xii

Jews and Communism according to Louis Budenz

Tuesday, 20 December 2011

One of the major defectors from the Communist Party USA was the former editor of the *'Daily Worker'* and Politburo member Louis Budenz; of Hungarian and Irish origin, who; like Whittaker Chambers, *'defected'* after the *'defeat of fascism'*. He was; like many members of the CPs across the world at the time, originally drawn into communism as a way to defeat *'the evils of Fascism'* in what we call the *'Popular Front'* epoch of 1934/36 to 1939. Budenz; with Whittaker Chambers and Elizabeth Bentley, was a star witness on the organisation and attitude of the Communist Party USA as well as its underground organisation (the secret apparatus) and the illicit funding that it received from the USSR through the medium of the Comintern to enable its attempted conquest of North America.

Budenz was something of a celebrity in his own lifetime and published four books on the basis of his communist experiences. He has; however, suffered from a hail of what can only be called abuse from left-leaning; or outright Marxist, academics who have questioned his testimony repeatedly and even simply dismissed him as a *'lying reactionary'*. The basis of this charge is largely because Budenz; like Chambers and former Marxist intellectuals like James Burnham, switched from a Marxist milieu to a conservative one, but what those who argue the *'absurdity'* of the testimony; which has now been shown to be correct by archival documentation from the Comintern archives themselves, forget is that at this time the GRU (Soviet Military Intelligence); as well as the GPU, NKGB and SMERSH, still killed perceived or real high-profile traitors to their cause. A good example is Walter Krivitsky who was betrayed by Soviet mole Kim Philby in 1945 and the GRU simply smashed their way into his hotel room and killed him. Another is Leon Trotsky who the NKVD went to great trouble to kill and in whose killing Budenz indirectly assisted as a facilitator.

Critics of the ex-Communist witnesses also tend to forget that both Chambers and Budenz came from highly religious backgrounds; Catholic in these particular cases, and both of them confess; perhaps with too much hindsight, to having had longings for their faith during their time as Communists. Indeed much as their Christian faith made them susceptible; and paved the way for them, to become Communists: it was that same religious urge that actually; if their testimony is to be taken as read, got them out again. Indeed Budenz makes clear that he was influenced in his choice of socialism by Catholic intellectuals such as Hilaire Belloc: who argued for a form of Socialism; partly derived from Papal Bulls and the economic ideas of Saint Thomas Aquinas, known as Distributism.

Whether or not one is a Christian: this is interesting as it indicates; perhaps uncomfortably for some, that Christianity has a tendency to pave the way for Communism in at least some of its believer's minds (*'Liberation Theology'* is another good example of it). As Christianity is a philosophy built on the idea of communalism and pacifism (well at least in most of its forms),

which has lent itself to the tradition of Christian Socialism but perhaps more relevantly: Christianity in any variant is a complete belief system that must influence the choices made in any secular/terrestrial context, because if it doesn't then how can one say that one actually believes in the Christian God?

That; when taken to its logical conclusion, means that Christianity in general is a form of weltanschauung; or philosophy of life, and if one strips away the belief in the Christian God then one can easily be left with not dissimilar; and highly emotive, assumptions to those made as the basis for socialism and communism. In essence Marxism simply offers an alternative; albeit secular, religion: although this has long been disputed by Marxists: most recently by Cohen. No prizes for guessing that yet another member of the tribe turns up as an academic Communist apologist.

This was the intellectual journey that both Budenz and Chambers document, which allowed them to become Communist high-flyers, but at the same time also prevented them from becoming hard-core materialists and thus also became a bit like Diogenes and his lamp in their minds. I have already covered Chambers' innumerable mentions of the hugely disproportionate number of jews involved in Communist subversive activity in the United States, but Budenz is another man who; while not anti-Semitic or against jews in any way, shape or form, does in fact indirectly do a very good job of documenting their influence and power in the Communist Party USA.

I will adopt the same format that I used with my article on Chambers and simply list the jewish individuals Budenz mentions and then give the point he makes about them with the necessary reference. I also hasten to note that those I have listed below I have been able to find confirmatory evidence of having been jewish and I have left out any whom I can find no additional evidence; aside from my suspicion, of having been so.

To wit:

Solomon Adler

Soviet agent in the US Treasury Department (Budenz, 'Techniques', p. 281)

Israel Amter

Communist leader (Budenz, 'Story', p. 101)

In charge of '*national groups*'; i.e. '*civil rights*', pro-negro and pro-jewish, propaganda and organisation (Budenz, 'Story', p. 205)

Leader of the Communist Party USA in New York State (Budenz, 'Men', p. 173)

John Arnold

Chief Editor of the Communist Party USA's Yiddish newspaper: '*Daily Freiheit*' (Budenz,

‘Cry’, p. 56)

Sol Auerbach (better known as James Allen)

Comintern representative in the Philippines (Budenz, ‘Cry’, p. 56)

Foreign Affairs editor of the Sunday edition of the *‘Daily Worker’* (Budenz, ‘Story’, p. 307; ‘Cry’, p. 56)

Conducted espionage against the US military (Budenz, ‘Story’, p. 311)

Rudy Baker (nee Rudolph Blum)

Writer for the *‘New Masses’* (Budenz, ‘Men’, p. 18)

Carried out espionage activities against US and Canadian governments (Budenz, ‘Men’, p. 18)

Leonard Berkowitz

Communist Hollywood Film Script Writer (Budenz, ‘Cry’, p. 23)

Soviet agent in US Office of War Information (Budenz, ‘Cry’, p. 23; ‘Techniques’, p. 285)

Lionel Berman

Writer for the *‘Daily Worker’* (Budenz, ‘Men’, p. 219; ‘Techniques’, pp. 33-34)

Alexander Bittelman

Long-time communist leader and representative of the Comintern in North America (Budenz, ‘Men’, pp. 18; 78)

Chief Theoretician of the Communist Party USA (Budenz, ‘Cry’, p. 76; ‘Techniques’, p. 49)

Alfred Blumberg

Former Professor at John Hopkins University (Budenz, ‘Cry’, p. 162)

Communist leader in Washington D.C. (Budenz, ‘Men’, pp. 105; 253) and Maryland areas (Budenz, ‘Cry’, p. 162)

David Bohm

Soviet agent inside the United States’ atomic program (Budenz, ‘Cry’, p. 17)

Joseph Brodsky

Communist Party USA's legal advisor and lawyer (Budenz, 'Men', pp. 44; 78)

Facilitated the Comintern's funding of the Communist Party USA (Budenz, 'Men', p. 108)

Boris Bykov

Head of the GRU (Soviet Military Intelligence) in North America (till 1938) (Budenz, 'Cry', p. 61)

Esther Cantor

Writer for the '*Daily Worker*' (Budenz, 'Cry', p. 84)

In charge of distributing Communist propaganda to negroes; and inciting them against the government, in the US (Budenz, 'Cry', p. 84)

Sam Carr (nee Schmil Kogan)

Long-time member of the National Committee of the Communist Party of Canada (Budenz, 'Story', p. 280)

Morris Childs (nee Moishe Chilovsky)

Managed Communist Party USA's funding from the Comintern (Budenz, 'Men', p. 86)

Worked as a Soviet espionage agent in North and Central America (Budenz, 'Men', pp. 86-87)

Joe Clark (nee Joseph Cohen)

Professor at Brooklyn College (Budenz, 'Cry', p. 161)

Writer for the '*Daily Worker*' and '*New Masses*' (Budenz, 'Cry', p. 161)

Judith Coplon

Soviet agent in the US Department of Justice (Budenz, 'Cry', p. 72)

Crystal Eastman

Wife of Communist leader: Max Eastman (Budenz, 'Story', p. 60)

Edited the Communist '*Masses*' magazine (Budenz, 'Story', p. 60)

Max Eastman

Edited the Communist '*Masses*' magazine (Budenz, 'Story', p. 60)

Gerhard Eisler (former leader of the German Communist Party [the KPD])

Representative of the Comintern in the United States (Budenz, 'Story', pp. 240-241)

Joseph Fields (nee Joseph Felshin)

Staff writer for '*The Communist*' (Budenz, 'Men', p. 219)

Wrote for the '*Daily Worker*' (Budenz, 'Men', p. 219)

Benjamin Gitlow

Leading communist functionary until 1928 (Budenz, 'Story', pp. 102-103; 'Men' p. 12;)

Advised against helping striking and by then desperate miners (Budenz, 'Story', p. 93)

Later became a leading exponent of '*anti-Communism*' (Budenz, 'Story', p. 188; 'Cry', p. 117; 'Techniques', p. 310)

Arthur Gleason

Wrote for and was employed by left-wing magazine: '*The Nation*' (Budenz, 'Story', p. 61)

Member of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society (Budenz, 'Story', p. 61)

Founded the communist magazine: '*Labor Age*' (Budenz, 'Story', p. 61)

Ben Gold

Head of the International Fur and Leather Goods Workers Union. (Budenz, 'Men', p. 190; 'Techniques', p. 193)

Actively conspired to manipulate the American Federation of Labor while pretending not to be a Communist. (Budenz, 'Men', pp. 190; 202; 'Cry', pp. 75-76; 'Techniques', p. 188)

Jacob Gollos (nee Yakov Naumovich Reizen)

Chairman of the Communist Party USA's Control Commission (Budenz, 'Men', pp. 39; 78; 'Cry', p. 66)

Headed the Communist holiday company: '*World Tourists*' (Budenz, 'Story', p. 238; 'Men', p. 55)

Was a Soviet espionage agent (Budenz, 'Story', p. 238; 'Techniques', p. 123)

Michael Greenberg

Soviet agent in the Whitehouse (Budenz, 'Cry', p. 68)

Worked with the pro-Communist Institute of Pacific Relations (Budenz, 'Techniques', p. 284)

Abraham Heller

Managed the financial support given to the Communist Party USA by the Soviet Union (Budenz, 'Story', p. 132)

Annalee Jacoby

Pro-Communist writer associated with the '*Daily Worker*' (Budenz, 'Cry', p. 46; 'Techniques', p. 228)

Phillip Jaffe

Soviet espionage agent in China (Budenz, 'Men', pp. 53; 278; 'Techniques', p. 281)

Used US government documents; given to him by Soviet agents, to help the Chinese Communist Party. (Budenz, 'Cry', p. 35; 'Techniques', p. 286)

Important figure in the pro-Communist Institute for Pacific Relations (Budenz, 'Men', pp. 264-265; 'Cry', pp. 45; 50; 59; 63)

Albert Kahn

Communist author. (Budenz, 'Cry', p. 99)

Felix Kuzman

Soviet espionage and underground network courier (Budenz, 'Men', pp. 42; 74; 253)

Former member of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade (Budenz, 'Men', p. 81)

Harold Laski

British Communist author (Budenz, 'Story', p. 100)

Confident of Karl Radek; a leading jewish Bolshevik, who told him of his opposition to Stalin and support of Trotsky. (Budenz, 'Story', p. 138)

Avram Landy

In charge of Communist propaganda amongst Slavic groups in the United States (Budenz, 'Story', p. 237)

Adam Lapin

Washington D.C. and a foreign correspondent of the '*Daily Worker*' (Budenz, 'Story', p. 230; 'Men', p. 269)

Daniel de Leon

Set up and ran communist and socialist trade unions to deliberately try and rival the American Federation of Labor (Budenz, 'Story', p. 44)

Claimed everyone who disagreed with him was a '*scallywag*' and a '*scavenger*' (Budenz, 'Story', p. 66)

Sam Liptzin

Writer for the Communist Party USA's Yiddish newspaper: '*Daily Freiheit*'. (Budenz, 'Men', p. 70)

Jay Lovestone

General Secretary of the Communist Party USA (until 1928) (Budenz, 'Story', p. 88)

Jacob Mindel

Soviet espionage agent in North America (Budenz, 'Men', p. 98)

Trained female Communists to seduce US military officers to learn military secrets (Budenz, 'Men', p. 130; 'Techniques', p. 116)

George Mink

High-Ranking Officer in the Abraham Lincoln Brigade (Budenz, 'Men', p. 124)

Steve Nelson (nee Steve Mesarosh)

Soviet espionage agent in North America (Budenz, 'Men', p. 34; 'Cry', p. 17)

High-Ranking Officer in the Abraham Lincoln Brigade (Budenz, 'Men', pp. 36; 124)

Helped the Chinese and German Communist parties (Budenz, 'Men', p. 37)

Moissaye Olgin

Communist leader (Budenz, 'Men', p. 42)

Author of '*Why Communism?*' (Budenz, 'Men', p. 42; 'Techniques', p. 22)

Joseph Peters

Representative of the Comintern in the United States (Budenz, 'Story', pp. 138-139; 'Men', p. 78)

Joseph Pogany (former minister in the Bela Kuhn regime)

Representative of the Comintern in the United States (till 1938) (Budenz, 'Story', p. 240; 'Techniques', p. 26)

Conducted espionage activities against the US Government (Budenz, 'Techniques', p. 26)

Abraham Lincoln Polonsky

Communist Hollywood Film and Radio Script Writer (Budenz, 'Cry', pp. 23-24)

Soviet agent in Office of Strategic Services (Budenz, 'Cry', p.24)

Julia Stuart Poyntz

High-Ranking Communist Party USA Leader (Budenz, 'Story', p. 263)

Assassinated by the GRU (Soviet Military Intelligence) in 1938 for preparing to break away from the Communist Party USA (Budenz, 'Story', p. 263; 'Cry', p. 130)

Mattias Rakosi

General Secretary of the Communist Party of Hungary (Budenz, 'Cry', p. 211)

Morris Rappoport

Communist leader in Washington state (Budenz, 'Men', p. 105)

Andrew Roth

Stole US Military documents for the Soviet Union (Budenz, 'Cry', p. 10)

Harry Sacher

Communist Party USA Lawyer (Budenz, 'Cry', p. 82)

Solomon Schwarz

Writer for the '*Daily Worker*' (Budenz, 'Story', p. 303)

Nathan Gregory Silvermaster

Soviet spy in the US government (Budenz, 'Men', pp. 105-106)

Jacob 'Jack' Stachel

Communist leader and representative to the Comintern (Budenz, 'Story', p. 127; 'Men', p. 143; 'Techniques', p. 120)

Took his orders from Joseph Peters, Alexander Bittelman and Joseph Pogany. (Budenz, 'Story', pp. 188-189; 245; 251; 274; 335; 'Men', pp. 18; 40; 51; 267; 269)

Endorsed lying to serve the Communist cause (Budenz, 'Story', p. 216)

Joseph Starobin

Foreign Affairs editor of the '*Daily Worker*' (Budenz, 'Story', p. 278; 'Men', p. 154)

Sid Stein

Communist Party USA's Labor Commissar (Budenz, 'Cry', p. 84)

Alexander Trachtenberg

Long-time member of the Communist Party USA's Central Committee (Budenz, 'Story', p. 230; 'Men', pp. 78; 219; 'Techniques', p. 119)

Joseph Woodrow Weinberg

Soviet espionage agent inside the United States' atomic program (Budenz, 'Cry', p. 17)

Robert William Weiner

Treasurer of the Communist Party USA (Budenz, 'Story', p. 226; 'Men', p. 78)

In charge of a large private communist slush fund. (Budenz, 'Men', pp. 107-108)

Louis Weinstock

Communist union leader (Budenz, 'Men', pp. 96; 197)

Max Weiss

Secretary of the Young Communist League (Budenz, 'Men', p. 46)

Harry Dexter White (nee Weiss)

Soviet agent in the US Treasury Department (Budenz, 'Techniques', p. 281)

Bibliography

Louis Budenz, 1947, *This is My Story*, 1st Edition, McGraw-Hill: New York ('Story')

Louis Budenz, 1948, *Men without Faces: The Communist Conspiracy in the U.S.A.*, 1st Edition, Harper: New York ('Men')

Louis Budenz, 1952, *The Cry is Peace*, 1st Edition, Henry Regnery: Chicago ('Cry')

Louis Budenz, 1954, *The Techniques of Communism*, 1st Edition, Henry Regnery: Chicago ('Techniques')

Richard Krebs, Soviet Intelligence and the Jews

Wednesday, 21 December 2011

Richard Julius Hermann Krebs; better known by his pseudonym Jan Valtin, was a German Comintern and Soviet espionage agent who later defected to the West. He is an unusual man precisely because he was thoroughly dedicated Communist activist; who had attended the Lenin School in Moscow, and; for the cause he dedicated himself to, freely admitted that he had murdered and helped murder opponents of that cause. He is generally overlooked even in the academic literature because he published his autobiography; *Out of the Night*, (1) in 1941 during a time when the world was preoccupied with the early stages of the Second World War so Krebs' story was forgotten as it wasn't then *'en vogue'*. There is the odd mention of him in the academic literature as well as a recent German language biography of him. (2)

Valtin is another ex-Communist who has been abused as a *'lying reactionary'* by left-leaning and outright Marxist academics, but he is also much harder than usual to discredit as being one (as unlike Louis Budenz, Whittaker Chambers and Elizabeth Bentley he never became a conservative figure nor did he *'get religion'*) particularly as he has strong anti-fascist credentials and his Dutch Communist wife; nicknamed Firelei, was allegedly killed by the SS in 1938/9 (although neither myself or Waldenfels have been able to find any proof of this). (3) Valtin was; like Budenz, Chambers and Bentley, in contact with very senior figures in the Comintern and global communist cause, in which he dealt with messengers from such senior (jewish) Bolsheviks as Karl Radek. (4)

Indeed Valtin's description; from a position of knowledge, of Radek is rather insightful as he calls him *'the Comintern's most clever – and most cynical – propagandist'* who was the effective overlord of the KPD and the Comintern's Western Secretariat (based in Germany) during the 1920s before the rise of Stalin. (5) Radek was; in spite of his egalitarian rhetoric about the *'workers of the world uniting'*, very conscious of his jewishness and of the jewishness of other high-ranking Bolsheviks and at the 1927 Comintern Congress in Moscow he made his opposition

to Stalin on the basis of the latter's lack of jewishness by presenting a simple riddle:

'What is the difference between Moses and Stalin?

Moses took the Jews out of Egypt; Stalin takes them out of the Communist Party.' (6)

It thus little wonder that Radek was purged by Stalin in the late 1930s, but as Conquest has correctly noted: this has little to do with Radek having been jewish and everything to do with Stalin's general paranoia (7) and mafia-style of government that Birstein has recently stylized it as. (8) As Lindemann notes it is probably merely coincidental that many leading Bolsheviks purged by Stalin were jewish (9) as so many of the Bolshevik leadership at this point were jewish: (10) so it is little wonder that Stalin targeted jewish Bolshevik opponents (as it was hard not to) and then later several batches of more prominent jews given his obsessive need to see Trotskyite conspiracies everywhere undermining his power. (11)

Valtin; like both Chambers and Budenz, inadvertently reveals the reality of the massive jewish involvement in the upper echelons of the Comintern cadre and Soviet intelligence fraternity. Valtin names Hugo Marx as a major Soviet intelligence asset and one of Stalin's gang of bank robbers in the '*good old days*' of the pre-revolutionary Tsarist period of Stalin's life. (12) It is not surprising that Marx was jewish and; as Mosse termed him, '*representative of the articulate Jewish party membership*'. (13)

Knowing of Marx's jewishness makes it all the more interesting when Valtin recounts that he was ordered by Marx to give up command of his unit of approximately thirty hardy German Communist seamen to a '*Levantine merchant*' called '*Meyer*'. (14) Of course; '*Levantine merchant*', is a polite way of saying that '*Meyer*' (Valtin makes clear he knew this was a pseudonym) was a jewish Communist who; as Valtin tells us, was recruiting working men for espionage work on behalf of the Comintern and Soviet intelligence. (15)

'*Meyer's*' real name was in fact John Bornas and he; as far as I can ascertain, was jewish. After Meyer set up various safe houses for Communist agents in Hamburg, New York and Buenos Aires and charged Communist seamen for the privilege of using them. He was ordered to the Soviet Union by the GPU, refused and was deliberately exposed; along with ten other Communists who worked closely with him, to the German police (who rightly arrested and imprisoned him for espionage). (16) The reason that Bornas didn't go back to the '*Worker's Paradise*' was; of course, that this was a euphemism for being executed in Communist circles at this time. (17)

A more senior jewish communist; and agent of the Comintern, was Felix Neumann who commanded the Hamburg '*Red Hundreds*'; a play on words on the anti-Semitic Tsarist '*Black Hundreds*', which was the KPD's nascent version of the Cheka. This evolved into what was called the '*T-Units*'; literally '*Terror Units*', which was part of the secret apparatus of the KPD and was to form the basis of the future Cheka. (18) In the meantime its role was to police German Communists and during the various Communist uprisings in Hamburg and Munich: to execute '*class traitors*', '*bourgeois*', '*reactionaries*' and '*counter-revolutionaries*' (in spite of a very recent attempt to play down the KPD death squad's murderous activities in these revolts). (19)

We should also note that like its German counterpart: jews played a key role in early Soviet secret police and repressive activities as even eminent jewish historians have had to reluctantly admit. (20)

That is not to say that Valtin does not make mistakes as he suggests that Belgian Soviet intelligence agent; Edgar Andree, had '*slightly Jewish features*' (21) when he was; in fact, not jewish (rather the son of an Belgian itinerant manual labourer and his wife).

Neumann however did not last in the vicious world of Soviet state-sponsored espionage and was captured and interrogated by the German police. Neumann broke under intensive questioning; remember he had just been trying to overthrow the state at the behest of the GPU and had at least personally murdered one man in cold blood, (22) and started leaking information to the police having obviously decided that his best bet at saving his life was to turn police informer. His fellow jewish Bolsheviks were understandably angry at this turn of events and an attempt of Neumann's life failed. However not easily deterred the GPU successfully set one of its young rising Bolshevik stars; Heinz Neumann, to arrange the murder of the now marked jewish Bolshevik Felix Neumann. (23)

Heinz Neumann; scion of a wealthy jewish grain-dealing family from Berlin, (24) was a major figure in the history of International Communism having earned the nickname of the '*Butcher of Canton*' for his role as a Soviet advisor to the Chinese Communist Party between 1924 and 1927 as well as in the KPD being one of its chief theoreticians. (25) Indeed Neumann was later the editor of the KPD's main newspaper; '*Die Rote Fahne*', and a close associate of Stalin, but was executed in 1937 as part of the latter's famous purges (which particularly ravaged non-Russian Comintern cadre like Neumann).

One of the more interesting tit-bits that demonstrates Neumann's utter ruthlessness is that when he was sent by the KPD to Moscow in 1923 with one Carl Kindermann whom he denounced the later as a '*fascist spy*' because Kindermann; a homosexual, had propositioned him sexually. (26) We also know that Neumann was; like many male jews, fairly obsessed with bedding gentile girls: in Neumann's case he liked his shiksa's tall, blonde-haired and blue-eyed. (27) Not exactly the most pleasant person in the world now: was he?

I should note as an aside that Valtin himself was propositioned by a homosexual; pretending to be a Protestant Pastor, when he was working as a Soviet intelligence asset in California and Valtin promptly fled and caught the next train out of San Bernardino. (28)

Valtin also tells us that the KPD was under the direct control of the famous jewish Bolshevik Zinoviev in 1923 and that he could order them to revolt if he so wished it (while he stayed safe and sound in Moscow). (29) We then discover that yet another '*Levantine merchant*'; i.e. a jewish capitalist, was working for Soviet intelligence in Hamburg and had knowingly sold the Soviet Union at least one ship to aid it. (30) Such capitalist co-operation; jewish and non-jewish, may surprise some, but it wasn't just the exception in this period but the rule (as the USSR was after all a large potential market) (31) and the perfidious '*righteous gentile*' Raoul Wallenberg was a prominent example of this kind of '*cooperation*' (although it didn't stop him being killed by SMERSH after World War II). (32)

Valtin moves swiftly on to another major figure in Soviet intelligence in this period; Michael Avatin, a Latvian GPU operative who worked primarily in Europe and the United States specialising in sniffing out and exposing anti-Communist agents. Atavin's girlfriend was a jewess from Warsaw: Malka Stifter. (33) The budding Stalinist couple had met while attending the Lenin School for Foreign Cadre in Moscow and Stifter was very young: Valtin puts her at under nineteen and from what I've been able to work out she was more like seventeen at the time. (34)

We are then told that Stifter worked as a Soviet espionage agent; specialising in subverting the military and police, in the Baltic States, Yugoslavia and her native Poland. Valtin credits Stifter; perhaps too generously, with being the principle '*hidden hand*' behind the Polish military mutinies in Skiernivice, Lodz and Nova-Vileiko: whence she was arrested and interrogated by the Polish police. Wanting to break the Communist infiltration of and influence in their military: the Polish government authorised the use of extreme methods; including torture, to break Stifter who eventually threw in the proverbial towel and gave up a whole slew of Communist agents who were then exposed, driven out of the country, imprisoned or executed by the Polish police. Stifter was placed; in spite of her betrayal of her fellow Communists, on the rolls of the Communist martyrs. (35)

Valtin mentions that at least one of the Lenin School lecturers; Rosa Speculant, was jewish and later like Stifter was captured by the Polish police but unfortunately escaped the hangman's noose. Speculant lectured on how to disseminate propaganda and in reward for her services a grateful USSR named a children's home in Novorossisk after her. (36)

Valtin then mentions seeing a thirty-five page report he had made on the chances of inciting a race-based uprising in Hawaii on the desk of the jewish head of the Profintern: Solomon Lozovsky. (37) Lozovsky was a major figure in the Soviet Union till Stalin had him killed for cooperating with Zionists and showing jewish nationalist sentiments. (38)

Among his many of posts was the control of the Profintern (the Soviet international trade unionist network) from 1921 to 1937 (an unusually long tenure in the USSR) and the Soviet Information Bureau (to influence world opinion in favour of the USSR during and after World War II) as well as being a member of the powerful Central Committee of the Communist Party, the Supreme Soviet and a Deputy Foreign Minister. Lozovsky is usually ignored by critics of jews and it is worth mentioning that he is actually one of best case studies of jewish power in the USSR and that his jewish nephew was George Mink: a major figure in the Communist Party USA. (39) Mink; according to Valtin, like Heinz Neumann was a jew with a particular passion for bedding gentile women and tried to rape an attractive Danish maid in Copenhagen. (40)

Valtin next mentions a young German Communist named Hans Sorgers; who was an editor for an unspecified KPD periodical or publishing house, who was caught by the German secret police because he had become infatuated with a Communist jewess. Who after being picked up as potential Communist agent blurted out; under questioning, as much information as she possibly could to save her own skin regardless of her misguided lover's life and her own professed beliefs. (41)

The next stop on Valtin's whistle-stop tour of the Jewish elements of the Comintern and Soviet intelligence apparatus is Paris where he is directed to the apartment of a Jewish architect called Roger Walter Ginsburg. Whose spacious and luxuriant apartment on the fashionable Rue de Seine was the centre of much Soviet intelligence activity in both France and Western Europe. (42)

Ginsburg provided such services to Soviet intelligence as: acting as a dead drop location, communications hub, banker and passport forger. His wife; Doris Ginsburg, also translated Comintern and Soviet intelligence directives and material for this intelligence network running out of their apartment: she also acted as an impromptu interpreter. (43)

One of the Soviet agents; whose dispatches were sent through Roger Ginsburg, was a Jewish police superintendent in Tel Aviv: who was busy helping Arabs get to Moscow so they could be trained as Soviet intelligence assets to fight against '*Anglo-French Imperialism*' in the Middle East. (44)

Around the time that Valtin met his wife-to-be; Firelei, he assisted a Jewish Comintern asset named Hirsch who was to go to Galicia; a major centre of Jewish culture no less, and help organise the '*class conscious*' Jews against the Poles in the name of the '*world revolution*'. Hirsch was however quickly caught by the Polish police and promptly hung for high treason. (45)

There ends the litany of Jewish Bolsheviks that Krebs mentions in his '*Out of the Night*'; aside from some mentions of the infamous Bela Kuhn (but I judge that no introduction is necessary to his murderous regime and subsequent activities), which is very informative in telling us just how many Jews got involved in working for '*world revolution*' with the Comintern and Soviet intelligence. One wonders how some can continue to claim there was no significant Jewish representation in international communism or among the Bolsheviks?

Puzzling indeed!

References

1. Jan Valtin, 1941, '*Out of the Night*', 1st Edition, Alliance: New York
2. Ernst von Waldenfels, 2002, '*Der Spion der aus Deutschland Kam: Das Geheime Leben des Seemanns Richard Krebs*', 1st Edition, Aufbau Verlag: Berlin
3. For example of the comparative leniency of the Third Reich towards Communist prisoners see the remarkable booklet Reinhard Rurup (Ed.), 1997, '*Topography of Terror: Gestapo, SS and Reichssicherheitshauptamt on the "Prinz-Albrecht-Terrain": A Documentation*', 6th Edition, Verlag Willmuth Arenhovel: Berlin, which manages to indirectly inform us of this; to modern readers, startling fact (in spite of the clunky and badly translated English title).
4. Valtin, Op. Cit., p. 41
5. Ibid.
6. Albert Lindemann, 1997, '*Esau's Tears: Anti-Semitism and the Rise of the Jews*', 1st Edition, Cambridge University Press: New York, p. 452

7. Robert Conquest, 1968, *'The Great Terror: Stalin's Purge of the Thirties'*, 1st Edition, MacMillan: New York, p. 76
8. Vadim Birstein, 2011, *'SMERSH: Stalin's Secret Weapon. Soviet Military Counterintelligence in WWII'*, 1st Edition, Biteback: London, p. 25
9. Lindemann, Op. Cit., p. 453
10. Orlando Figes, 1997, *'A People's Tragedy: The Russian Revolution 1891-1924'*, 1st Edition, Pimlico: London, p. 696
11. Duncan Hallas, 1984, *'Trotsky's Marxism'*, 2nd Edition, Bookmarks: Chicago, p. 5
12. Valtin, Op. Cit., pp. 45; 110
13. George Mosse, 1971, *'German Socialists and the Jewish Question in the Weimar Republic'*, Leo Baeck Institute Year Book, Vol. 16, No. 1, p. 143
14. Valtin, Op. Cit., p. 47
15. Ibid.
16. Ibid, p. 48
17. Birstein, Op. Cit., p. 37
18. Valtin, Op. Cit., p. 57
19. David Olusoga, Casper Erichsen, 2011, *'The Kaiser's Holocaust: Germany's Forgotten Genocide'*, 2nd Edition, Faber and Faber: London, pp. 282-287
20. Salo Baron, 1964, *'The Russian Jew'*, 1st Edition, MacMillan: New York, p. 203
21. Valtin, Op. Cit., p. 58
22. Ibid, p. 66
23. Ibid, p. 67
24. Ibid.
25. Ibid.; Adolf Ehrt, 1990, [1933], *'Communism in Germany: The Communist Conspiracy on the Eve of the 1933 National Revolution'*, 1st Edition, Noontide Press: Costa Mesa, p. 20
26. Valtin, Op. Cit., pp. 67-68
27. Ibid, pp. 140; 353
28. Ibid, p. 98
29. Ibid, pp. 83; 182
30. Ibid, pp. 96-97
31. Sean McMeekin, 2003, *'The Red Millionaire: A Political Biography of Willi Muenzenberg, Moscow's Secret Propaganda Tsar in the West'*, 1st Edition, Yale University Press: New Haven, p. 122
32. Birstein, Op. Cit., pp. 29-30
33. Valtin, Op. Cit. p. 111
34. Ibid.
35. Ibid, p. 116
36. Ibid, p. 138
37. Ibid, pp. 119-120; 203-205
38. Joshua Rubenstein, Vladimir Naumov, (Eds.), Laura Esther Wolfson (Trans.), 2005, *'Stalin's Secret Pogrom: The Inquisition of the Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee'*, 2nd Edition, Yale University Press: New Haven, pp. 385-386
39. Valtin, Op. Cit., pp. 309-310; Whittaker Chambers, 1952, *'Witness'*, 1st Edition, Random House: New York, pp. 302-303
40. Valtin, Op. Cit., p. 312

- 41. Ibid, p. 143
- 42. Ibid, pp. 185-186; 470-471
- 43. Ibid, pp. 186-187; 484
- 44. Ibid, p. 189
- 45. Ibid, p. 210

How you shouldn't view the Jews: A Reply to Dr. D (Part I)

Thursday, 22 December 2011

Recently browsing through the Blogosphere; as I sometimes do when I am not feeling up to conducting research, writing another book or working through a novel, I came across an article by a chap who writes under the pseudonym; 'Dr. D', at the 'Sarah Maid of Albion' blog. The article concerned is entitled: [*'How should we view the Jews?'*](#) Unfortunately the article is from July 2010 so it is very slightly dated, but as it isn't too old I have taken the view that it is worth replying to it from the perspective of an educated anti-Semitism. As 'Dr. D' is courteous and thoughtful in his writing I shall observe the academic pleasantries as opposed to my preferred polemical style on SC.

D starts off by juxtaposing the two most common forms of non-jewish reaction to jews: the philo-Semitic (the jews are generally good) and the anti-Semitic (the jews are generally bad). His example of the philo-Semitic camp (most Evangelical Christians [well in the US anyway]) is reasonable, but his example of the anti-Semitic camp (the Protocols of Zion proponents) is highly misleading. This is unfortunate as D remarks that '*we should first know something about*' the jews before we form an opinion: I would point out that D unfortunately has not followed his own creed here as it is plain as day that he knows very little about opponents of the jews (historically or currently) or even the jews in some instances.

I am sure D would disagree upon reading my comments here, but it is worth understanding that although the Protocols of Zion are the most famous anti-jewish text in this day and age: their believers were never the majority of anti-Semites as far as I can ascertain but rather a very vocal minority (rather like pagans in the Third Reich). Unfortunately some authors on the Protocols; who are often jewish, have propounded a large number of myths surrounding their reception and the belief in them beyond the early years of their mass publication in the West (i.e. from 1917 to the mid-1920s).

Be that as it may be: D's example of the anti-Semitic camp is poorly chosen as it represents only one strand (and not even a major one) of anti-jewish thought and certainly doesn't in any way equate to the widespread and unusual belief systems of Evangelical Christians regarding jewishness. A better example that D could have used would have been the anti-Semitic groups of the 1880s and 1890s in France and Germany, which; although less useful rhetorically speaking, would more accurately describe anti-jewish thought in both its historic and modern contexts in much the same way that the Evangelical Christian example does (perhaps more so than D is aware).

I am somewhat surprised at D's comment that the West '*enjoys*' the '*benefits*' of a '*Judeo-Christian heritage*' regardless of one's present beliefs, which is a tautology as it simply reasserts the premise without giving the required clarity as to why this is the case. Disproving such an assertion is simple enough as it merely requires a thought experiment.

To wit: if, as D posits, the West has acquired '*benefits*' from its '*Judeo-Christian heritage*' then surely it has equally acquired '*benefits*' from various genocidal actions that it has undertaken round the world, which therefore means that the '*anti-Imperialist*' arguments of '*national liberation*' used by Marxists and leftists in their various different shades of crimson are correct. In essence: you can't have your cake and eat it. All or none must be true: unless we do as Nietzsche exclaimed and get back to the core of the issues concerned.

The core of the issue is; of course, biology and its necessary concomitant when trying to understand any biological group: sub-species (better known as race). I don't propose to point out at length the need to understand history as an exponential and evolving series of individual and group conflicts, but rather to simply observe that the '*Judeo-Christian heritage*' that D wishes to ascribe such positive values to and derive benefit from has equally been applied to very different peoples with very different effects. Need I remind D of the huge gulf that separate say the Church of Rome from the Coptic Christians of Egypt and the apparent lack of value the Copts have derived from their '*Judeo-Christian heritage*' in comparison to the West?

After all if it is the '*values*' and '*spirituality*' that make the man: then surely we are dealing with the long-debunked theory of the Tabula Rasa (the '*Blank Slate*') here (which essentially posits a pseudo-Lamarckian view of human biology and the resultant veiled denial of Mendelian genetics)? I don't wish to ascribe views; that D may not hold, to him, but I would question whether D has fully understood the necessary implications of his arguments; whether he views them as rhetorical or factual, in a wider context.

Thus the objective constant; per the scientific method, cannot be the '*Judeo-Christian heritage*' of the West that D puts forward, but rather it has to be an objective constant that does differ and does dispassionately alter the socio-cultural expression of a given idea and we have just such an objective constant in biological groups also known as races.

D also incorrectly asserts that the '*basis*' of '*civil law*' is Christian (actually Roman and Greek), our customs (a seriously mixed bag often with non-Christian roots) and that everything we know has grown out of this '*Judeo-Christian*' background. I'd agree with the latter point to an extent, but again D is unfortunately guilty of overstating his case (and in a sense misrepresenting it by doing so) as he doesn't clarify that it is only a part of the background.

If '*Judeo-Christian*'; a term I personally object to, ideas have played a large background part to things then so have earlier non-Christian ones as well as later secular ones by virtue of the same logic. Need I remind D that the Italian Renaissance has not without reason been styled as the re-emergence of paganism in Europe as it resulted from the rediscovery of pagan art and intellectuals, of which stories are still told (for example the artists who paid to be lowered into Nero's palace so they could study and paint the luxurious frescos).

In essence: you cannot ascribe single causative status to the so-called '*Judeo-Christian heritage*' as it is but one of many worldviews that necessarily have impacted the values and ideas that D holds dear if we choose to look at history in terms of ideas, philosophies and intellectual fashions/fetishes. It is also noteworthy that in ascribing to a '*Judeo-Christian heritage*' a causative power then D is subscribing to the position that an abstract idea; as what on earth is the '*Judeo-Christian heritage*' specifically (it could literally be almost anything), causes an objective fact (the power of the West) to occur. That is rather like suggesting that because the Prophet Mohammed was the Chosen of Allah then the mountain must therefore have sprouted legs and gone to Mohammed in spite of the objective fact that we know mountains cannot move anywhere on their own.

D then makes the statement that if we should have an opinion about the jews then we should know something about with which I generally occur given that I believe that if one deals with the reality of the jew then the world will applaud anti-Semites; like me, but if we don't deal with that reality and make the jew a cruel and inhuman monster then the world will have justified contempt for anti-Semites like me. That said while it is clear to me that D has read some literature on the jews: I would question the factual nature of a lot of his assertions about both Judaism and jews.

After an orthodox; if misguided, evangelical exegesis on the origin of the jews D makes a categorical error when he asserts that '*to be a Jew came to be one who followed the Law of Moses*' as that leaves out the meaning of the '*Chosen People*'; i.e. that that status is handed down from father to son; if you will, not from a confession of religious faith. The jews were already; at this time, associating jewishness not with confession of faith, but with being descended from the Israelites that Moses allegedly brought out of Egypt (600,000 if one believes the Gemara). I am this surprised to find that D leaves out any mention of the Prophets Nehemiah and Ezra; for example, who preach that exact doctrine to the Israelites and note that while he cites a passage from Genesis he does not cite others that contradict his assertion of a confession of faith being sufficient. The only example I can immediately recall from the Tanakh where a confession of faith is thought to be sufficient to be regarded as a jew; of a sort, is Ruth the Moabitess who is something of an exception to the rule and is probably part of the origin; or at least the rabbinic justification, for jewishness being governed by the maternal line in all instances except for the Kohanim and Levites (where it is the paternal line that matters) from at least the era of the academies (but probably far earlier).

This lack of recognition of the biological nature of jewishness at this early juncture means that the remainder of D's presentation on the history of the jewish kingdoms in Palestine and the sects at the time of Jesus is flawed. He further compounds his error by claiming that '*Judaism is what makes a Jew, at least historically*' which is; I am afraid, not correct as while Judaism has served as the tool which has kept the jewish community together: the jewish sense of mission; even in this early period, and of having a unique and separate identity is obvious from even a brief reading of the academic literature on the subject.

A pointed case is the Hellenizing; i.e. secular, jews; a representative example being Philo of Alexandria: who while not exactly orthodox worshippers of Hashem sought to reconcile Greek and Latin philosophy with Judaism as it then existed. One wonders how D is to explain that if

Judaism was the whole of the Jewish experience at this early juncture: then how does explain the explicitly Jewish individuals; like Herod Agrippa II, who acted in the Jewish communities interests in Rome, but were not even slightly interested in Judaism?

Simply put: I am afraid D cannot do so within his outlined ideological position but rather uses an over-generalization to Christianise; for lack of a better term, Judaism and to make it more like later Christianity than later Judaism. One can quite easily see from D's comments that he is using Saint Paul's conception of the meaning of '*gentile*' rather than the one common to Judaism at the time. This is probably merely an accidental expression of D's own beliefs than anything malicious or deliberately misleading, but it never-the-less is dangerously lacking in context and does significantly mislead the reader.

D fails to highlight; due to this fundamental error, for example the well-known links between the Essenes and the Zealots: nor does he highlight that both groups started life as extremist variants within the Pharisees. The Essenes choosing a life of seclusion and abstinence following the '*Teacher of Righteousness*' in; what is sometimes argued as, an early form of monasticism. The Zealots fundamentally believed the same thing as the Essenes, but differed in the belief that they were the hand of Yahweh and could bring about the coming of the Jewish Messiah by fighting the Romans tooth and nail as well as purifying Israel of those members who collaborated with the original; in Jewish eyes, '*evil empire*'.

The difference between the two is perhaps best understood by putting it in the context of modern Judaism: those religious Jews who are also Zionists believe that by recreating a Jewish state in Palestine they can hasten the advent of the Jewish Messiah (like the Zealots) and those religious Jews who are anti—Zionists who believe that recreating a Jewish state in Palestine does not hasten; and in fact prevents, the advent of the Jewish Messiah (like the Essenes). Neither doubt each other's fundamental religious beliefs, but rather their disagreement is about how to get to the desired state (the Messianic times when the Jews rule the world).

Once again the lack of understanding on D's part that Judaism both at this time and later followed a biological definition of what a Jew was comes to the fore. As he fails to note that none of the four parties he mentions; the Sadducees, Pharisees, Essenes and Zealots, all believed that membership of Israel was inherited not confessed and that their primary objection was not that non-Jews were in Palestine, but that they were subordinated; as the Chosen of Yahweh, to a Gentile power (the '*Rome and Persia*' of the Mishnah). As well as that the definition of a Gentile was such that one could not truly convert and usually became a '*God Fearer*' (a concept from which the Noahide Laws derive whence a Gentile unconditionally dedicates themselves to the service of Jews as Yahweh's '*Chosen nation*') or at very best a '*Jewish soul born into an impure Gentile body*' (meaning one is a lower class of Jew, not a member of Israel as such and at a hereditary disadvantage in marital, social and religious terms etc).

D's comments that Judaism is a legalistic religion; with which one can only agree as Arnold Toynbee did when he called it a '*dead*' religion of ritual and form alone (which follows; for example, Voltaire's mischievous critique of Judaism), and that '*most*' of the Judaism of today has roots; in this particular epoch, in the ideas of the Pharisees is correct. However D then moves into a very confused discussion of Judaism and Jewish identity when he tries to justify his claim

that Judaism; as a confession of faith, makes the Jew.

D doesn't tell us why; after acknowledging that religious and non-religious Jews exist within the same identity with a shared historical narrative and assumptions, '*religious faith*' is the single causative factor of this shared identity; which some politically left-wing elements have sought to conflate with the biological concept of the nation through the medium of the term '*national identity*', but rather makes the odd claim that '*despite religious faith, they [the Jews] exhibit all of the other characteristics of all Jews.*'

This is yet another tautology as it doesn't explain why; after splitting the Jews into religious and secular (which is a gross oversimplification any way you look at it), that Jews may still be understood as a religious community with non-religious Jews exhibiting religious '*characteristics*'. The proverbial '*elephant in the room*' here is that Judaism defines Jewishness biologically and therefore the '*other characteristics*' of this '*religious group*' are; in fact, the characteristics of the Jewish biological group. There is simply no way around that, but D refuses to mention it although it is clear to me that he understands; but does not wish to or cannot accept, that this is indeed the case.