

NAZI-ZIONIST COLLABORATION

BY *Jews Against Zionism and Anti-Semitism,*
Melbourne, Australia.

**PUBLISHED IN BRITAIN BY BAZO-PALESTINE SOLIDARITY AND AZAN
(ANTI-ZIONISTS AGAINST THE NAZIS) IN CO-OPERATION WITH JAZA (JEWS
AGAINST ZIONISM AND ANTI-SEMITISM) IN AUSTRALIA**

1981

£1.50

**AAARGH
INTERNET 2006**

This text is very important. Rather than scanning our old printed copy, we relied upon a Web available digital edition. Originally typed in 1981 by Ann Morris. Digitized and edited in 2005 by Patrick Muldowney and Anita Hood.

Retrieved (Nov. 2005) from

<http://www.lastsuperpower.net/docs/nzcccontents>

BRITISH ANTI-ZIONIST ORGANISATION

George Mitchell
90 John Street
Glasgow G1
Britain
(Stamped)

BAZO-Palestine Solidarity Objectives

The organisation opposes international Zionism in all its manifestations as racialist ideology, especially the Zionist state entity.

The organisation particularly opposes Zionism in Britain.

The organisation campaigns for a Unitary, Democratic, Secular State in all of Palestine with equal obligations and rights for all its citizens irrespective of their racial origin and religious beliefs, as proposed by the Palestine Liberation Organisation (PLO).

The organisation supports the struggle of the Palestinian People and all progressive forces for the attainment of this objective.

The organisation supports the struggle of the Palestinian People as part of the world National Liberation Movement against Zionism and Imperialism for its right to self-determination in its entire homeland and believes that the exercise of this right is the only correct step towards the creation of the Unitary, Democratic, Secular State in all of Palestine.

AAARGH

THE WEBSITE WAS FOUNDED IN 1996 BY AN INTERNATIONAL TEAM

<http://vho.org/aaargh>

<http://aaargh.com.mx>

<http://litek.ws/aaargh>

If you intend to connect to the AAARGH website from France, you need an anonymizer.

<HTTP://ANON.FREE.ANONYMIZER.COM/HTTP://WWW.AAARGH.COM.MX/>

OR: [HTTP://AAARGH.COM.MX.NYUD.NET:8090](http://AAARGH.COM.MX.NYUD.NET:8090)

We work in French, English, German, Spanish, Italian, Rumenian, Russian, Chech, Danish, Indonesian, Portuguese, Dutch, Hungarian...

THE QUARTERLIES OF AAARGH

<http://geocities.com/ilrestodelsiclo>

Conseils de révision
Gaette du Golfe et des banlieues
The Revisionist Clarion
Il resto del siculo
El Paso del Ebro
Das kausale Nexusblatt
O revisionismo em lingua português
Arménichantage

NEW ADDITIONS ON AAARGH

<http://aaargh.com.mx/fran/nouv.html>

<http://vho.org/aaargh/fran/nouv.html>

BOOKS (260) PUBLISHED BY AAARGH ON INTERNET

<http://vho.org/aaargh/fran/livres/livres.html>

<http://aaargh.com.mx/fran/livres/livres.html>

DOCUMENTS, COMPILATIONS, AAARGH REPRINTS

<http://aaargh.com.mx/fran/livres/reprints.html>

<http://vho.org/aaargh/fran/livres/reprints.html>

FREE SUBSCRIBE: (E-MAIL)

revclar@yahoo.com.au

elrevisionista@yahoo.com.ar

MAIL:

aaarghinternational@hotmail.com

POUR ÊTRE TENUS AU COURANT DES PÉRÉGRINATIONS DE L'AAARGH ET RECEVOIR LA LETTRE DES AAARGHONAUTES (EN FRANÇAIS, IRRÉGULIÈRE):

elrevisionista@yahoo.com.ar

AAARGH, TO AVOID DYING STUPID.

MAKE COPIES OF THE SITE. JOIN AAARGH. BROADCAST AAARGH. WORK FOR AAARGH. LET'S TOIL FOR OUR COMMON FREEDOM. LET'S TRAMPLE THE CENSORS.

FOREWORD

by The British Anti-Zionist Organization - Palestine Solidarity (BAZO-PS) 1981

The British Anti-Zionist Organization - Palestine Solidarity (BAZO-PS) being founded in 1975 by, mostly, young people tended to concentrate its activities in support of the PLO by exposing the imperialist nature of the Zionist enemy which was, and still is, standing against Palestinian Self-Determination.

At that time, the leadership of the Organization had little real understanding of the nature of the Zionist State and the mechanisms by which Zionism strives to retain political control over the indigenous Jewish Communities throughout the world. Such understandings were simply beyond us then.

However, we did notice one consistent Zionist theme, which was this: Whenever the Zionist State is in political trouble either by being progressively isolated in the U.N. by the Afro-Asian bloc or when under tactical pressure from its friends in Western Europe to 'see sense' and agree to the formation of a Palestinian Bantustan on the West Bank & Gaza, it resorts to its favorite excuse and *raison d'être* viz. 'The State of Israel is the homeland of The Jewish People' and 'The only way to prevent a second Holocaust is to defend the State against the world if necessary'.

Using such 'justifications', Begin and his Nazi-like friends indiscriminately bomb the Lebanon and selectively murder their political opponents throughout the world. All in the name of protecting Jewry.

There was a time in the history of BAZO-PS when we had little to say about the murder of millions of people by the Hitlerite Nazis, other than completely opposing it as is expected of any anti-racist organization.

As for the disgraceful Zionist attempts to utilize the tragedy of the Holocaust to boost the political prestige of 'Israel', we merely restricted ourselves to noting that Nazism was a European phenomenon and that the Palestinian Arabs, having no complicity in the murder of European Jewry, should not have been penalized by having their homeland occupied by European colonial settlers.

In a word, if a Zionist State was to be established (which as an anti-racist group we disagree with **in principle**), then it should have been established on the European lands of the Nazi exterminators, and not on Palestinian lands.* The opportunist attempts to exploit the tragedy of the Holocaust in the service of Zionist 'Israel' by promoting the film series of the same name was the breaking point with BAZO-PS.

The film series caused us to reconsider the accepted (Zionist) history of the tragedy. In this we were encouraged by our Orthodox Jewish colleagues of Neturei Karta who have been struggling against all manifestations of Zionist interference in the life of the Jewish communities.

We imported and publicized their book, *The Holocaust Victims Accuse*, written by Rabbi Moshe Shonfeld, throughout Britain. At one point, an advert for the book was refused publication by the pro-Zionist periodicals, the *Jewish*

Chronicle and *Jewish Echo*. The reader might well ask why such papers should refuse to accept a paid advert for a book which deals with the Holocaust from the Orthodox Jewish point of view and which was written by an Orthodox rabbi ?

In addition, our Organization suddenly found itself exposed to a major slander campaign financed by 'Israeli' money : our members were termed 'anti-Semites' except when they were of a Jewish origin they were characterized as 'self-haters'.

Since our initial baptism in such vicious slander we have read more and more about the situation surrounding the tragedy of the Holocaust. So much so that we are now capable of understanding the symbiotic relationship between Zionism and anti-Semitic Nazism.

In Britain we are now the foremost accusers of Zionist-Nazi collaboration and we mean to prove our views to the public. In this context we are convinced that the following pamphlet, *Zionist-Nazi Collaboration* which was written by our colleagues of the 'Jews Against Zionism and Anti-Semitism' group (JAZA) in Australia and which was submitted in evidence in support of the Community 3CR radio station in Australia, says it all.

3CR radio was accused by Zionist sympathizers of being anti-Semitic by transmitting pro-Palestine broadcasts.

The so-called 'Victoria Jewish Board of Deputies' (VJBD) long since dominated by pro-Zionist political attitudes complained about 3CR's exposure of the Zionist-Nazi collaboration issue.

In view of the fact that the truth of the matter has been extensively verified by anti-racist organizations over the past two decades, yet public awareness of the issue is, to say the least, non-existent, we have no hesitation in publishing this JAZA document in Britain with their permission and in cooperation with AZAN (Anti-Zionists Against the Nazis).

It is in the interests of Zionism to hush up the whole matter, yet the issue keeps coming to the fore in the most unlikely journals. For example, the respected and widely-read magazine *History Today* ran what it described as a 'fascinating' article by Dr. Jacob Boas entitled 'A Nazi Goes to Palestine' in its January, 1980 issue. (see p. iv).

This brought the predictable and dreary outcry from Zionist agents in this country. But the truth will come out. Even the pro-Zionist *Jewish Chronicle* ran a three-part series entitled 'Holocaust - The Hidden Truth'. Dubbed 'a disturbing and startling enquiry', its author and so-called expert, Walter Laqueur purported to investigate 'how the news of the 'Final Solution' became known to, and was dealt with by, the leaders of world Jewry.' (see p. v).

Needless to say our Mr. Laqueur stayed far away from any suggestion of Zionist-Nazi Collaboration which resulted in his series being rather contradictory. Our attempt at unraveling Mr. Laqueur's contradictions, which took the form of a letter to the *Jewish Chronicle*, was ignored. Understandably from a Zionist's point of view.

Well, Zionism may decide it could ignore our letter, but we will see if it can ignore this pamphlet. It is our view that only a dishonest person can read this pamphlet through to the end, with all its evidence, and still support racist Zionism.

BAZO-PS 1981

* Note that it is exactly what the Iranian President Ahmadinejed just said (Dec. 2005), triggering an uproar in the Western media.

Nazi-Zionist Collaboration:

Authors' preface

Readers solely interested in the historical question of Zionist-Nazi Collaboration could start reading from chapter 5, 'The Kastner Case'. However, the earlier sections are of some interest in describing how a typical Zionist 'campaign' works and why many Jews and others are deceived into supporting them. So this submission to the Australia Broadcasting Tribunal is reprinted here unchanged except for minor sub-editing and the addition of reference notes.

Community Radio 3CR in Melbourne, Australia is a federation of many affiliates with varying political views. It is biased towards the working class and opposed to imperialism and racism. Therefore, Zionist organizations are refused affiliation or air-time.

Anti-Zionist affiliates such as the Palestine-Australia Solidarity Committee and the Palestine Arab Club are allowed to broadcast their views uncensored.

Unable to accept this open reversal of the usual situation, the Zionist movement through the 'Victorian Jewish Board of Deputies', (VJBD) launched an extremely vicious smear campaign against 3CR. This centered on allegations of anti-Semitism, but also 'terrorism' and all the rest of it.

Since 3CR is entirely self-supporting and has a public and democratic decision-making process, the normal means of pressure and manipulation did not work, although they did do a great deal of damage and exacerbated the Station's internal problems.

Consequently, an all-out campaign was launched in the Australian media which resulted in a public enquiry by the Australian Broadcasting Tribunal into whether the Station's license to broadcast should be revoked. The Zionist 'Victorian Jewish Board of Deputies', (VJBD) claimed at this enquiry that allegations of 'Nazi-Zionist collaboration' during the Holocaust were the most offensive material broadcast by 3CR affiliates, being simply a paranoid anti-Semitic conspiracy theory intended to bait the Melbourne Jewish Community.

The only 'evidence' submitted by the VJBD to refute such broadcasts was a brief statement by a Melbourne University academic, Dr. John Foster. We have reprinted this statement in full in Appendix A., (Address deleted for digital reproduction) since reference is made to it in this booklet, and readers should be able to judge for themselves what weighty arguments for censoring radio broadcasts were being replied to.

Although evidence by Rabbi's Levi and Gutnick, Mr. Bloch and other VJBD witnesses has been referred to in passing, they are not reprinted here as they were simply expressing general outrage and did not even attempt to refute specific allegations. To substantiate the broadcasts 'Jews Against Zionism and Anti-Semitism', (JAZA) another 3CR affiliate, prepared a detailed study on 'Nazi-Zionist Collaboration'.

This submission was prepared rather hurriedly, and specifically for the public enquiry into 3CR, rather than as a comprehensive survey of the question. Nevertheless, we are reprinting it here unchanged except for minor sub-editing and the edition of reference notes.

Although by no means comprehensive, the evidence submitted by JAZA was

apparently sufficient for the VJBD to decide it did not want a public enquiry into these allegations at any cost.

As explained in Appendix B, the VJBD withdrew from the enquiry with none of its demands met, after a unilateral declaration by Radio 3CR, which reaffirmed its original position. (Appendix C).

For more than a year since then, anti-Zionist broadcasts by 3CR affiliates have continued unchanged and Zionists have been given no right of reply. So far, the Zionists have done nothing to resume their media campaign against 3CR, and VJBD President, Arnold Bloch has resigned his position.

Since the same allegations have been repeated on the air many times, there is no doubt that Zionists still find them 'offensive'. But they no longer want a public enquiry into them. Anyone reading this book will understand why.

In addition to the 'Nazi-Zionist Collaboration' material, JAZA and other 3CR affiliates presented a good deal of material on other aspects of Zionism, substantiating broadcasts alleging that it is a racist movement and so forth.

This included some material on the history of Zionism, and how it came to dominate Jewish communities, and particular reference to the role played by 'left-wing Zionism' in confusing the issues.

Some of this material is being prepared for publication by BAZO-PS and will appear as a separate book.

Many people, both in JAZA and outside it assisted in preparing this material and commenting on it. Most will have to remain nameless for various reasons (including Zionist terrorism).

Mention should be made of the assistance of Frans Timmermann in sub-editing and preparing the reference notes and, of course, BAZO-PS for re-typing, publishing and distributing.

A further edition is planned for wider circulation and dealing with Nazi-Zionist Collaboration in its own right, quite apart from the 3CR enquiry. Any comments and suggestions should be sent to JAZA, Melbourne. (post 2005 enquiries to Lastsuperpower.)

Finally, questions have been raised about reference to Jews as an ethnic or national minority group rather than simply as adherents of a particular religion. These questions come from PLO supporters as well as the usual queries from Zionists as to how some JAZA members can call themselves Jews if they are not Zionists and not religious. This is an important issue which has a bearing on the future status of Israeli Jews in a democratic solution to the Palestine problem.

Space precludes a proper analysis here, but a few words are necessary. Most of the people in countries like Australia and the USA who are generally called 'Jews' are more accurately 'people of Jewish origin'. Most are already quite fully assimilated into the nations in which they live but they still retain some specifically 'Jewish' cultural characteristics which have very little to do with religion.

What they have in common is not membership of the mythical Zionist 'world-wide Jewish Nation' but parents, grandparents or great grandparents who once spoke the Yiddish language and were part of recognized national minorities in Eastern European countries like Poland and Russia (this, of course, has nothing to do with 'race').

A comparison could be made with people of Gypsy origin (another European minority people who were wiped out by the Nazis). But it is quite misleading, and plays into the hands of Zionism, to define Jews by 'religion' as the only alternative to Zionism.

1. INTRODUCTION

The Victorian Jewish Board of Deputies has emphasized accusations of Nazi-Zionist collaboration as the material it finds most offensive and has claimed that 3CR broadcasters take delight in driving the Jewish community, into frenzy, by making such allegations. We in Jews Against Zionism and Anti-Semitism have made a detailed study of this question and wish to present our findings to this inquiry.

Although we do not even speak the necessary foreign languages to be able to survey the primary sources, we do claim to know a lot more about it than Dr. Foster does, having carefully studied the secondary sources on both sides instead of only one side.

Our evidence will show that claims of Nazi-Zionist collaboration broadcast on some 3CR programs are well founded and thoroughly documented in a substantial literature accessible to non-experts with a bit of hard work.

They are not fantasies, let alone anti-Semitic fantasies.

Broadcasts about Nazi-Zionist collaboration are a reflection on the airwaves of Australia of written material long accepted as part of the serious literature on the subject, and which has long been legally available in the State of Israel.

Any apparent strangeness and 'extremism', of these broadcasts, is not because they reflect the views of a lunatic fringe, but because this serious literature is not readily available in Australia and is therefore unfamiliar to listeners.

In passing, we should mention that allegations of Nazi-Zionist collaboration do not originate, as is often claimed and widely assumed, from Arab answers to Israel's use of the Holocaust as a propaganda weapon.

Nor, as should be obvious from 3CR's hostile attitude to the Soviet Union, are they a result of Soviet propaganda on this subject.

Nor are these allegations meant to excuse Palestinian Arab collaborators with Nazism, such as the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem.

Only Zionists, with their fundamentally racist outlook, imagine that collaboration is an accusation one can level against a whole ethnic group, or that one can refute such accusations by proving that people of the same ethnic origin as the accuser are also guilty of the same crime.

Since Israel's exploitation of the Holocaust for propaganda is so blatant, the assumption, that accusations of Zionist collaboration must be a propaganda reply, seems fairly natural. But in fact most of the available English language literature on this subject was written by Jews long before the modern Palestinian revolution got going.

The issue was first raised on 3CR, in the second edition of *Palestine Speaks* that went to air, by two Palestinian Jews, one of whom happened to have worked in the law office that handled the most famous Israeli court case concerning Nazi collaboration. The debate has since escalated, with increasingly hysterical Zionist

accusations against 3CR, being used to provoke more comments on this subject in reply.

Presumably the Zionist assumption was that no hard evidence would be available to back these allegations up. If so, we will now refute that assumption.

In doing so, we have deliberately avoided relying much on the substantial amount of material recently published by the Soviet Union and its supporters for their own reasons.

Among the sources we have relied on are the publications of the 'Guardians of the City' or 'Neturei Karta' - orthodox religious Jews who live strictly according to Torah. These include the book; *The Holocaust Victims Accuse* by Reb Moshe Shonfeld, (1) which was first published as a series of articles in the Israeli Hebrew magazine *Digleinu* in the years 1961 to 1964, and the article 'Some of my Best Friends are Nazis' by N. Glaser², published in the New York *Jewish Guardian*, Volume 2, Number 2. (2)

We have also used the book *Perfidy* by Ben Hecht, (3) an extreme Zionist of the Menachem Begin ('Revisionist') variety. (4) This was originally published in English in New York in 1961, and has since been reprinted in Hebrew in Israel in 1970. It is now available in an English reprint edition from the Neturei Karta.

This material is virtually inaccessible in Australia due to active Zionist suppression, and does not circulate at all, either within the Jewish community or outside it.

We have also made some use of *Eichmann in Jerusalem* by Dr. Hannah Arendt, (5) who also supports the existence of the State of Israel, and a number of other serious works, generally written from a pro-Zionist standpoint.

None of these writers could be even remotely described as 'left-wing', and their books have nothing to do with the Arab-Israeli dispute. So far as Ben Hecht and Rabbi Shonfeld are concerned, there are probably no other subjects we could agree on, except the fact that the top Zionist leadership did collaborate with the Nazis and that this fact should be known to the public.

We have provided copies of these and other related works to the Tribunal and we ask that they be read carefully before any decision is contemplated that might inhibit 3CR from permitting its affiliates to continue broadcasting these allegations.

Before documenting the allegations themselves, we would like to comment on the reactions to them within the Jewish community, based on our own experiences, talking to relatives and friends.

¹ Reb Moshe Shonfeld, *The Holocaust Victims Accuse: Documents and Testimony on Jewish War Criminals* Part 1, Neturei Karta of USA, New York, 1977.

² N, Glaser, Some of my best friends are Nazis, *Jewish Guardian* Vol.2, No. 2 (Nov. 1978), p. 22-24.

³ Ben Hecht, *Perfidy*, Julian Messner, Inc., New York, 1961.

⁴ This does not refer to a departure from Marxism. The Union of Zionists-Revisionists was founded in the early 1920s as an extreme right-wing split-off from the official Zionist movement.

⁵ Hannah Arendt, *Eichmann in Jerusalem*. The Viking Press, New York, 1965.

2. JEWISH COMMUNITY REACTIONS

There is no doubt that Zionists have become rather frenzied about these allegations of Nazi collaboration and do consider them offensive. Any Zionist who believes the allegations to be false is naturally offended about a movement he or she supports being accused of collaborating with something so vile as Nazism.

Most people who call themselves Zionists see Zionism as just a sort of Jewish cultural and philanthropic movement friendly to the State of Israel, and have very little idea of what it really involves.

The very small number of hard core Zionists who know anything about Zionist-Nazi collaboration also find it offensive to be reminded about this, and are naturally in a frenzy to prevent others finding out about it, although why they imagine that a public hearing will help suppress the information remains a mystery.

Thus there is no doubt that Zionist indignation about these particular broadcasts is quite genuine, even though a great deal of their outrage about other aspects of 3CR programs is somewhat synthetic.

As for the Jewish community as a whole, there is also no doubt a widespread hostile reaction on this question.

However, it is not all that widespread, and even more important, it is not a hostile reaction to what is actually broadcast on 3CR, but to what Jews have been told is being broadcast on 3CR.

2.1 Anti-Semitism and Anti-Zionism

There are two major anti-Semitic conspiracy theories, which are well known within the Jewish community and give particular offence to Jews. One is that the holocaust never happened and is essentially a 'Zionist Hoax', as for example put forward by the neo-Nazi Professor Butz in his book *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*. ⁽⁶⁾**[note by aaargh: of course, Prof. Butz is not neo-nazi anymore than the leftist authors of the present pamphlet.]** The other is that the Holocaust was deliberately arranged by the Zionists who more or less tricked the Nazis into it in order to win sympathy. This theory, based on the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, ⁽⁷⁾ has been put forward by the notorious [Australian] anti-Semite Eric Butler in his book *The International Jew*. ⁽⁸⁾

Both these conspiracy theories use the term 'Zionist' primarily as a code word, or else a euphemism, for 'Jew', if they use it at all.

Both draw sustenance from reference to some actual facts about connections

⁶ Arthur R. Butz, *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, Historical Review Press, Warwickshire, 1976.

⁷ *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion* is an anti-Semitic tract falsely purporting to uncover an international Jewish conspiracy aimed at world power. It was written in the 1890s by an agent of the Russian secret police.

⁸ Eric D. Butler, *The International Jew: The truth about the Protocols of Zion*, Adelaide, New Times, 1947.

between Jews, or Zionists and Nazis, but intertwine them with various fantasies, and are quite clearly examples of anti-Semitic paranoia rather than any genuine analysis of Zionism as a specific political movement.

People in the Jewish community are very conscious that the use of 'Zionist' as a code word for 'Jew' is now quite common in anti-Semitic literature, whether done subtly as, by Professor Butz, and the modern Eric Butler, or crudely as in the old Eric Butler; or in modern neo-Nazi publications such as the newspaper *Attack* which is freely distributed without legal interference in Australia.

This common use of the term 'Zionist', has been used, for example in 'The Australian League of Rights', (9) by Andrew Campbell, an intelligence officer in the 'Civil Service', to suggest that left wing anti-Zionism is strikingly similar to the anti-Semitic views of the League of Rights.

In fact some of Eric Butler's material is strikingly similar, for the simple reason that it is copied directly from anti-Zionist publications, even to the point of enthusiastically endorsing the views of anti-Zionist Jews.

No doubt our evidence at this inquiry will also be used by Eric Butler in that way, but this cannot be helped.

The point is that if one wants to discredit Jews as an ethnic group, it makes a good deal of sense to talk about Zionism and the savage atrocities it has committed, just as it would make sense to talk about Nazism if one wished to discredit Germans.

An examination of League of Rights publications shows quite clearly that there is no flow of anti-Semitic ideas into genuine anti-Zionist material, but simply an adoption of some anti-Zionist arguments by anti-Semites.

There is a flow the other way in some propaganda from the more reactionary Arab governments a decade or so ago. We have included in our evidence a sample from Israel's good friend of today, the Egyptian Government, in order to highlight the contrast between this sort of material and the purely anti-Zionist, not anti-Semitic material published by the Palestinian liberation forces and used in 3CR broadcasts.

Nevertheless, considerable emphasis has been given in Zionist propaganda, to the existence of such Arab anti-Semitic literature, even years after it stopped coming out. For example see Isi Liebler's book *The Case for Israel*, which is virtually a text book at Mount Scopus College. (10)

This does create an atmosphere in which broadcasts apparently attacking 'Zionists' rather than 'Jews' will be viewed with some suspicion, rather than simply being taken at face value, within the Jewish community.

It would not be surprising if some anti-Semites did try to attach themselves to genuine anti-Zionist activities as an opportunity to have a go at Jews, just as anti-Catholics may have tended to line up with the left-wing of the Australian Labour Party (ALP) in the 1955 split.

In fact no such tendency has been observed in Australia to our knowledge, and it would not be tolerated if it ever did emerge. On the contrary, it has always been noticeable that people with anti-Semitic inclinations have tended to favour Zionism, which confirms their prejudice that Jews are somehow alien 'to Australia and belong elsewhere. Mr. B.H. for example, reflected a much more anti-Semitic attitude than is common in Australia, when as a child he got into a fight with another school student simply because the latter was Jewish, and he also reflects a

⁹ Andrew Campbell, *The Australian League of Rights*, Outback Press, Melbourne, 1978.

¹⁰ Isi Liebler, *The Case for Israel*, Executive Council of Australian Jewry, Melbourne, 1972.

much more pro-Zionist attitude than is common in Australia.

He has admitted publicly that his earlier anti-Semitism is connected with his later pro-Zionism. But most Australians who are not particularly interested in bashing Jewish school students are not particularly interested in sponsoring Jewish emigration to the State of Israel either.

Another factor relevant to Jewish reactions to 3CR is widespread concern within the Jewish community about allegedly 'anti-Zionist' campaigns in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe which appear to have little to do with Middle East politics and have been characterized as essentially anti-Semitic.

Despite 3CR's exclusion of the Australia Soviet Friendship Society in the same way that it excludes 'Paths to Peace', there is a lot of Zionist propaganda within the Jewish community about a sort of 'Soviet, Arab, Left-Wing Conspiracy', rather like the 'International Zionist, Communist Conspiracy'. This lends plausibility to Zionist efforts to picture attacks on Zionism in 3CR broadcasts as a form of anti-Semitism similar to the 'anti-Zionist' campaigns of Eastern Europe.

In fact, anti-Semitic use of the term 'Zionist' as a code word for 'Jew', has nothing whatever in common with the correct use of this term on 3CR programs dealing with the activities of the State of Israel, and its supporters in Australia, just as normal references to 'Nazism' on 3CR and in other media has nothing to do with anti-German hate propaganda.

'Zionism', and 'Zionist' are simply the only correct terms that can be used in the context 3CR programs use them, and they cannot be avoided simply because anti-Semites also use these terms in a quite different way. All 3CR programs can do about it is repeatedly state that they do not mean 'Jews', or 'Judaism', which is precisely what those programs do in fact repeatedly say.

2.2 How Zionists stir up hostility to 3CR

The whole difficulty is that this situation is being deliberately exploited by Zionists, who themselves believe that a Jew is or ought to be automatically a Zionist, and who repeatedly confuse the issue by spreading deliberate lies within the Jewish community, saying that this is also the way 3CR programs use the term Zionist.

The responsibility for that clearly lies with the people who are doing it, not with 3CR.

Indeed, there is a problem that 3CR broadcasters tend to bend over backwards not to talk about Jews at all when it would be perfectly legitimate to discuss the fact that most Jews tend to be strongly pro-Israel, and to discuss the influence of the Jewish community in Australia, as an important factor biasing public debate against the Palestinian viewpoint.

The distinction between 'Zionist' and 'Jew' is perfectly clear when the pro-Palestinian broadcasts talk about Zionism in connection with the activities of the state of Israel and its supporters in Australia, while anti-Semites also talk about Zionism in connection with the fluoridation of water supplies and other related matters.

The distinction is also clear when pro-Palestinian broadcasts talk about the pro-Zionist and anti-Palestinian bias of the media in Australia and the various attempts by Zionists to manipulate and control the public debate on Palestine.

Nevertheless, this does leave the way open for Zionists to pick isolated

phrases out of context and misrepresent the situation to the Jewish community as though 3CR programs were referring to the familiar anti-Semitic fantasies about a 'Jewish owned press' etc.

This does stimulate some reaction against 3CR, but not a great deal because most people, whether Jewish or not, have at least heard of allegations about the pro-Israeli bias of the media and can understand the distinction between this question and fantasies about 'Jewish ownership'.

Thus, when Rabbi Levi points, out that **'not one Jew owns or controls a daily newspaper or TV or radio station in Australia'**, most people hearing him, are not likely to take it for granted that this is really a refutation of anything said on 3CR.

But when 3CR programs talk about 'Zionist-Nazi collaboration' during the Holocaust, they are NOT using the term 'Zionist' in a similar context to its use in anti-Semitic conspiracy theories well known within the Jewish community, and in a context which has nothing directly to do with the Palestine question, but, which is well known to be a common theme in the propaganda of the Soviet Union, a country whose policies are now widely believed to be anti-Semitic.

Since most people, whether Jewish or not, have never even heard of accusations that there was collaboration between Nazis and Zionists during the Holocaust, except in the context of anti-Semitic conspiracy theories or Soviet propaganda, this is a situation where people are far more likely to readily accept that 3CR programs are saying what Zionists claim they are saying, and it is an almost ideal situation for Zionists to exploit.

Naturally Zionists do not wish to have to actually answer accusations of collaboration, and have in fact scrupulously avoided doing so - preferring to set up the 'expert witness' Dr. Foster as fall guy instead. They have every reason to wish to create confusion as to what allegations have actually been made on 3CR, and have done so in their usual expert way by quoting isolated accusations without quoting the supporting evidence.

Not only have Zionists managed to create a widespread impression that 3CR is in some way associated with the anti-Semitic conspiracy theories of Professor Butz, in a way documented in *Nation Review* of 7 June, but within the Jewish community at least, Zionists have been able to create an impression that 3CR is in some way associated with the theories of Eric Butler.

What is really striking however, is that it is the very people who have been quite deliberately confusing this issue in order to stir up hostility within the Jewish community, who now appear before the Broadcasting Tribunal claiming to be offended! Moreover, they are 'offended' mainly by broadcasts which have quite clearly been made in direct response to a debate provoked by them, and which are mainly angry responses to the vicious accusations of anti-Semitism that have constantly been made.

Thus, when Rabbi Levi says, **'the anti-Semitic content of the 3CR programme has included the theory that the Jews murdered themselves in World War Two'**, he is not commenting on the content of 3CR programs, as can be seen from the transcripts, but is simply repeating what he has been telling members of the Jewish community over and over again.

When such lies, supported by quotations taken out of context are circulated widely within the Jewish community over a long period of time, it is not surprising that they can provoke some real indignation which would never have resulted from the actual broadcasts themselves.

Zionists may not be quite as respected within the Jewish community as they

like to think they are, but when they loudly and repeatedly claim that 3CR programs are 'exterminatory anti-Semitism, similar to Nazi propaganda during the holocaust', that the Station 'spews forth anti-Semitic material', and has a 'ban on Jewish groups affiliating' and so on; and when these claims are taken up in the national press, people in the Jewish community, like most others, will not readily assume that those making these statements are simply telling breathtaking lies.

We have submitted as evidence some genuine examples of Nazi propaganda and other examples of what Rabbi Levi calls 'exterminatory anti-Semitism' so that the Tribunal can see for itself just how much truth there is in his accusations.

The extreme viciousness of this accusation may also help the Tribunal to understand why some 3CR broadcasters have been provoked, unwisely perhaps, into replying with such terms of abuse as 'lying Zionist' etc.

2.3 How Zionist Misrepresentation of 3CR Can Be Effective

Our main point is that these accusations of Rabbi Levi and company go far to explain whatever hostility there is towards 3CR within the Jewish community. The plain fact is that Rabbi Levi and company have a very much wider audience within the Jewish community than 3CR does, and most people who have heard the accusations against 3CR and signed petitions etc have never even heard the allegedly offensive programs.

Repeated and well advertised statements that 3CR continually 'spews forth' anti-Semitic material will not be taken literally by most Jews, any more than it will by most other Australians.

But there are substantial numbers of Jewish people in Melbourne, as Mr. Bloch, Rabbi Levi, Rabbi Gutnick, Sam Lipski and company well know, who have lived through a time when radio stations and newspapers really did spew forth such material, and who will not take such accusations with the necessary grain of salt and will not feel particularly inclined to tune into the station to check it out.

Quite a few such people do not speak English as a first language and are doubly vulnerable to this kind of cynical political manipulation.

On tuning in to a pro-Palestinian 3CR program and finding that it does attack 'Zionism' and 'Zionists' in a very hostile and uncompromising way, which unfortunately is sometimes not very sophisticated or persuasive, and is always totally opposed to the thoughts and feelings towards Israel of the large majority of Jews in Melbourne, it is not surprising if many Jewish people in Melbourne assume that they are not being lied to by messieurs Bloch, Levi, Gutnick, Lipski and company, and that other broadcasts they have not actually heard really do contain the juicy anti-Semitic sentiments they allege.

Since many people cannot distinguish clearly between being strongly opposed to the views someone else is expressing, and being personally insulted and offended by something 'offensive', it is really rather surprising that the campaign by Rabbi Levi and company, the 'well orchestrated campaign' described by Mr. Bloch, has not been more successful.

Some insight into the way indignation can be provoked by a dishonest campaign of this sort is provided by the evidence of Kim Beazley, of Perth, (Update-2005-leader of the ALP opposition) who would presumably be reliant on the VJBD rather than a radio receiver, for information as to what 3CR broadcasts

in Melbourne have been saying, (from some 4500 km away).

According to Mr. Beazley:

'By the strange perversion of fact which makes the station suggest that Hitler was an instrument of Zionism they would logically have to suggest Arab governments were instruments of Zionism, if persecutions and expulsions are Zionist strategy. With a twisting of fact which is purely startling, they turn the undoubted fact that persecution of Jews has built up the migration flow to Israel into a plot by the persecuted, as if they were responsible for their own persecution.'

Of course, no 3CR program has ever suggested that Hitler was an instrument of Zionism, just as there has been no claim that Zionists welcomed the Holocaust, let alone organized it. That Mr. Beazley should believe these are issues raised by 3CR is testimony to the efficiency of the Zionist propaganda machine rather than the transmitting power of that radio station.

Mr. Beazley, may be pleased to note however that Palestinian supporters have denounced reactionary Arab governments for persecuting and expelling Jews, pointing out that this does aid Zionism and has been actively promoted by Zionists.

Let us get it quite clear. The accusation that has been made in some 3CR programs is that some Zionists, including the top Zionist leadership, actively collaborated with the Nazis even to the point of assisting them to exterminate European Jewry. That is a very strong accusation and there is no need to confuse it with any stronger ones.

3. WHAT IS COLLABORATION ?

The term 'collaboration' has a definite meaning which does not always imply common aims, voluntary cooperation or equal partnership.

Marshal Pétain, Head of State of Vichy France, for example, is generally held to have been a Nazi collaborator because he assisted the Nazis to do their dirty work in France, although it is not suggested that he actually had the common aim of wanting to see the Germans rule France, or that he was an equal partner, or that his collaboration was not the involuntary result of France being defeated in the war.

The point is that while most French people either resisted or just went about their business and did what they had to, to survive, Petain and his associates actively collaborated with the enemy that had occupied France, and for that they stand condemned.

Another term, 'Quisling', is sometimes used, especially in Israeli literature about Jewish collaborators with Nazism, although it should properly be applied only to collaborators who had exactly the same aims as the enemy.

It is well known within the Jewish community, although less widely known outside, that there were many Jewish collaborators with the Nazis, just as there were collaborators among all other people subjected to the Nazi jackboot. These included members of the so-called 'Judenrat', or Jewish Councils in the ghettos, almost all the Jewish Police in the ghettos, and all the Jewish Gestapo agents and concentration camp trustees or 'Kapos'.

The only dispute is a semantic one as to whether 'collaborator' is the appropriate term for people who were not actually Quislings, and who usually collaborated primarily in order to save their own necks. There is no real dispute that 'collaborator' is the proper term in many of these cases; and it can be applied to certain Jews who actively assisted the Nazis, even though they did not have the same aims as the Nazis and were in many cases exterminated along with the rest when their usefulness had ended.

The State of Israel even has a special law for dealing with these people, which is unique in applying to crimes committed outside Israeli territory and before the State came into existence, and also unique in providing for the death penalty and being exempted from the statute of limitations.

The only dispute is whether top Zionist leaders are guilty of collaboration and whether they should be executed in accordance with this law. Naturally, most Zionists deny it, although by no means all, since the facts about Nazi-Zionist collaboration have been exposed by prominent Zionists including the present Israeli Minister for Justice, Shmuel Tamir. ⁽¹¹⁾ Those who deny it often get quite frenzied about it and pretend that Zionism is being accused of responsibility for Nazism so as to avoid answering the accusations of collaboration with Nazism.

¹¹ Tamir has since resigned.

4. HANNAH ARENDT

The fuss about 3CR is not the first time Zionists have responded to accusations of Nazi collaboration by confusing the issue, and it is worth studying an earlier example to understand the techniques used.

In her book *Eichmann in Jerusalem*, Dr. Hannah Arendt, who is neither left-wing nor pro-Palestinian, and who supports the existence of Israel as a Jewish State, touched on some of the questions involved, although she did not really hit the sore spots and did not directly accuse the Zionist movement of collaboration with Nazism.

4.1 Zionist emigration and Gestapo expulsion

Hannah Arendt wrote:

'During its first few years, Hitler's rise to power appeared to the Zionists chiefly as 'the decisive defeat of assimilationism'. Hence, the Zionists could, for a time, at least, engage in a certain amount of non-criminal cooperation with the Nazi authorities; the Zionists too believed that 'dissimilation', combined with the emigration to Palestine of Jewish youngsters and, they hoped, Jewish capitalists, could be a 'mutually fair solution.' At the time, many German officials held this opinion, and this kind of talk seems to have been quite common up to the end. A letter from a survivor of Theresienstadt, a German Jew, relates that all leading positions in the Nazi-appointed '*Reichsvereinigung*' were held by Zionists (whereas the authentically Jewish '*Reichsvertretung*' had been composed of both Zionists and non-Zionists), because Zionists, according to the Nazis, were the 'decent' Jews since they too thought in 'national' terms. To be sure, no prominent Nazi even spoke publicly in this vein; from beginning to end, Nazi propaganda was fiercely, unequivocally, uncompromisingly anti-Semitic, and eventually nothing counted but what people who were still without experience in the mysteries of totalitarian government dismissed as 'mere propaganda'. There existed in those first years a mutually highly satisfactory agreement between the Nazi authorities and the Jewish Agency for Palestine - a '*Ha'avarah*', or Transfer Agreement, which provided that an emigrant to Palestine could transfer his money there in German goods and exchange them for pounds upon arrival.

It was soon the only legal way for a Jew to take his money with him (the alternative then being the establishment of a blocked account, which could be liquidated abroad only at a loss of between fifty and ninety-five percent). The result was that in the thirties, when American Jewry took great pains to organize a boycott of German merchandise, Palestine, of all places, was swamped with all kinds of 'goods made in Germany'. Of greater importance for Eichmann were the emissaries from Palestine, who would approach the Gestapo and the S.S. on their own initiative, without taking orders from either the German Zionists or the Jewish Agency for Palestine. They came in order to enlist help for the illegal immigration of Jews into British-ruled Palestine, and both the Gestapo and the S.S. were helpful.

They negotiated with Eichmann in Vienna, and they reported that he

was 'polite', 'not the shouting type', and that he even provided them with farms and facilities for setting up vocational training camps for prospective immigrants. ('On one occasion, he expelled a group of nuns from a convent to provide a training farm for young Jews', and on another 'a special train was made available and Nazi officials accompanied' a group of emigrants, ostensibly headed for Zionist training farms in Yugoslavia, to see them safely across the border.) According to the story told by Jon and David Kimche, with 'the full and generous cooperation of all the chief actors' (*The Secret Roads: The 'Illegal' Migration of a People, 1938-1948*, London, 1954), these Jews from Palestine spoke a language not totally different from that of Eichmann. They had been sent to Europe by the communal settlements in Palestine, and they were not interested in rescue operations: 'That was not their job' they wanted to select 'suitable material', and their chief enemy, prior to the extermination program, was not those who made life impossible for Jews in the old countries, Germany or Austria, but those who banned to the new homeland; that enemy was definitely Britain and not Germany. Indeed, they were in a position to deal with the Nazi authorities on a footing amounting to equality, which native Jews were not, since they enjoyed the protection of the mandatory power; they were probably among the first Jews to talk openly about mutual interests and were certainly the first to be given permission 'to pick young Jewish pioneers' from among the Jews in the concentration camps. Of course, they were unaware of the sinister implications of this deal, which still lay in the future; but they too somehow believed that if it was a question of selecting Jews for survival, the Jews should do the selecting themselves. It was this fundamental error in judgment that eventually led to a situation in which the non-selected majority of Jews inevitably found themselves confronted with two enemies - the Nazi authorities and the Jewish authorities.'⁽¹²⁾

4.2 The Jewish Councils

On collaboration by the Judenrat officials, Dr. Arendt wrote:

'To a Jew this role of the Jewish leaders in the destruction of their own people is undoubtedly the darkest chapter of the whole dark story. It had been known about before, but it has now been exposed for the first time in all its pathetic and sordid detail by Raul Hilberg, whose standard work *The Destruction of the European Jews* I mentioned before. In the matter of cooperation, there was no distinction between the highly assimilated Jewish communities of Central and Western Europe and the Yiddish-speaking masses of the East. In Amsterdam as in Warsaw, in Berlin as in Budapest, Jewish officials could be trusted to compile the lists of persons and of their property, to secure money from the deportees to defray the expenses of their deportation and extermination, to keep track of vacated apartments, to supply police forces to help seize Jews and get them on trains, until, as a last gesture, they handed over the assets of the Jewish community in good order for final confiscation. They distributed the Yellow Star badges, and sometimes, as in Warsaw, 'the sale of the armbands became a regular business; there were ordinary armbands of cloth and fancy plastic armbands

¹² Hannah Arendt, *Eichmann in Jerusalem*, pp. 59-61.

which were washable'. In the Nazi-inspired, but not Nazi-dictated, manifestoes they issued, we still can sense how they enjoyed their new power – 'The Central Jewish Council has been granted the right of absolute disposal over all Jewish spiritual and material wealth and over all Jewish manpower', as the first announcement of the Budapest Council phrased it. We know how the Jewish officials felt when they became instruments of murder - like captains 'whose ships were about to sink and who succeeded in bringing them safe to port by casting overboard a great part of their precious cargo'; like saviors who 'with a hundred victims save a thousand people, with a thousand ten thousand'. The truth was even more gruesome. Dr. Kastner, in Hungary, for instance, saved exactly 1,684 people with approximately 476,000 victims. In order not to leave the selection to 'blind fate', 'truly holy principles' were needed 'as the guiding force of the weak human hand which puts down on paper the name of the unknown person and with this decides his life or death'. And whom did these 'holy principles' single out for salvation? Those 'who had worked all their lives for the *zibur*' (community)' - i.e., the functionaries - and the 'most prominent Jews', as Kastner says in his report.

No one bothered to swear the Jewish officials to secrecy; they were voluntary 'bearers of secrets', either in order to assure quiet and prevent panic, as in Dr. Kastner's case, or out of 'humane' considerations, such as that 'living in the expectation of death by gassing would only be the harder', as in the case of Dr. Leo Baeck, former Chief Rabbi of Berlin. During the Eichmann trial, one witness pointed out the unfortunate consequences of this kind of 'humanity' - people volunteered for deportation from Theresienstadt to Auschwitz and denounced those who tried to tell them the truth as being 'not sane'. We know the physiognomies of the Jewish leaders during the Nazi period very well ; they ranged all the way from Chaim Rumkowski, Eldest of the Jews in Lodz, called Chaim I, who issued currency notes bearing his signature and postage stamps engraved with his portrait, and who rode around in a broken-down horse-drawn carriage ; through Leo Baeck, scholarly, mild-mannered, highly educated, who believed Jewish policemen would be 'more gentle and helpful' and would 'make the ordeal easier' (whereas in fact they were, of course, more brutal and less corruptible, since so much more was at stake for them); to, finally, a few who committed suicide - like Adam Czerniakow, chairman of the Warsaw Jewish Council, who was not a rabbi but an unbeliever, a Polish-speaking Jewish engineer, but who must still have remembered the rabbinical saying: 'Let them kill you, but don't cross the line'. (13)

Dr. Arendt's conclusion was that without this collaboration, many lives could have been saved:

'But the whole truth was that there existed Jewish community organizations and Jewish party and welfare organizations on both the local and the international level. Wherever Jews lived, there were recognized Jewish leaders and this leadership, almost without exception, cooperated in one way or another, for one reason or another, with the Nazis. The whole truth was that if the Jewish people had really been unorganized and leaderless, there would have been chaos and plenty of misery but the total

¹³ Ibid., pp. 117-119.

number of victims would hardly have been between four and a half, and six million people.' (14)

4.3 The Zionist response to Arendt

Initially, Dr. Arendt's book received a sympathetic reaction from the Israeli press, but almost immediately the Zionist propaganda machine was turned on full blast to attack it because the 'concept about Jewish participation in the Nazi Holocaust...may plague Jews for years to come'. (15) On 11 March 1963 the B'nai Brith Anti-Defamation League issued a 'summary' recommended to 'book reviewers and others when the volume appears' which accused Hannah Arendt of saying, among other things:

'That Europe's Jewish organizations in the main played a 'disastrous role' by cooperating with the Nazi extermination machine. **As a result the Jews, themselves, bear a large share of the blame.**' (emphasis added). (16)

As Hannah Arendt comments in the *New York Review of Books*, 20 January, 1966:

'In other words, as everybody soon knew and repeated, my 'thesis' was that the Jews had murdered themselves.' (17)

Exactly as Rabbi Levi now says about 3CR. This line was repeated by almost every reviewer of Arendt's book, as though, in Mary McCarthy's telling phrase, they came out of a 'mimeographing machine', which in fact they did. Eichmann's prosecutor Gideon Hausner, even announced in the *New York Daily News* (20 May, 1963):

'The author would have you believe that Eichmann really wasn't a Nazi, that the Gestapo aided Jews, that Eichmann actually was unaware of Hitler's evil plans'. (18)

This sort of response is fairly typical of the Zionist reaction when questions about Nazi collaboration are raised. Although the first attacks on Hannah Arendt's book described it as an 'otherwise masterly report' and said that 'Dr. Arendt is a recognized scholar' and 'a person of eminent respectability', by the end of the campaign they had to prove that the 'evil book' was written by an 'evil person'.

Whole books were written by various 'experts' to refute her. (19)

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 125.

¹⁵ Hannah Arendt, *The Jew as Pariah*, Grove Press, New York, 1978.

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ Arendt, *Eichmann in Jerusalem*, p.283.

¹⁸ Arendt, *The Jew as Pariah*.

¹⁹ See, for example, Jacob Robinson, *And the Crooked Shall be made Straight: The Eichmann Trial, the Jewish Catastrophe, and Hannah Arendt's Narrative* Macmillan, New York, 1965. This is a vitriolic page-by-page attempted rebuttal but is, however, a disjointed apologia as far as the facts are concerned.

In *The Jew as Pariah* she describes the campaign against her. Some of her comments shed interesting light on how the VJBD has been able to create a certain image about 3CR within the Jewish community in Melbourne :

'No one will doubt the effectiveness of modern image-making, and no one acquainted with Jewish organizations and their countless channels of communication outside, their immediate range will underestimate their possibilities in influencing public opinion. For greater than their direct power of control is the voluntary outside help upon which they can draw from Jews who, though they may not be at all interested in Jewish affairs, will flock home, as it were, out of age-old fears (no longer justified, let us hope, but still very much alive) when their people or its leaders are criticized. What I had done, according to their lights was the crime of crimes. I had told 'the truth in a hostile environment,' as an Israeli official told me, and what the A.D.L. and all the other organizations did was to hoist the danger signal... (20)

4.4 The campaign backfires

According to Dr. Arendt, the campaign 'was of course a farce, but it was effective.'

'Or was it? After all, the denunciation of book and author, with which they achieved great, though by no means total, success, was not their goal. It was only the means with which to prevent the discussion of an issue 'which may plague Jews for years to come.' And as far as this goal was concerned, they achieved the precise opposite. If they had left well enough alone, this issue, which I had touched upon only marginally, would not have been trumpeted all over the world. In their efforts to prevent people, from reading what I had written, or, in case such misfortune had already happened, to provide the necessary reading glasses, they blew it up out of all proportion, not only with reference to my book but with reference to what had actually happened. They forgot that they were mass organizations, using all the means of mass communication, so that every issue they touched at all, pro or contra, was liable, to attract the attention of masses whom they then no longer could control. So what happened after a while, in these meaningless and mindless debates was that people began to think that all the nonsense the image-makers had made me say was the actual historical truth. 'Thus, with the unerring precision with which a bicyclist on his first ride will collide, with the obstacle he is most afraid of, Mr. Robinson's formidable supporters have put their whole power at the service of propagating what they were most anxious to avoid. So that now, as a result of their folly, literally everybody feels the need for a 'major work' on Jewish conduct in the face of catastrophe. (21)

Likewise, already one effect of the VJBD's activities to discredit 3CR has been to give publicity and credence to Professor Butz's neo-Nazi apologetics about the Holocaust. However, another effect has been to draw attention to the question of Nazi-Zionist collaboration. Since the VJBD has given us the opportunity, we in

²⁰ Hannah Arendt, *The Jew as Pariah*, p. 275.

²¹ Ibid.

JAZA would like to take up this question. We will go into it in more detail than other questions, partly because it is of special concern to us as Jews, and partly because this may make it less necessary to go into some of the other issues in detail.

5. THE KASTNER CASE

5.1 Introduction

Rather than answer every complaint in the same detail, we are taking up the issue which the Victorian Jewish Board of Deputies (VJBD) has declared to be the most offensive of all, and will show that on this question; 'The documentation available is overwhelming and its message is thundering', just as *Palestine Speaks* claimed in one of the extracts complained about by the VJBD.

Since the accusation of direct Zionist cooperation and assistance in the extermination of hundreds of thousands of Jewish people, and the accusation that this flowed logically from shared aims, are clearly the most 'extreme' and 'offensive' accusations of Nazi-Zionist collaboration broadcast on 3CR programs, we will deal with this first, and in greater detail.

Since the 'Kastner case' is the subject of most of the broadcasts concerning collaboration which have been specifically complained about, we shall go into this in greatest detail, and have put some books in as evidence about it.

Having answered the VJBD where its case appears strongest, and on the points to which it has given greatest emphasis, we hope it may become apparent to the Tribunal that things are not quite what they may have appeared before this inquiry began.

The most notorious case of Nazi-Zionist collaboration is that involving Rudolf Kastner.

Most Jewish people in Australia have never heard of Rudolf Kastner. Those who have, are generally under the impression that there is some 'controversy' about negotiations he undertook for ; 'the purchase of Jewish lives for money and military equipment', but that he was 'fully rehabilitated', by the Supreme Court of Israel.

That is exactly the line taken by Dr. John Foster, the Victorian Jewish Board of Deputies expert witness, in his evidence condemning 3CR for anti-Semitism.

It is quite clear from this evidence, that Dr. Foster does not know anything at all about the Kastner case, since he does not even know what Kastner was accused of.

This may not be his fault however, since one cannot read an accurate account of the Kastner case in any of the widely available works dealing with the Holocaust, either in bookshops or libraries. Apart from 3CR, the suppression of information has been so complete, that even an expert like Dr. Foster, specifically asked to give evidence on the matter, has been unable to find out what it is all about.

5.2 The Accusations

Briefly, the accusations against Kastner are as follows:

Dr. Rudolf Verba, a Doctor of Science now serving at the British Medical Research Council, was one of the few escapees from Auschwitz. In his memoirs published in February, 1961, in the *London Daily Herald* he wrote :

I am a Jew. In spite of that - indeed because of that - I accuse certain Jewish leaders of one of the most ghastly deeds of the war.

This small group of quislings knew what was happening to their brethren in Hitler's gas chambers and bought their own lives with the price of silence. Among them was Dr. Kastner, leader of the council which spoke for all Jews in Hungary...

While I was prisoner number 44070 at Auschwitz - the number is still on my arm - I compiled careful statistics of the exterminations... I took these terrible statistics with me when I escaped in 1944 and I was able to give Hungarian Zionist leaders three weeks notice that Eichmann planned to send a million of their Jews to his gas chambers... Kastner went to Eichmann and told him, 'I know of your plans: spare some Jews of my choice and I shall keep quiet.'

Eichmann not only agreed, but dressed Kastner up in S.S. uniform and took him to Belsen to trace some of his friends. Nor did the sordid bargaining end there.

Kastner paid Eichmann several thousand dollars. With this little fortune, Eichmann was able to buy his way to freedom when Germany collapsed, to set himself up in the Argentine...' (22)

These accusations are confirmed by the 'Eichmann Confessions' published in *Life magazine*, 28 November and 5 December, 1960 :

I resolved to show how well a job could be done when the commander stands 100% behind it. By shipping the Jews off in a lightning operation, I wanted to set an example for future campaigns elsewhere... In obedience to Himmler's directive I now concentrated on negotiations with the Jewish political officials in Budapest... Among them Dr. Rudolph Kastner, authorized representative of the Zionist movement. This Dr. Kastner was a young man about my age, an ice-cold lawyer and a fanatical Zionist. He agreed to help keep the Jews from resisting deportation – and even keep order in the collection camps – if I would close my eyes and let a few hundred or a few thousand young Jews emigrate illegally to Palestine. It was a good bargain. For keeping order in the camps, the price... was not too high for me.

...We trusted each other perfectly. When he was with me, Kastner smoked cigarettes as though he were in a coffeehouse. While we talked he would smoke one aromatic cigarette after another, taking them from a silver case and lighting them with a silver lighter. With his great polish and reserve he would have made an ideal Gestapo officer himself.

Dr. Kastner's main concern was to make it possible for a select group of Hungarian Jews to emigrate to Israel...

As a matter of fact, there was a very strong similarity between our attitudes in the S.S. and the viewpoint of these immensely idealistic Zionist leaders ... I believe that Kastner would have sacrificed a thousand or a hundred thousand of his blood to achieve his political goal... 'You can have the others,' he would say, 'but let me have this group here.' And because Kastner rendered us a great service by helping keep the deportation camps peaceful, I would let his groups escape. After all, I was not concerned with

²² Hecht, op. cit. pp. 261-262.

small groups of a thousand or so Jews... That was the 'gentleman's agreement' I had with Kastner. ⁽²³⁾

Quite clearly these accusations, whether true or false, do not relate merely to 'the purchase of Jewish lives for money and military equipment', as Dr. Foster imagines, and the term 'collaboration' is the term that would apply.

It seems unlikely that if Dr. Foster had known what the accusation actually was, he would have condemned 3CR saying, 'In these circumstances, to talk of collaboration is malicious and absurd.'

Are the accusations against Kastner true ?

According to the Government of Israel, they are a lie. When Malchiel Greenwald, a strongly pro-Zionist Israeli citizen published these accusations against Kastner, the Israeli Government did rather more than demand that his views should not be broadcast. Because a prominent Zionist official was involved, the Attorney General of the State of Israel prosecuted Greenwald for criminal libel. ⁽²⁴⁾

5.3 The Verdict

Let the verdict of Judge Benjamin Halevi in Israel's District Court of Jerusalem speak for itself, given in criminal case No. 124 of 1953. The Attorney General vs. Malchiel Greenwald. This material should be studied carefully, since a substantial extract from it, broadcast on 3CR, has been complained about by the Victorian Jewish Board of Deputies as allegedly offensive to the Jewish community, likely to promote anti-Semitism, likely to promote racism, in bad taste and contrary to common sense.

It is the actual words used that are the subject of the Board's complaint, not the manner of their presentation by 3CR. Presumably the Board itself was not aware just whose words they were when it made its complaint, which shows how complete suppression of information can backfire on the censors themselves.

Here then are excerpts from the verdict of Judge Halevi, who later became one of the panel of three judges that tried Eichmann:

The masses of Jews from Hungary's ghettos obediently boarded the deportation trains without knowing their fate. They were full of confidence in the false information that they were being transferred to Kenyermeze.

The Nazis could not have misled the masses of Jews so conclusively had they not spread their false information through Jewish channels.

The Jews of the ghettos would not have trusted the Nazi or Hungarian rulers. But they had trust in their Jewish leaders. Eichmann and others used this known fact as part of their calculated plan to mislead the Jews. They were able to deport the Jews to their extermination by the help of Jewish leaders.

The false information was spread by the Jewish leaders. The local leaders of the Jews of Kluj and Nodvarod knew that other leaders were spreading such false information and did not protest.

²³ Ibid., pp. 260-261.

²⁴ A spokesman for the Ministry of Trade and Industry.

Those of the Jews who tried to warn their friends of the truth were persecuted by the Jewish leaders in charge of the local 'rescue work.'

The trust of the Jews in the misleading information and their lack of knowledge that their wives, children and themselves were about to be deported, to the gas chambers of Auschwitz. led the victims to remain quiescent in their ghettos. It seduced them into not resisting or hampering the deportation orders.

Dozens of thousands of Jews were guarded in their ghettos by a few dozen police. Yet even vigorous young Jews made no attempt to overpower these few guards and escape to nearby Rumania. No resistance activities to the deportations were organized in these ghettos.

And the Jewish leaders did everything in their power to soothe the Jews in the ghettos and to prevent such resistance activities.

The same Jews who spread in Kluj and Nodvarod the false rumor of Kenyermeze, or confirmed it, the same public leaders who did not warn their own people against the misleading statements, the same Jewish leaders who did not organize any resistance or any sabotage of deportations,... these same leaders did not join the people of their community in their ride to Auschwitz, but were all included in the rescue train.

The Nazi organizers of extermination and the perpetrators of extermination permitted Rudolf Kastner and the members of the Jewish Council in Budapest to save themselves, their relatives, and friends. The Nazis did this as a means of making the local Jewish leaders, whom they favored, dependent on the Nazi regime, dependent on its good will during the time of its fatal deportation schedule. In short, the Nazis succeeded in bringing the Jewish leaders into collaboration with the Nazis at the time of the catastrophe.

The Nazi chiefs knew that the Zionists were a most vital element in Jewry and the most trusted by the Jews.

The Nazis drew a lesson from the Warsaw ghetto and other belligerent ghettos. They learned that Jews were able to sell their lives very expensively if honorably guided.

Eichmann did not want a second Warsaw. For this reason the Nazis exerted themselves to mislead and bribe the Jewish leaders.

The personality of Rudolf Kastner made him a convenient catspaw for Eichmann and his clique, to draw into collaboration and make their tasks easier.

The question here is not, as stated by the Attorney General in his summation, whether members of the Jewish Rescue Committee were or were not capable of fulfilling their duty without the patronage of the S.S. chiefs. It is obvious that without such S.S. Nazi patronage the Jewish Rescue Committee could not have existed, and could have acted only as an Underground.

The question is, as put by the lawyer for the defense, why were the Nazis interested in the existence of the Rescue Committee? Why did the S.S. chiefs make every effort to encourage the existence of the Jewish Rescue Committee? Did the exterminators turn into rescuers?

The same question rises concerning the rescue of prominent Jews by these German killers of Jews. Was the rescue of such Jews a part of the extermination plan of the killers?

The support given by the extermination leaders to Kastner's Rescue

Committee proves that indeed there was a place for Kastner and his friends in their Final Solution for the Jews of Hungary – their total annihilation.

The Nazi's patronage of Kastner, and their agreement to let him save six hundred prominent Jews, was part of the plan to exterminate the Jews. Kastner was given a chance to add a few more to that number. The bait attracted him. The opportunity of rescuing prominent people appealed to him greatly. He considered the rescue of the most important Jews as a great personal success and a success for Zionism. It was a success that would also justify his conduct – his political negotiations with Nazis and the Nazi patronage of his committee.

When Kastner received this present from the Nazis, Kastner sold his soul to the German Satan.

The sacrifice of the vital interests of the majority of the Jews, in order to rescue the prominent, was the basic element in the agreement between Kastner and the Nazis. This agreement fixed the division of the nation into two unequal camps; a small fragment of prominent, whom the Nazis promised Kastner to save, on the one hand, and the great majority of Hungarian Jews whom the Nazis designated for death, on the other hand.

An imperative condition for the rescue of the first camp by the Nazis was that Kastner will not interfere in the action of the Nazis against the other camp and will not hamper them in its extermination. Kastner fulfilled this condition. He concentrated his efforts in the rescue of the prominents and treated the camp of the doomed as if they had already been wiped out from the book of the living.

One cannot estimate the damage caused by Kastner's collaboration and put down the number of victims which it cost Hungarian Jews. These are not only the thousands of Jews in Kluj alone, but also the thousands of Jews in Navarro or any other community in the border area ; Jews who could escape through the border, had the chief of the rescue committee fulfilled his duty toward them.

All of Kastner's answers in his final testimony were a constant effort to evade this truth.

Kastner has tried to escape through every crack he could find in the wall of evidence. When one crack was sealed in his face, he darted quickly to another.

(Judgment of Judge Benjamin Halevi, Criminal Case 124/53; Attorney General vs Malchiel Greenwald, District Court, Jerusalem June 22, 1955) ⁽²⁵⁾

Judge Halevi reverts to the meeting of Kastner with the S.S. officers Becher and Rudolf Hoess, commandant of Auschwitz at the time when the 'new line' of rescuing Jews was revealed by Hoess. He says:

From this gathering in Budapest, it is obvious that the 'new line' stretched from Himmler to Hoess, from Jutner to Becher and Krumey.

According to Kastner, however, these Nazis were all active, in rescuing Jews.

This meeting of these important German guests in Budapest exposes the 'rescue' work of Becher in its true light. It reveals also the extent of Kastner's

²⁵ Hecht, op. cit. pp. 178-181.

involvement in the inner circle of the chief German war criminals.

Just as the Nazi war criminals knew they needed an alibi and hoped to achieve it by the rescue of a few Jews at the eleventh hour, so Kastner also needed an alibi for himself.

Collaboration between the Jewish Agency Rescue Committee and the Exterminators of the Jews was solidified in Budapest and Vienna. Kastner's duties were part and parcel of the general duties of the S.S.

In addition to its Extermination Department and Looting Department, the Nazi S.S. opened a Rescue Department headed by Kastner.

All these extermination, robbery and rescue activities of the S.S. were coordinated under the management of Heinrich Himmler. (*ibid*)

Judge Halevi continues:

Kastner perjured himself knowingly in his testimony before this court when he denied he had interceded in Becher's behalf. Moreover, he concealed the important fact that he interceded for Becher in the name of the Jewish Agency and the Jewish world Congress.

As to the contents of Kastner's affidavit, it was enough for the defense to prove Becher was a war criminal. It was up to the prosecution to remove Becher from this status, if they wished to negate the affidavit.

The Attorney General admitted in his summation that Becher was a war criminal.

The lies in the contents of Kastner's affidavit, the lies in his testimony concerning the document, and Kastner's knowing participation in the activities of Nazi war criminals, and his participation in the last minute fake rescue activities - all these combine to show one overwhelming truth - that this affidavit was not given in good faith.

Kastner knew well, as he himself testified, that Becher had never stood up against the stream of Jewish extermination, as Kastner had declared in the affidavit.

The aims of Becher and his superior, Himmler, were not to save Jews but to serve the Nazi regime with full compliance. There is no truth and no good faith in Kastner's testimony, 'I never doubted for one moment the good intention of good Becher.'

It is clear that the positive recommendation by Kastner, not only in his own name but also in the name of the Jewish Agency and the Jewish World Congress was of decisive importance for Becher. Kastner did not exaggerate when he said that Becher was released by the Allies because of his personal intervention. The lies in the affidavit of Kastner and the contradictions and various pretexts, which were proven to be lies, were sufficient to annul the value of his statements and to prove that there was no good faith in his testimony in favor of this German war criminal. Kastner's affidavit in favor of Becher was a willfully false affidavit given in favor of a war criminal to save him from trial and punishment in Nuremberg.

Therefore, the defendant, Malchiel Greenwald, was correct in his accusations against Rudolf Kastner in the first, second, and fourth of his statements. (*ibid.*)

Judge Halevi's verdict found Malchiel Greenwald generally innocent of libel against Kastner, but fined him one Israeli pound (fifty pence) for the one

unproven accusation - that Kastner had actually collected money from his Nazi partners for his aide to their slaughter program. The judge also ordered the Government of Israel to pay Greenwald two hundred Israeli pounds (one hundred pounds) as court costs. ⁽²⁶⁾

In fairness to Kastner it should be mentioned that as well as having been unpaid, it was never established that he ever wore S.S. uniform.

Nevertheless, this verdict, and the evidence on which it was based, completely establishes the truth of everything said on 3CR about the matter.

If the story ended there, it would only prove conclusively that the individual Kastner was a collaborator and the Israeli Government had attempted to defend him, although facts brought out in the trial pointed to much more than that.

But the story does not end there.

5.4 The Reaction

Public opinion in Israel was almost unanimous in demanding that Kastner and his associates should be put on trial. Remember that up to now it was Kastner's accuser who was on trial.

The Communist Party newspaper *Kol Haam* (Voice of the People) wrote:

'All those whose relatives, were butchered by the Germans in Hungary know now clearly that Jewish hands helped the mass murder.' (23 June 1955)

In the authoritative Israeli newspaper *Haaretz.*, the leading political journalist, Dr. Moshe Keren wrote:

'Kastner must be brought to trial as a Nazi collaborator. And at this trial, Kastner should defend himself as a private citizen, and not be defended by the Israeli Government...'. (14 July 1955)

Haboker, the pro-Government General Zionist party paper stated:

'The public wants to know the real facts about Kastner, and not about him alone. The only way to find out the truth is to put all the Rescue Committee people on trial and give them a chance to offer their defense.' (23 June 1955)

But public opinion was not quite unanimous. The problem with bringing Kastner and his associates to trial was that his associates were the Government of Israel.

As the evening paper *Yediot Aharanot* said:

'If Kastner is brought to trial the entire government faces a total political and national collapse - as a result of what such a trial may disclose.' (23 June 1955)

Accordingly, the Government of Israel did not put Kastner on trial, instead it filed an appeal against the acquittal of Greenwald for criminal libel.

²⁶ Ibid., pp. 181-183.

As Dr. Karlebach wrote in Israel's largest evening newspaper, Maariv:

'What is, going on here? The Attorney General has to mobilize all the government power, appeal himself, in court, to justify and defend collaboration with Himmler! And in order to defend a quisling, the government must drag through the streets one of the grimmest stories of our history!'

'At 11 P.M. the verdict was given. At 11 A.M. next morning the government announces the defense of Kastner will be renewed - an appeal filed. What exemplary expediency! Since when does this government possess such lawyer-genius who can weigh in one night the legal chances of an appeal on a detailed, complex verdict of three hundred pages?' (21. June 1955)' (27)

At, the appeal hearings before the Supreme Court, the Attorney General of Israel, Chaim Cohen, explained clearly why the Government of Israel was defending Kastner so strongly:

The man Kastner does not stand here as a private individual. He was a recognized representative, official or non-official of the Jewish National Institutes in Palestine and of the Zionist Executive; and I come here in this court to defend the representative of our national institutions. (28)

The truth of this statement cannot be denied. Kastner's collaboration was not that of an individual. It was the collaboration of the Zionist leadership.

So far, it has only been established that the Government of Israel continued to support a Nazi collaborator after the facts about his collaboration had been conclusively established in an Israeli Court. But the story gets worse.

The Supreme Court of Israel unanimously found that Becher was indeed a Nazi war criminal and that Kastner had without justification, and in the name of the Jewish Agency, helped Becher to escape justice. On this point Greenwald was acquitted of libel and Kastner was not 'fully rehabilitated'.

The Supreme Court also accepted the facts established in the lower Court - that Kastner deliberately concealed the truth about Auschwitz from the majority of Hungarian Jews in exchange for Nazi permission to take a thousand or so to Palestine. Again, Kastner was far from being 'fully rehabilitated'.

5.5 The Majority Judgment

But now comes the really nasty bit. After unanimously acknowledging these facts, the Supreme Court of Israel, by a majority of three to two, found that Kastner's actions were morally justifiable and convicted Greenwald of criminal libel for calling this 'collaboration'.

In saying that 3CR broadcasts concealed the fact that Kastner had been fully rehabilitated by the Israeli Supreme Court, Dr. Foster is totally missing the point.

Kastner's actions only proved that he was a Nazi collaborator it is the defense of these actions by the Government and Courts of Israel that prove conclusively

²⁷ Ibid., pp. 185-186.

²⁸ Ibid., p. 268.

that Zionism approves of Nazi collaboration.

The majority of the Supreme Court of Israel did not rehabilitate Kastner. They joined him.

Let us read from the majority Judgment of Supreme Court Judge Shlomo Chesin:

...What point was there in telling the people boarding the trains in Kluj, people struck by fate and persecuted, as to what awaits them at the end of their Journey...Kastner spoke in detail of the situation, saying, 'The Hungarian Jew was a branch which long ago dried up on the tree.' This vivid description coincides with the testimony of another witness about the Hungarian Jews, 'This was a big Jewish community in Hungary, without any ideological Jewish backbone.' (Moshe Shweiger, a Kastner aide in Budapest, protocol 465)

I fully agree with my friend, Judge Agranat, when he states that, 'The Jews of Hungary, including those in the countryside, were not capable, neither physically nor mentally, to carry out resistance operations with force against the deportation scheme'...From this point of view no rescue achievement could have resulted by disclosing the Auschwitz news to the Jewish leaders there, and this...is a consideration which one can properly conclude that Kastner had in front of his eyes.

...And I take one more step. I am certain that the silence of Kastner when he arrived in Kluj was premeditated and calculated and did not result from this great despair because of the helplessness of the Jewish community. Even then, I say, this is still not considered willful collaboration and assistance in the extermination, because all the signs indicate that Kastner's efforts were aimed at rescue and rescue on a big scale...And towards the end I take one last step.

In doing so I go very far and say that if even if Kastner ordered himself to keep silent knowingly, in submission to the strong will of the Nazis, in order to save a few Jews from hell – there is still no proof that he stained his hands by collaborating with the enemies of his people and carrying out their plan to exterminate most of the Jewish community in Hungary.

Even if, through these activities of his – or rather, through omissions – the extermination became easier. And as to the moral issue, the question is not whether a man is allowed to kill many in order to save a few, or vice versa. The question is altogether in another sphere and should be defined as follows: a man is aware that a whole community is waiting its doom. He is allowed to make efforts to save a few, although part of his efforts involve concealment of truth from the many; or, should he disclose the truth to many though it is his best option that this way everybody will perish. I think that the answer is clear.

What good will the blood of the few bring if everybody is to perish?...As I said, I am not arguing with the basic factual findings of the learned President of the Jewish District Court (Judge Halevi) but it seems to me, with all due respect, that his findings do not, as of necessity, demand the conclusion he has arrived at. That is to say collaboration on the part of Kastner in the extermination of the Jews. And that they better coincide with bad leadership both from a moral and public point of view...

In my opinion, one can say outright that if you find out that Kastner collaborated with the enemy because he did not disclose to the people who

boarded the trains in Kluj that they were being led to extermination, one has to put on trial today Danzig, Herman, Hanzi, Brand, Revis and Marton and many more leaders and half-leaders who gagged themselves in an hour of crisis and did not inform others of what was known to them and did not warn and did not cry out of the coming danger...

Because of all this I cannot confirm the conclusion of the District Court with regard to the accusation that Greenwald has thrown on Kastner of collaboration with the Nazis in exterminating the Jewish people in Hungary during the last war.' (29)

In other words, the Court approved of Kastner's contempt for the Hungarian Jews and could not allow him to be condemned for doing exactly what many other Zionist leaders and half-leaders did – concealing their knowledge of the Nazi extermination plans so that Jews would board the trains to Auschwitz peacefully while their Zionist 'leaders' boarded a different train for Palestine.

5.6 The minority Judgment

It cannot be said that **all** top Zionist leaders actively approved of Nazi collaboration in this way. Indeed the most precise answer to this sickening judgment of Judge Chesin is provided in the minority judgment of Supreme Court Judge Moshe Silberg:

'I do not say that he was the only man who possessed information among the leaders. It is quite possible that somebody else as well does not have a clear conscience with regard to this concealment. But we are dealing here with the guilt of Kastner and we do not have to make judgments on the guilt of others...

The declaration of the learned Attorney General therefore shrinks into an opinion...'Kastner was convinced and believed that there was no ray of hope for the Jews of Hungary, almost for none of them, and as he as a result of his personal despair, did not disclose the secret of the extermination in order not to endanger or frustrate the rescue of the few – therefore he acted in good faith and should not be accused of collaborating with the Nazis in expediting the extermination of the Jews, even though, in fact, he brought about its result.'

I am compelled to state that it is very difficult for me to conceive such an intention. Is this good faith? Can a single man, even in cooperation with some of his friends, yield to despair on behalf of and without the knowledge of 800,000 other people? This is, in my opinion, the decisive consideration in the problem facing us. The charge emanating from the testimony of the witnesses against Kastner is that had they known of the Auschwitz secret, then thousands or tens of thousands would have been able to save their lives by local, partial, specific or indirect rescue operations like local revolts, resistance, escapes, hidings, concealment of children with Gentiles, forging of documents, ransom money, bribery, etc - and when this is the case and when one deals with many hundreds of thousands, now does a human being, a mortal, reject with, complete certainty and with an extreme 'no' the efficiency

²⁹ Ibid., pp. 270-272.

of all the many and varied rescue ways? How can he examine the tens of thousands of possibilities? Does he decide, instead of you? Indeed, he who can act with such a usurpation of the last hope of hundreds of thousands is not entitled to claim good faith at his defense. The penetrating question *quo warrento* is a good enough answer to a claim of such good faith...

If the superintendent of a big hospital lets thousands of sick people die so that he may devote himself to the sure rescue of - one soul, he will come out guilty, at least morally, even if it is proven that he as an individual erroneously thought that there was no hope of saving the other patients. He is a collaborator with the angel of death.

Either a complete atrophy of the soul or a blind involvement with complete loss of senses and proportion in his small but personal rescue operation could bring a man to such a gigantic, hazardous play.

And if all this is not enough to annul the claim of good faith which was put before us on behalf, of Kastner by the Attorney General, then Kastner himself - comes and annuls it altogether. Not only did he never make this claim, but his own words prove the contrary. He writes in his report to the Jewish Agency that the Committee sent emissaries to many ghettos in the countryside and pleaded with them to organize escapes and to refuse to board the trains. And though the story of these pleadings is untrue, and the silence of Kastner in Kluj is proven, the very uttering of these statements entirely contradicts the claim that Kastner had concealed the news about the fate of the ghetto inmates in good faith and only as a result of - his complete despairing of the chances of escaping or resisting the Germans. You can not claim at the same time helplessness and activity. Anyway, such a claim is not convincing...

We can sum up with these three facts:

1. That the Nazis didn't want to have a great revolt - 'Second Warsaw' - nor small revolts, and their passion was to have the extermination machine working smoothly without resistance this fact was known to Kastner from the best source - from Eichmann himself...And he had additional proofs of that when he witnessed all the illusionary and misleading tactics which were being taken by the Nazis from the first moment of occupation.

2. That the most efficient means to paralyze the resistance with - or the escape of a victim, is to conceal from him the plot of the coming murder. This fact is known to every man and one does not need any proof or evidence for this.

3. That he, Kastner, in order to carry out the rescue plan for the few prominents, fulfilled knowingly and without good faith the said desire of the Nazis, thus expediting the work of exterminating the masses.

And also the rescue of Becher by Kastner... He who is capable of rescuing this Becher from hanging proves that the atrocities of this great war criminal were not so horrifying or despicable in his eyes...I couldn't base the main guilt of Kastner on this fact had it been alone, but when it is attached even from afar to the whole scene of events it throws retroactive light on the whole affair and serves as a dozen proofs of our conclusion.

(Supreme Court Judge, Moshe Silberg, 1957) ⁽³⁰⁾

³⁰ Ibid., pp. 273-275.

5.7 Conclusion

If that had been the majority judgment, one could say that whatever their attitudes to the Arabs, and whatever their past behavior might have been under pressure, the Zionist leadership today did not advocate collaboration with the Nazis.

One could then at least understand the complaints by Mr. Bloch President of the Victorian Jewish Board of Deputies, about the 'dragging in of alleged episodes in the history of Jewish/Nazi relationships.'

But Judge Silberg's judgment was that of a minority.

The Kastner case is therefore not an alleged episode in past history, being 'dragged in' to discredit an opponent.

It is a continuing controversy in which the top Zionist leadership of Israel stand indicted of continuing to publicly defend collaboration with the Nazis in the extermination of Jews.

Despite the unanimous finding of the Supreme Court of Israel that Kurt Becher was a major war criminal, the Jewish Agency (World Zionist Organization) refused to withdraw the fraudulent certificate Kastner gave on their behalf, which saved Becher from hanging, and allowed him to remain a free man in West Germany, the head of several corporations and with an estimated personal worth of 30 million.

Becher has even used his certification as a 'good' SS officer to give evidence in support of his associates at other war crimes trials in West Germany.

Since the prosecution, representing the Israeli Government, agreed with the Supreme Court that Becher was a major war criminal, one can only presume that the Israeli Government did not want him put on trial for fear of what might come out.

Likewise, none of Kastner's associates on the Zionist Relief and Rescue Committee or his bosses in the Jewish Agency have ever been put on trial as demanded by Israeli public opinion. Let alone the hundreds of 'prominents' who helped Kastner to reassure the Hungarian Jews that they were going to Kenyerméze and not Auschwitz, in exchange for tickets on the one train that took them eventually to Palestine.

As for Kastner himself, he will cause no further embarrassment to the Zionist leadership with his undisputed claims that everything he did was approved by the Jewish Agency (World Zionist Organization) leadership in Palestine. He is, as Dr. Foster so delicately puts it, 'now dead'. Or putting it less delicately, on 3 March, 1957 he was shot by Zeer Eckstein immediately after the appeal hearings were concluded, and before the judgment 'rehabilitating' him was delivered. Eckstein was not a Hungarian avenger. He was a paid undercover agent of the Israeli secret service. ⁽³¹⁾

Clearly this issue has a major indirect relevance to the Arab-Israeli dispute. Apart from countering Israel's cynical use of the Holocaust as a propaganda weapon, it answers a very real concern that many people have about the State of Israel and the Jews. This concern is whether, if Jews had a State of their own during the Holocaust many more could have been saved, and whether this is not

³¹ Ibid., p. 208. Another 'fantastic allegation' no doubt; but admitted in court during the murder trial.

an essential future consideration, at least as an insurance policy.

The facts of the Kastner case show that the very existence of the Jewish Agency (World Zionist Organization) was an actual help to the Nazis and that more could have been saved if the Zionist movement had not existed. Having a State that approves of actions like those of Kastner for an insurance policy, is like using petrol for a fire extinguisher.

Zionism is not the answer to anti-Semitism, but a cowardly proposal to run away from it. The only answer to anti-Semitism is to fight back. We shall go on to prove this in detail.

6. THE BACKGROUND TO COLLABORATION

It is not enough to document what Kastner did and what the Supreme Court of Israel and the Israeli Government approved of him doing. One has to ask 'why?'. Why did Kastner think it right to actively assist in leading hundreds of thousands to their deaths in exchange for the lives of a few? Why did the top Zionist leadership feel compelled to defend him after this crime was proved? Why does the Victorian Jewish Board of Deputies (VJBD) continue to defend him to this day?

To understand this, we must look at the basic Zionist policy during the period of the Holocaust.

Today of course, Zionism presents itself as the representative of all Jews everywhere. But before and during the war, Zionism was quite clear about its role as a specific political movement concerned solely with those Jews who wished to colonize Palestine, and the large majority of Jews were opposed to it. Zionist activity meant organizing Jewish emigration to Palestine and building a homeland in Palestine.

To the reproach that they didn't do enough about rescuing Jews in general from Nazi occupied Europe, Zionists could and did reply that this was not the function of Zionism. Zionism was not then, as it is not today, a movement for the protection of Jews, but a movement for establishing a Jewish State in Palestine. The only difference is that today Zionism pretends to have a broader function and to speak on behalf of all Jews.

Stories about heroic Zionist efforts to smuggle Jews into Palestine are so much a part of the popular culture in Western countries like Australia today that people tend to forget that during the Holocaust this was a disruption of the war effort, not a life saving operation.

The people smuggled into Palestine had already escaped from Nazi Europe and the activities to smuggle them in were not directed against the Nazis but against the British. Failure did not mean that the refugees were returned to enemy territory, but that they were detained on other British territory such as Mauritius, instead of being allowed into Palestine.

Hundreds of thousands, and even millions of Jews wanted to get out of Europe alright, but Palestine was generally the last place they wanted to go. Contrary to popular myth there was no historic or cultural link between the mass of European Jews and Palestine at all.

Most European Jews were basically city dwellers and the U.S.A., which absorbed some two million Jewish migrants in the great exodus from Eastern Europe between the 1880s and 1914 would have been the preferred destination. Put anywhere at all, away from the Nazis, would have been welcomed.

The problem was how to get away from the Nazis, not how to get into Palestine, and the fact that most Jews did not particularly want to go to Palestine is proved by the fact that the overwhelming majority have stayed well clear, even after the State of Israel was established.

Those who did want to colonize Palestine had already created so much Arab

antagonism with their policies of 'conquering land', 'conquering labor,' and 'conquering trade' (that is, boycotting Arabs), that the British authorities, who were quite sympathetic to Zionism, had to restrict Jewish immigration.

Otherwise, pro-Nazi agitators like the Grand Mufti would have been assisted to win substantial support for the Axis cause, especially among the feudal ruling class.

Thus from every point of view, except for building a Jewish State, immigration to Palestine should have been the last thing on any Jew's mind during the second world war. But for Zionists, the Jewish State was everything and this warped perspective is now the subject of praise.

For the majority of mainstream Zionists, that warped perspective meant sitting out the war building up the 'National Homeland' in Palestine and organizing campaigns for unrestricted Jewish immigration and for a Jewish Army, while the overwhelming majority of Jews, like everyone else during the second world war, had other concerns which included organizing partisan resistance movements and enlisting en masse, in the Allied Armies.

6.1 Failure to support Resistance

The Victorian Jewish Board of Deputies (VJBD) has specifically complained about a *Palestine Speaks* broadcast, of 5 June 1977, which said:

'Not only did the International Zionist movement with its world-wide political influence, its financial intelligence and arms-smuggling resources fail to send any arms or ammunition to help the beleaguered ghetto fighters...'

But that statement is a simple fact.

The World Zionist Organization prided itself on its international organization and especially its intelligence network and so on. It was the only specifically Jewish international organization which had liaison offices both inside, and on the periphery of Nazi Europe; which had direct organizational links with Zionist groups throughout Europe and direct access to and political influence with the Allied powers, and which had been engaged in arms smuggling and financial operations.

The only other international Jewish organization was the Bund, which had far less resources and did far more to publicize the Holocaust and seek support for Jewish resistance in Europe.

The vast apparatus of the World Zionist Organization, including its illegal armed forces in Palestine etc., was not used to publicize the Holocaust and support resistance, but took part in covering it up until the Allied powers decided to publicize it.

This vast Zionist apparatus was not used either for assisting beleaguered ghetto fighters or aiding rescue activities. Rabbi Michael Dov Weissmandel, organizer of rescue activities in Slovakia asks in his book *From the Depths* :

'Why didn't they try, from their place of freedom, to break through to us

and send us a secret messenger ? This question becomes greater when we see that the governments of Czechoslovakia and Poland, which were in free lands, sent secret messengers daily to their loyal people in the occupied countries. And therefore our amazement grows. Why don't the great organizations of Jewry, use these messengers, if they have no other way ?

And during all of the years since we developed this method, those in the free countries did not once attempt to send messengers to us - rather, WE had to send them and to pay for them. How many did we send them only for them to return empty-handed – because those over there did not have time to answer ?

(Quoted in *The Holocaust victims accuse*, by Rabbi Moshe Shonfeld) (32)

The only known assistance from the international Zionist movement to Jewish resistance in Nazi Europe was when the British Royal Air Force parachuted some volunteers from Palestine to make contact with partisan forces. Those who were escorted by Tito's partisans from Yugoslavia to Hungary were handed over to the Gestapo by their Zionist 'liaison' in Budapest - Rudolf Kastner.

Many Zionists in Nazi Europe had no choice but to fight back against the Nazis and some acquitted themselves with honor in ghetto rebellions and partisan warfare, although these resistance activities were generally led by Communists and Bundists rather than by Zionists.

It is not necessary, as Dr. Foster seems to imagine, for anti-Zionist programs on 3CR to mention this fact, since it has been very thoroughly drummed in by Zionist propaganda which conveys the impression that Zionists were the main organizers of resistance.

As Dr. Foster mentions, the Zionist participation in the Warsaw ghetto uprising is 'well documented'. Indeed, it is documented to death and exaggerated in numerous stories, books and plays, on stage, screen and television, which picture the Jews of Warsaw fighting under the Blue and White Zionist flag, not mentioning that the Polish flag was flown as well.

Large masses of Jews organized resistance movements and took part in partisan warfare throughout occupied Europe – usually under Communist leadership, often under direct command of the Red Army, and generally making quite a substantial contribution to the Allied war effort.

Generally, Zionists preferred Masada-like last stands to the more effective form of resistance - partisan warfare. But even at Warsaw, where their contribution was greatest, the majority of fighters were Communist, Bundist or unaffiliated. Moreover, although both left-wing Zionists and Revisionists did make a major contribution to the Warsaw ghetto rebellion, their first target was other Zionists, mainly mainstream ones, who were leaders of the Nazi sponsored *Judenrat*, the ghetto police and the Jewish Gestapo.

The leading pro-German, anti-British Zionist theoretician, one of the well known international leaders of a dissident faction in Zionism, Dr. Alfred Nossig, was shot by the Warsaw ghetto fighters as a Gestapo agent. Whatever role some Zionists played in the resistance activities, the plain fact is that they got little or no support from the international Zionist movement, whose leadership was too busy demanding unrestricted immigration, and a Jewish Army in Palestine.

That is not to say that Zionists in Palestine were incapable of giving assistance to partisan warfare. On the contrary, the mainstream Zionists and the

³² Shonfeld, op. cit. p.85.

Revisionists maintained very efficient clandestine armed forces in Palestine throughout the war, and these both had extensive arms smuggling operations which substantially depleted British armories and forced the diversion of British troops to guard duty. But these arms were for use against the British and the Arabs, not against the Germans. Details will be found in *Cross Roads to Israel* by Christopher Sykes. ⁽³³⁾

6.2 Extremist Zionists and the Axis

Although the Haganah, representing the mainstream Zionists, maintained a ceasefire throughout most of the second world war, Zionist policy was to 'fight the war as though there was no White Paper (restricting immigration) and to fight the White Paper as though there was no war'.

In 'fighting the White Paper as though there was no war', the mainstream Zionists did manage to tie down substantial numbers of British troops and naval units to guard Palestine. This may be called stupidity rather than outright collaboration, but the same cannot be said for the policy of the Zionist Revisionists and their clandestine armed forces the Irgun.

Apart from sporadic raids earlier, the Irgun formally declared war on Britain in January 1944 and organized systematic terror activities against the British forces in Palestine from then on. This was while European Jews were still being exterminated by the Nazis.

There are accusations that the Irgun proposed a formal military pact with Nazi Germany, promising intelligence and other support against Britain on condition that a victorious Germany would establish a Jewish State in Palestine, although it is clear that Germany never accepted this alliance, having been allied with the Grand Mufti instead.

A memorandum dated January 1941 from a report by the Naval attaché at the German Embassy in Turkey reads as follows:

'It is often stated in the speeches and utterances of the leading statesmen of National Socialist Germany that a New Order in Europe requires as a prerequisite the radical solution of the Jewish question through evacuation. '*Judenreines Europa*'. The evacuation of the Jewish masses from Europe is a precondition for solving the Jewish question ; but this can only be made possible and complete through the settlement of these masses in the home of the Jewish people, Palestine, and through the establishment of a Jewish state in its historic boundaries. The solving in this manner of the Jewish problem, and thus the bringing about with it of the liberation of the Jewish people once and for all, is the objective of the political activity and the year's long struggle of the Jewish freedom movement : the National Military Organization (*Irgun Zvai Leumi*) in Palestine.

The NMO, which is well-acquainted with the goodwill of the German Reich government and its authorities towards Zionist activity inside Germany and towards Zionist emigration plans (one should notice, in this respect the fascist-Zionist cooperation in the years stretching between 1933 and 1939 - K.P.) - is of the opinion that:

³³ Christopher Sykes, *Cross Roads to Israel*, Nel Mentor London, 1967.

1. Common interests could exist between the establishment of a new order in Europe in conformity with the German concept, and the true national, aspirations of the Jewish people as they are embodied by the NMO.
2. Cooperation between the new Germany and a renewed Hebrew nation (*volkisch-nationalen-Hebraertum*) would be possible, and
3. The establishment of the historical Jewish state on a national, and totalitarian basis and bound by a treaty with the German Reich would be in the interest of maintaining and strengthening the future German position of power in the Near East. Proceeding from these considerations, the NMO in Palestine offers to take an active part in the war on Germany's side, provided the above-mentioned national aspirations of the Jewish liberation movement are recognized by the German Reich government.

This offer by the NMO, whose validity extends over the military, political and information levels, inside and also according to certain organizational preparations outside Palestine, would be bound to the military training and organizing of Jewish manpower in Europe, under the leadership and command of the NMO. These military units would take part in the fighting to conquer Palestine, in case such a front is formed.

The indirect participation of the Israeli freedom movement in the drawing up of the New Order in Europe, already in its preparatory stage, would be connected with a positively radical solution of the European Jewish problem in conformity with the above-mentioned national aspirations of the Jewish people. This would strengthen to an uncommon degree the moral basis of the New Order in the eyes of the entire world.

The cooperation of the Israeli freedom movement would also be in line with one of the recent speeches of the German Reich Chancellor in which Herr Hitler stressed that any combination and any alliance would be entered into in order to isolate England and defeat it. ⁽³⁴⁾

This document comes from East German sources and has not been confirmed conclusively from material in Western archives, although it is quite consistent with the behavior of the Revisionist Zionists as a fascist party allied with other fascist parties in pre-war years.

Since it could be an East German forgery, or could have originally been a British forgery, we will not rely on this document. But there is no doubt whatever that the Irgun's offshoots, the even more extreme 'Stern Gang', Lehi, or Fighters for the Freedom of Israel did establish treasonable relations with fascist Italy and launched terrorist attacks on British forces in Palestine with Italian aid and as a direct component of the Axis war effort.

They were shot as Axis quislings by the British and denounced by the mainstream Zionists, although this did not prevent cooperation being re-established after the war was over, Dr. Foster can call it what he likes, but we would call a declaration of war against Britain in 1944 and a formal alliance with an Axis power, voluntary collaboration with the Nazis.

Of course the mainstream Zionist position was basically on the side of the

³⁴ Klaus Polkehn, "The Secret Contacts: Zionism and Nazi Germany, 1931-1941". *Journal of Palestine Studies* Vol.V, No.s 3-4 (Spring/Summer 1976) pp. 79-80.

Allies and the Irgun was only an extremist minority led by the extremist Menachem Begin, now Prime Minister of the extremist State of Israel, who came to Palestine as a soldier in the Polish Army fighting Nazis but deserted to fight Britain instead. Thus the accusation can be put much stronger than it has been on 3CR.

Not only did the International Zionist movement fail to aid the beleaguered ghetto fighters, but the only use it made of its facilities for arms smuggling etcetera was to support terrorist attacks on the Allies with the assistance from the Axis.

While Jews in Europe, including some Zionists, were fighting the Nazis with help from the Allies, some Zionists in Palestine were fighting the British with help from the Axis.

6.3 The Haganah reports to Eichmann

The accusation that the Haganah was supplying intelligence reports to Adolf Eichmann in 1937 may appear fantastic. But no, unlike the alleged Irgun proposals for an alliance with Germany, the documents confirming intelligence links between Feivel Polkes, commander of the Haganah, protector of the Jews, and Adolf Eichmann of the security service of the SS can be authenticated from German war records captured by American troops and kept at the National Archives in Washington.

The negotiations arose in connection with Zionist involvement in the brisk trade exporting Jews organized by Gestapo agents anxious to make Europe *Judenrein*.⁽³⁵⁾

In the archives of the Reichsführer of the SS, Heinrich Himmler, on microfilm roll RFSS 411, frames 2936012 to 2936069, will be found details of Polkes' offer of intelligence information in a visit to Berlin from February 26 to March 2, 1937; and also Eichmann's travel report on his subsequent visit to Palestine and his conversations with Polkes on October 10 and 11, 1937 in Cairo's Café Groppi, after Eichmann was kicked out of Palestine by the British.

Here Eichmann reports the approval Polkes expressed of German 'radical' policies leading to increased Jewish immigration to Palestine, and reports intelligence information received from Polkes concerning pro-Soviet Arab leaders (who were trying to prevent an Arab-Axis alliance) and concerning the location of an underground Communist radio station broadcasting to Germany.

Fantastic? Yes, but on the public record!

This background may help explain how the Jewish Agency's policy - the World Zionist Organization's policy, could lead it to support Kastner's collaboration with the Nazis in exterminating Jews. When this came up, negotiations and 'common interests' with the Nazis were already nothing new.

6.4 Zionist priorities during the Holocaust

Zionist policy during the Holocaust is best summed up in the words of Yitzchak Greenbaum speaking on 'The Diaspora and the Redemption',⁽³⁶⁾ at a Tel

³⁵ See Sykes, op. cit. for a description of this joint Gestapo / Zionist activity. Also see Heinz Hohne, *Der Order unter dem Totenkopf*, Gütersloh, 1967.

³⁶ The "diaspora" refers to Jewish existence outside Israel.

Aviv meeting in February 1943:

For the rescue of the Jews in the Diaspora, we should consolidate our excess strength and the surplus of powers that we have. When they come to us with two plans – the rescue of the masses of Jews in Europe or the redemption of the land - I vote, without a second thought, for the redemption of the land. The more said about the slaughter of our people, the greater the minimization of our efforts to strengthen and promote the Hebraization of the land.

If there would be a possibility today of buying packages of food with the money of the 'Keren Hayesod' (United Jewish Appeal) to send it through Lisbon, would we do such a thing ? No! and once again No ! (37)

Greenbaum confirms this in his postwar book *In Days of Holocaust and Destruction* :

'... when they asked me, couldn't you give, money out of the United Jewish Appeal funds for the rescue of Jews in Europe, I said, 'NO!' and I say again ' NO!'...one should resist this wave which pushes the Zionist activities to secondary importance.' (38)

Notice that Greenbaum had not only insisted that buying land from the Arabs was more important than rescuing Jews in Europe, as he admitted after the war, but he had even called for less to be **said** about the slaughter, so as not to distract attention from buying land! It was an **explicit** call for a conspiracy of silence.

Greenbaum, whose son was an exceptionally notorious Kapo at Auschwitz, was not just some insignificant Zionist functionary shooting his mouth off. He was Kastner's immediate superior in the Jewish Agency, as head of the Rescue Committee for European Jewry, and he became a cabinet Minister in Israel's first Government.

Greenbaum's policy was the Zionist movement's policy (39) Kastner was only carrying out an agreed policy.

This policy was summed up in the slogan 'one goat in Eretz Israel is worth an entire community in the diaspora.' (40)

As Rabbi Shonfeld comments :

'The rescue committee of the Jewish Agency falsely bore the name 'rescue'. It would be more appropriate to call it the Committee for Covering Up, Ignoring and Silencing... the thoughts of Zionist officials and especially the chairman, Greenbaum, were steeped in plots and schemes to use the Holocaust and its consequences to build up the national home, and to realize the demands for establishing a Jewish State.' (41)

This attitude was further demonstrated in a letter from Nathan Schwab,

³⁷ Shonfeld, op. cit. p. 26.

³⁸ Ibid.

³⁹ Greenbaum was actually in a minority in the Zionist leadership on this question. The damning fact is that he was left in charge of the 'rescue committee' after openly expressing his opposition to the use of Zionist money for rescue activities.

⁴⁰ Eretz Israel refers to the land of Israel.

⁴¹ Shonfeld, op. cit. p. 56.

representative of the Jewish Agency in Switzerland, to the Rescue Committee for Czech Jewry :

'Since we have the opportunity of this courier, we are writing to the group that they must always remember that matter which is the most important, which is the main issue that must always be before our eyes. After all, the allies will be victorious. After the victory, they will once again divide up the world between the nations as they did, at the end of the first war. Then they opened the way for us for the first step and now, as the war ends, we must do everything so that Eretz Israel should become a Jewish state. Important steps have already been taken in this matter.

As to the cry that comes from your country, we must be aware that all the nations of the Allies are spilling much blood and if we do not bring sacrifices, with what will we achieve the right to sit at the table when they make the distribution of nations, and territories, after the war? And so it would be foolish and impertinent on our side to ask the nations whose blood is being spilled for permission to send money into the land of their enemies in order to protect our own blood.

Because '*rak b'dam tihyu lanu haaretz*' (only through blood will the land be ours). As to yourselves, -- members of the group -- '*atem taylu*' ('you will get out'), and for this purpose we are providing you with funds by this courier.' (42)

(Letter from Nathan Schwalb to the pro-Zionist Jewish Rescue Committee in
Czechoslovakia)

As Rabbi Shonfeld comments:

Here Mr. Schwalb expressed the complete Zionist ideology and stated clearly and openly the politics of the Zionist leaders in the area of rescue: The shedding of Jewish blood in the Diaspora is necessary in order for us to demand the establishment of a 'Jewish' state before a peace commission. Money will be sent to save a group of '*chalutzim*' (pioneers), while the remainder of Czech Jewry must resign itself to annihilation in the Auschwitz crematoria. (43)

6.5 Suppressing the News

There is no doubt about the fact that the Zionist leadership kept quiet about the Holocaust while it was going on. Kastner was able to excuse his own silence about Auschwitz by telling the Court that other Jewish Agency representatives suppressed the news he sent out while negotiations proceeded :

I learned that the Jewish Agency and Joint Distribution Committee Representatives in Switzerland, Moshe Schwalbe and Saly Mayer, did not give out information to the press about the mass killings. They failed to give the press the news I sent from Budapest. I sent cables also to the Istanbul Rescue Committee (of the Jewish Agency). They were also kept secret from

⁴² Ibid., pp.26-28.

⁴³ Ibid., p.28.

the press. I informed them almost daily by cables, about the pace of the extermination. My cables were never published anywhere. (44)

Indeed, as Ben Hecht explains:

There, will be many witnesses, to testify about this silence during Greenwald's trial, among them Professor Aktzin, dean of the Law faculty of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem. I quote from the trial record:

'TAMIR: IS IT TRUE THAT THE JOINT DISTRIBUTION COMMITTEE AND THE JEWISH AGENCY DID SUPPRESS THE NEWS OF THE EXTERMINATION IN THE UNITED STATES UP TO AND THROUGH 1941 ?

'PROFESSOR AKTZIN : THE ZIONISTS, JEWISH AGENCY AND JOINT DISTRIBUTION COMMITTEE DID REFRAIN FROM PUBLICIZING IN THE AMERICAN PRESS THE MASSACRE OF JEWS.'

While the war was still on in 1945, a Jewish mission of survivors from Poland came to the annual meeting of the World Jewish Congress. They came with accusations, and the leaders of the Jewish Congress listened stoically to their complaint. The survivors from Poland accused these leaders of Zion of having failed to arouse the nations of the world to the fact that the Jews were being exterminated. The mission accused the leaders of Jewry of having neglected practical possibilities of rescue and help. The leaders stated that the omissions, were the result of a deliberate decision. They offered as explanation 'the opinion of the executive board was that it was inadvisable because of our diplomatic ties with these governments.' (Of the Free World.) (45)

Greenbaum justified the Zionist leaders policy of hiding the facts about the Holocaust from the public, in a speech he made at Sokolov House on 1 January, 1964. He said:

'Whoever is building the homeland and is battling for the very existence of the homeland, is excused from knowing; for he has another, greater obligation.' (46)

Thus after the war too, Greenbaum reaffirms that the holocaust had to be covered up because the knowledge that European Jewry was being exterminated would have distracted attention from the more important question of building a Jewish State in Palestine. This was also the occasion on which Greenbaum produced another gem :

'It would have been worthwhile to sacrifice another million Jews for the

⁴⁴ Hecht, op. cit. p.91.

⁴⁵ Ibid., pp.92-93.

⁴⁶ Shonfeld, op. cit. p.79.

glory of the Warsaw Ghetto revolt.' (47)

6.6 Zionist Leaders Admit Inactivity

Despite the popular impression, Zionist leaders do not seriously contest that they were inactive during the holocaust. Here is Dr. Nahum Goldmann, President of the World Jewish Congress speaking at a commemorative meeting on 4 March, 1962:

'There is no doubt that future Jewish history will judge the generation of the Holocaust which lived in free lands as guilty. It will accuse it of failing to adequately prepare for the Nazi danger in its beginning stages, and of not daring to fight desperately the annihilation in this period. I do not know whether, in the time of the war, the Allies could have prevented the death of millions of Jews. But there is no doubt in my heart that it was possible to save tens of thousands of Jews with active, daring measures by the democratic governments. But most of the responsibility lies upon us, due to our self-satisfaction with requests and routine demands and to the fact that groups of Jews did not have, enough courage to pressure the democratic governments with dramatic means and motivate them to act drastically.

I will never forget the day on which a telegram from the Warsaw ghetto was delivered to me, it was addressed to Rabbi Stephen Wise and to myself. We were asked why Jewish leaders in America do not protest day and night on the stairs of the White House until the President orders the bombing of the concentration camps and the railway tracks leading to them. We did not do so because the majority of Jewish leaders then were of the opinion that they should not interfere with the free world's war effort against the Nazis with stormy protests. Therefore we should not transfer the guilt to those who suffered and paid with their lives. If there is a basis to the historical 'I accuse', let us have the courage now to direct it against that part of the generation which was lucky enough to be outside of the Nazi domination and did not fulfill its obligation toward the millions killed.' (Reported in *Davar* 22 April 1964) (48)

While admitting most of the responsibility for the deaths of tens of thousands, if not millions of Jews who could have been saved, Goldmann tries to spread the blame around a bit, to include everyone who was not actually a victim of the Holocaust.

As Rabbi Shonfeld comments on this speech:

Today all have regrets : the past Nazis, the good Germans, the merciful Catholics, the very democratic British and Americans, and even the Jewish secular leaders. However, as we said, the statute of limitations against war crimes is not to apply to the Nazis and their accomplices, whether non-Jews or Jews... (49)

⁴⁷ Ibid., p. 79.

⁴⁸ Ibid., pp.68-70.

⁴⁹ Ibid., p. 70.

Actually, Nahum Goldmann received and ignored so many similar messages during the Holocaust that he was bound to become confused after 20 years. The telegram from the Warsaw ghetto did not refer to bombing concentration camps and railway tracks. It came from the 'Jewish National Committee' in Warsaw, via the Polish underground, on 21 January, 1943, and simply read as follows:

We notify you of the greatest crime of all times, about the murder of millions of Jews in Poland. Poised at the brink of the annihilation of the still surviving Jews, we ask you :

1. Revenge against the Germans
2. Force the Hitlerites to halt the murders
3. Fight for our lives and our honor
4. Contact the neutral countries
5. Rescue 10,000 children through exchange
6. 500,000 dollars for purposes of aid

Brothers - the remaining Jews in Poland live with the awareness that in the most terrible days of our history you did not come to our aid. Respond, at least in the last days of our life. ⁽⁵⁰⁾

Nor did all 'that part of the generation which was lucky enough to be outside of the Nazi domination' fail to 'fulfill its obligation toward the millions killed'. Not even all Jewish nationalists took Nahum Goldmann's Zionist stand that they 'should not interfere with the free world's war effort against the Nazis with stormy protests' (a pathetic lie considering the Zionist decision to 'fight the White Paper as though there was no war' in Palestine).

The Bundist ⁽⁵¹⁾ member of the Polish Government in exile, Artur Zygelbojm committed suicide as a public gesture to draw attention to what was happening in Warsaw. Despite the Zionist fears, he has never been accused of 'interfering with the free world's war effort against the Nazis with stormy protests.'

6.7 A message Zionist leaders ignored

The message Nahum Goldmann thought he remembered from Warsaw about bombing concentration camps and railways, actually came more than a year later from Rabbi Michael Dov Weissmandel, a rescue worker operating in Slovakia. If anyone thinks some 3CR programs speak too strongly, let them study this message :

May 15, 1944 - In a cave, near Lublin. Sholom and Greetings. We send you this special message to inform you that yesterday the Germans began the deportation of Jews from Hungary. It is the beginning of deportation of all the Hungarian Jews.

Every day, twelve thousand souls are being taken off. Four deportations of forty-five such train-loads move daily out of Hungary. Within twenty-six days all that area will have been deported.

The deported ones go to Auschwitz to be put to death by cyanide gas. A great number are dead on arrival. The Germans allow a few of the strongest

⁵⁰ Lucy Dawidowicz, *The War Against the Jews 1933-45*, Penguin Books, Middlesex, 1977, p.403.

⁵¹ The Bund (Fraternity) was a nationalist, but not Zionist, Social Democratic party of Jewish workers in Russia and Poland.

to stay alive. Those who are allowed to live are branded with a number burned into their arm and the Star of David burned into their chest.

Most of these privileged ones die within a month. Others take their place.

Those who go directly from the train to the gas chambers to be suffocated are not branded. They are completely consumed in the ovens and leave no evidence behind. These are 95% of each transport.

The dead bodies are burned in specially made ovens. Each oven burns 12 bodies an hour. In February there were 36 ovens burning. We have learned that more have been built.

Information supplied us by a few eyewitnesses' reveals that in February there were four disposal buildings. We have learned that more have been built since then.

Formerly, the Germans killed and burned the Jews in the Forest of Birkenwold, near Auschwitz. Now the killing and burning take place in the buildings shown on the enclosed map.

In December, the Germans built special trains to transport the Jews of Hungary to their extermination. This is the schedule of Auschwitz, from yesterday to the end ; twelve thousand Jews - men, women and children, old men, infants, healthy and sick ones - are to be suffocated daily and their bones and ashes are to be used to fertilize the German fields.

And you - our brothers in Palestine, in all the countries of freedom, and you, ministers of all the kingdom - how do you keep silent in the face of this great murder ? Silent while thousands on thousands, reaching now to six million Jews, were murdered. And silent now while tens of thousands are being murdered and waiting to be murdered ?

Their destroyed hearts cry to you for help as they bewail your cruelty. Brutal you are, because of the cold-bloodedness of the silence in which you watch.

Because you sit with folded arms and you do nothing, though you could stop or delay the murder of Jews at this very hour.

In the name of the blood of the thousands on thousands who have been murdered we beg, we plead, we cry out and demand that you take action, that you do deeds now - at once!

That the ministers of kingdoms and all the Lands raise a loud and piercing outcry that must enter the ears of the world, the ears of the German people, the ears of the Hungarian people. Let them cry out a warning to the German murderers. Let them proclaim that they know all that has been, done in the past, and that which is still being done. And the Pope, himself, should join in this cry of outrage against the German murderers.

Let this outcry be heard over all the radios and read in all the newspapers of the world, that unless they stop at once the deportations of Hungary's Jews - then will Germany be forever exiled from civilization.

We ask that the crematoria in Auschwitz be bombed from the air. They are sharply visible, as shown on the enclosed map.

Such bombing will delay the work of the German murderers.

What is more important - to bomb persistently all the roads leading from Eastern Hungary to Poland and to bomb persistently the bridges in the neighborhood of Karpatarus. Drop all other business to get this done. Remember that one day of your idleness kills twelve thousand souls.

You, our brothers, sons of Israel, are you insane ? Don't you know the

Hell around us ? For whom are you saving your money ?

How is it that all our pleadings affect you less than the whimpering of a beggar in your doorway ? Murderers! Madmen! Who is it that gives charity ? You who toss a few pennies from your safe homes ? Or we who give our blood in the depths of Hell ?

There is only one thing that may be said in your exoneration – that you do not know the truth. This is possible. The villain does his job so shrewdly that only a few guess the truth. We have told you the truth several times. It is possible that you believe our murderers more than you believe us ? May God open your eyes and give you the heart to rescue in these last hours the remainder.

Most important is that which I write about the bombing of the Auschwitz Crematoria and the bridges leading to them.

Such bombing can vitally delay the evil work of our slaughterers. And God who keeps alive the last remnant of Israel will show His mercy for which I pray. I pray as I write out of the sea tears of the people of Israel. We wait God's help. One from the market who witnesses the woes of his people.

(Rabbi Michael Dov Weissmandel, Exhibit of the Defense, no.36, State Attorney vs. M. Greenwald, District Court, Jerusalem CC124/53) (52)

During the Kastner case, Kenachera Eader of the Jewish Agency was asked 'Did you receive this letter from Rabbi Weissmandel ?' He answered :

'Letters like this came to us every day'. (53)

But Auschwitz was not bombed. Despite receiving these heart rending messages, the Zionist leaders contented themselves with routine requests. Presumably the point was they could not initiate 'stormy protests' without endangering the 'deals' that their representative Kastner was making to rescue a few Zionists and bring them to Palestine - and from the Zionist point of view, that was more important.

As well as the myth about not wanting to interfere with the Allied war effort, Zionist leaders have attempted to excuse their inactivity during the holocaust by pretending that they did not really know what was happening. (54)

See for example Nahum Goldmann's speech of February 1968.

But this excuse is refuted by numerous documents. The whole world knew about Hitler's extermination policy after the formal Allied declaration about it in December 1942, and the Zionist leaders knew from their own sources long before then.

See for example the speech of Knesset member Chaim Landau at a symposium held by the Israeli newspaper Maariv on 24 April, 1966. (55)

⁵² Hecht, op. cit., pp.140-143.

⁵³ Ibid., p.143.

⁵⁴ See, for example, Nahum Goldmann's speech of February 1968.

⁵⁵ *Maariv*, 24 April 1966. Cited in V. Bolshakov, *Anti-Communism, the Main Line of Zionism*. Novosti Press Agency Publishing House, Moscow, 1972, p.35.

6.8 Other Zionists Accuse

The worst that Zionists will admit to, and this interpretation is widely accepted, is that they deliberately refrained from putting sufficient pressure on the Allies to intervene to rescue Jews, because they did not want to prejudice friendly relations and the future establishment of a State of Israel with British and American support.

That admission is damning enough, and has been quite sufficient, to justify use of the term 'collaboration' by Zionist Revisionists who themselves accept the story that the conspiracy of silence was in response to British pressure, and who naturally regard immigration to Palestine as the central question in rescuing Jews.

A great deal of the exposure of Nazi collaboration by the mainstream Zionist leadership was carried out for political reasons by Revisionists who rightly say that agreeing to remain silent about the Holocaust, while millions were being murdered, amounts to collaboration with the murderers.

Thus Greenwald's defense counsel in the Kastner case, Shmuel Tamir, today Minister for Justice in the State of Israel, points out that *Davar* the official Zionist Labour Federation newspaper, did not publicize the holocaust and even ran an editorial saying :

The Nazi denial of extermination has a good foundation. Not as many were annihilated as was feared. ⁽⁵⁶⁾

Tamir says :

Until mid-July, six weeks after the killing of twelve thousand a day had begun, still not a single authoritative word is uttered by the Jewish Agency or any Zionist officials that 'the deportation had started - that already half a million were exterminated.

The Jewish Agency had by then the best and most exact informative source on the fate, of the Jews of Hungary, and on the deportation, and there was no British censorship of such items, as was proven in Court. But from the end of May until the 16th of July, for a full month and a half, when 12,000 Jews are being killed a day, still not a single, authoritative word is uttered by the Jewish Agency or any Zionist officials, that there deportations have started and are continued; that already half a million Jews were exterminated. For a full month and a half, Mr. Sharett and the Jewish Agency are knowingly and willfully suppressing all the news known to them. ⁽⁵⁷⁾

He continues:

And why this suppression of the dreadful news by Ben-Gurion, Sharett, Weizmann and all the official leaders of Jewry ? Because, had the masses in Palestine known then what was happening in Hungary, and known then the stony hearts of their leaders, a storm would have risen in our land. Power would have fallen out of their hands. And this, it seems, was more important to them.

There is no other explanation. Therefore I said : 'Collaboration here,

⁵⁶ Hecht, op. cit., p.145.

⁵⁷ Ibid., p.147.

parallel to collaboration there. But if the collaboration there has developed under German pressure, here we talk of men who lived in the free world, whose discretion could be more balanced, who were in control of good youth, wonderful youth, which awaited a command. The fact remains that the moral and historical responsibility, as far as Jews are concerned, lies first and foremost on those who lived in the free world. And though I am here to prove the guilt of Kastner, I say that his responsibility is lesser than that of the leaders of our free Jewish world. (58)

Ben Hecht, a supporter of the same Zionist party sums up :

These organizations, these philanthropists, these timorous Jewish lodge members in Zion, London and America, these Zionist leaders who let their six million kinsman burn, choke, hang without protest, with indifference and even with a glint of anti-Semitic cunning in their political plannings.

I sum up against them...

My faith says that nearly all the six million Jews could have been saved and the honor of our century saved with them had the powerful American Jewry alone united in a campaign to save them... And had those Palestine leaders who stayed Mum on the slaughter and were garrulous as geese on the needs of Zionism in Palestine - had they cried out - would they have survived as leaders? Would the British have ousted them and gutted 'the dream of Zionism'?

Again, I do not know, I only know that, by my measure, such honorable human behavior would have been of deeper worth to the world than a dozen States of Israel. (59)

But the truth is far worse than what Zionists will admit to - joining a conspiracy of silence under British pressure. As will be shown shortly, the only British pressure was against immigration to Palestine, and it was Zionists who were exerting pressure on Britain not to rescue Jews from the Holocaust.

A fairly accurate account of Zionist thinking at the time is given by Mapai leader Eliezer Livneh, expressing his regrets in a column entitled 'Thoughts on the Holocaust' in the newspaper *Yediot Aharanot* :

Our Zionist orientation educated us to see the growing land of Israel as the prime goal and the Jewish nation only in relation to its building the land. With each tragedy befalling the Jews in the diaspora, we saw the state as the evident solution. We continued employing this principle even during the Holocaust, saving, only those who could be brought to Israel. The mandate's limitation on immigration served as a political factor in our battle to open the doors to *aliya* and to establishing the state. Our programs were geared to this aim and for this we were prepared to sacrifice or endanger lives. Everything outside of this goal, including the rescue of European Jewry for its own sake was a secondary goal. If there can be no people without a country', Rabbi Weissmandel exclaimed, 'Then surely there can be no country without a people, and where are the living Jewish people if not in Europe' ? (60)

⁵⁸ Ibid., p. 148.

⁵⁹ Ibid., p. 193.

⁶⁰ Shonfeld, op. cit., pp. 24-25.

6.9 The Very Existence of the 'Jewish Agency' Helped the Nazis

As the revisionist newspaper Herut asks :

How are we to explain the fact that the leaders of the Jewish Agency and the chiefs of the Zionist movement in Palestine kept silent ? Why didn't they raise their voices ? Why didn't they shout about it over the whole wide world ? Why didn't they appeal in broadcasts of their 'secret' Haganah radio station to Jews in ghettos, camps and villages to flee, to the woods, to mutiny and fight, to try to save themselves ? By silence, they collaborated with the German to no less, an extent than the scoundrels who provided the Germans with the death lists, History will yet pronounce its verdict against them. Was not the very existence of the Jewish Agency a help for the Nazis ? When history tries the so-called *Judenrat* and the Jewish police, she will also condemn the leaders of the Agency and the leaders of the Zionist movement. (61)

And that really is the verdict of history.

Just as Judge Benjamin Halevi found that the Zionist Jewish Agency's 'Relief and Rescue Committee' in Budapest was a department of the Nazi SS, alongside the departments for extermination and looting, so we must find that the very existence of the 'Jewish Agency' (the world Zionist Organization) was a help to the Nazis in carrying out and covering up their crimes.

⁶¹ *Herut*, 25 May 1964. Cited in Bolshakov, op.cit. p. 40.

7. CLOSING THE DOORS

Let us now see whether it was really the British who were exerting pressure on Zionists not to publicize the Holocaust, or whether it was the Zionists who were exerting pressure not to rescue Jews.

It is a fact that when the news about Auschwitz finally got into the Swiss, not Palestinian, press, and despite efforts at suppression from the Zionist representative in Geneva, it immediately caused a world wide furore.

The Hungarian Government was forced to suspend the deportations under direct allied threats that 'the occupation of Hungary would not be like that of other civilized countries.'⁽⁶²⁾

The deportations were not resumed until after the German occupation of Hungary, and it is unlikely that the extermination of Hungarian Jewry could have been so successful in the short time available without Zionist assistance in luring the Jews onto the Auschwitz trains in a 'lightning operation' that whisked them out of Hungary just ahead of the Red Army.

7.1 Britain

The record shows that it was not the British who instigated the conspiracy of silence concerning the Holocaust, but rather Zionist leaders like Greenbaum who said that publicity for the Holocaust would have distracted attention from 'Hebraization' (clearing Arabs off) of the land.

Today Zionists constantly emphasize the importance of the State of Israel to Jews because they say that during the Holocaust there was no state in the world that Jews could turn to for protection or refuge.

What they fail to mention is that throughout this time there were Zionists working actively to keep the doors shut to Jews in every country except Palestine, and to some extent, even Palestine.⁽⁶³⁾

Here is Rabbi Dr. Solomon Schonfeld, Chairman of the Wartime Rescue Committee established by the Chief Rabbi of Britain, writing a letter to the *Times* of 6 June, 1961 :

Your recent reports of the Eichmann trial include considerable evidence tending to show that HM government was largely indifferent to and unwilling to take, action in defense of the European Jews who were being massacred daily by the Nazis ; and that this was so in spite of efforts by Zionist leaders to persuade the British Foreign Office to rouse itself into action on behalf of the victims. In your leader (June 1) you express concern lest it be held that our wartime government was guilty of negligence in the face of the Holocaust. Your correspondent succinctly suggests that the attention now being given to this side of the picture is connected with some current criticism of Zionist inactivity during the war.

My experience in 1942-1943 was wholly in favor of British readiness to

⁶² Gerald Reitlinger, *The Final Solution*, Sphere Books London, 1971, pp. 467-470.

⁶³ If the evidence that follows in this chapter appears incredible, please consider the present open Zionist campaign to prevent Soviet Jews from emigrating to any country other than Israel. And if Nazi cooperation with Zionist aims seems strange, please note that the USSR will issue visas to Jews to go to Israel only.

help, openly, constructively and totally, and that this readiness met with opposition from Zionist leaders who insisted on rescue to Palestine as the only acceptable form of help.

In December of 1942 (long before the approaches of 1944 reported from the Jerusalem trial), we in London formed a Council for Rescue from the Nazi Terror which, in turn, initiated a Parliamentary Rescue Committee under the chairmanship of Professor A.V. Hill M.P. supported by leading members of both Houses. At the time I was executive director of the Chief Rabbi's Religious Emergency Council and applied myself to this task. A motion was placed on the Order Paper in the following terms :

That in view of the massacres and starvation of Jews and others in enemy and enemy-occupied countries, this house asks H.M. Government, following the United Nations Declaration read to both Houses of Parliament on December 17, 1942, and in consultation with the dominion government of India, to declare its readiness to find temporary refuge in its own territories or in territories under its control for endangered persons who are able to leave those countries ; to appeal to the governments of countries bordering on enemy and enemy-occupied countries to allow temporary asylum and transit facilities for such persons ; to offer those governments, so far as practicable, such help as may be needed to facilitate their cooperation ; and to invite other Allied governments to consider similar action.'

As a result of widespread concern and the persistency of a few, this motion achieved within two weeks a total of 277 Parliamentary signatures of all parties. This purely humanitarian proposal met with sympathy from government circles, and I should add that H.M. Government did, in fact, issue some hundreds of Mauritius and other immigration permits – indeed, in favor of any threatened Jewish family that we could name. Already while the Parliamentary motion was gathering momentum, voices of dissent were heard from Zionist quarters : 'Why not Palestine ?' The obvious answer that the most urgent concern was humanitarian and not political, that the Mufti-Nazi alliance ruled out Palestine for the immediate saving of lives and that Britain could not then add to her Middle East problems, were of no avail.

At the Parliamentary meeting held on January 27, 1943, when the next steps were being energetically pursued by over 100 M.P.s and Lords, a spokesman for the Zionists announced that the Jews would oppose the motion on the grounds of its omitting to refer to Palestine. Some voices were raised in support of the Zionist view, there was considerable debate, and thereafter the motion was dead. Even the promoters exclaimed in desperation : If the Jews cannot agree among themselves, how can we help ?

It was useless to argue with a then current Zionist argument: 'Every nation has had its dead in the fight for its homeland – the sufferers under Hitler are our dead in our fight.' But it would be unjust now to permit the miswriting of history so as to cast blame upon Britain. By all means let Eichmann be tried on his murderous merits. Let the nations who participated in the Holocaust of this still Dark Age be judged alongside. Even let the opportunity be taken to point an accusing finger at the neutral bystanders, nations and individuals. But Britain was at her best. (64)

⁶⁴ Shonfeld, op. cit., pp. 60-61.

7.2 The USA

Zionists opposed even temporary havens in the USA, just as they opposed temporary havens in Palestine, on the grounds that there should be unrestricted permanent immigration to Palestine.

Thus, Henry L. Feingold, whose book '*The Politics of Rescue*', is dedicated to 'a true lover of Zion', writes :

One source of opposition to temporary havens was not so easily understood. The joyful reception of the free ports plan in the Jewish community was not fully shared by some of the Zionist organizations, who sensed that free ports, like mass resettlement outside Palestine, would take the edge off agitation for the revocation of the British White Paper and the eventual establishment of the Jewish commonwealth in Palestine. (65)

Despite his own Zionist convictions, Feingold is troubled enough to say :

Yet a gnawing doubt remains. Is it possible that there was an element of truth in the contention of the Bergson group that the goal of rescue and the national commonwealth goal worked at cross purposes during the war? Might the diversion of some resources to resettlement schemes such as the Sosua experiment in the Dominican Republic have made a difference for the doomed Jews of Europe? The Zionist movement had, after all, fashioned the only successful mass resettlement venture in the twentieth century. It possessed the zeal, the pioneering skill, and the support of the masses of Jews that might have gone far in overcoming the serious demographic difficulties found elsewhere.

The Zionists faced an agonizing choice. There were not enough resources to support both expensive resettlement ventures and the pioneering effort in Palestine. The bitter truth seems to be that in order for mass rescue to have succeeded, the effort in Palestine would not only have had to be supplemented by other resettlement ventures but also by mass infiltration into established states. Had the last two alternatives been realized before 1942 there is some reason to believe that the Wannsee decision to liquidate the Jews of Europe might not have been taken. In any case, more Jews might have been rescued.

Unfortunately, the strife between Zionists and other groups did not remain merely academic. It not only interfered with the mobilization of American Jewry but spilled over into the largely Zionist administered operation which maintained listening posts around the periphery of occupied Europe... (66)

Unlike Britain, there is very clear evidence that American disinterest in the fate of European Jewry was based on outright anti-Semitism in the State Department. More than a year after the joint Allied declaration of December 1942 warning the world about Hitler's extermination plans, the American Government

⁶⁵ Henry L. Feingold, *The Politics of Rescue: The Roosevelt Administration and the Holocaust, 1938-1945*, Rutgers University Press, New Brunswick, 1970, p. 264.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 300-301.

was still busily erecting barriers against Jewish refugees and suppressing information about the Holocaust.

Nothing at all was done about this by the American Zionist organizations, although an integrated American Jew, whose father had been a prominent anti-Zionist, Henry Morgenthau Jr, head of the Treasury Department of the US Government, eventually organized a Treasury investigation into what was happening.

According to *While Six Million Died* by Arthur D. Morse, the result was an official 'Report to the Secretary on the Acquiescence of This Government in the Murder of the Jews'.

This official internal Government report summed up the situation as follows :

'(State Department officials) have not only failed to use the Governmental machinery at their disposal to rescue Jews from Hitler, but have even gone so far as to use this Governmental machinery to prevent the rescue of these Jews.

They have not only failed to cooperate with private organizations in the efforts of these organizations to work out individual programs of their own, but have taken steps designed to prevent these programs from being put into effect.

They not only have failed to facilitate the obtaining of information concerning Hitler's plans to exterminate the Jews of Europe but in their official capacity have, gone so far as to surreptitiously attempt to stop the obtaining of information concerning the murder of the Jewish population of Europe. They have tried to cover up their guilt by :

- (a) concealment and misrepresentation;
- (b) the giving of false and misleading explanations for their failures to act and their attempts to prevent action ; and
- (c) the issuance of false and misleading statements concerning the 'action' which they have, taken to date.'⁽⁶⁷⁾

This damning official report was condensed by Morgenthau, retitled 'Personal Report to the President', and given to President Roosevelt on 16 January, 1944. Its introduction explicitly suggested that 'plain anti-Semitism' was motivating State Department officials and threatened a 'nasty scandal'.⁽⁶⁸⁾

Assistant Secretary of State Breckinridge Long, a notorious anti-Semite, was specifically named as the main culprit.

Roosevelt responded by immediately setting up a 'War Refugees Board' as requested, which for the first time began to take some effective action, although by then most of the Jews of Europe were already dead.

What has all this to do with Zionism ?

A notorious anti-Semite like Breckinridge Long could not get away with such an openly vicious policy without some powerful support.

Long's most useful supporter within the State Department was Lawrence Steinhardt, one of very few Jews occupying an important post in the Foreign Service.

A director of the American Federation of Zionists and then of the American Zionist Commonwealth during the 1920's, Steinhardt became notorious for his

⁶⁷ Arthur D. Morse, *While Six Million Died*. Secker and Warburg, London, 1968, p. 89.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 91.

strong support for the State Department's anti-refugee position. It is not for nothing that anti-Semites sometimes boast 'some of my best friends are Jews'.

According to Feingold :

...In 1939 he (Steinhardt) became Ambassador to Moscow. From that remote post he became involved in the rescue refugee crisis when he assumed a highly legalistic position on the issuance of visas, the power of the consuls, and the inviolability of the immigration laws. Long, delighted with the strong support he was receiving from a Jewish Ambassador, gleaned from his dispatches much evidence to support his anti-refugee petition, Steinhardt became, a staunch supporter of Long, in his 1940 campaign to establish a rigid screening procedure. He seemed anxious to adapt himself to the official anti-refugee petition of the State Department in the early phase and there was not a hint of his involvement in the Zionist movement in the 1920s.

In 1941 it was clear that Steinhardt went further than other State Department officials in his hostility to refugee advocates. When it was apparent that some consuls were refusing visas because of their distaste for Jews. Steinhardt nevertheless insisted that consuls rightfully had the final word. During the bitter dispute with the PACPR over the Department's administration of visa regulations, Long used a Steinhardt dispatch of October 1940 from Moscow, detailing with devastating effect the dangers of a more liberal visa list procedure. He left the dispatch with Roosevelt who was so impressed with it that when James G. McDonald and Francis Biddle appeared before him shortly thereafter to press for liberalization, they had no effective retort. Steinhardt lent strong support to Long's 'close relatives' ruling in June 1941, and buttressed Long's already strong anti-Semitic predilections by articulating his own prejudices against 'eastern' Jews. Long was so impressed with Steinhardt's slurs against 'eastern' Jews, that he recalled them in his diary :

Steinhardt is an able man and has decisiveness and courage. He took a definite stand on immigration in large numbers from Russia and Poland of the Eastern Europeans whom he characterizes as entirely unfit to become citizens of this country. He says they are lawless, scheming, defiant – and in many ways inassimilable. He said the general type of intending immigrant was just the same criminal Jews who crowd our police dockets in New York and with whom he is acquainted and whom he feels are never to become moderately decent American citizens. (69)

Feingold continues :

In January 1942 Steinhardt was transferred from Moscow to Ankara, a post that had attached to it some tradition for being filled by a Jew. The transfer seems also to have spurred a remarkable change, in Steinhardt's position on refugees and rescue...

...In April 1943 he, was instrumental in getting Turkey to accept approximately 30,000 Balkan Jews, including many from Rumania, for

⁶⁹ Feingold, op. cit.. pp. 285-286.

transit to Palestine... (70)

Although Feingold, a Zionist, takes a more charitable view, it seems clear that the change of heart occurred when the destination of the refugees was Palestine and not the United States.

Indeed Feingold notes that Steinhardt said 'his usefulness would be compromised should his link and sympathy to the Zionist cause become known' and 'In the State Department he was known as a staunch restrictionist while the Zionists considered him sympathetic to their cause.' (71)

While Feingold regards the two roles as contradictory, in fact resettlement of Jewish refugees in America would have been contrary to Steinhardt's Zionist principles, but getting them to Palestine was very much in accord with those principles.

Thus Steinhardt's Zionism was quite as genuine and consistent as his anti-Semitism.

7.3 Sweden

The Scandinavian countries have come out of the Holocaust with a much better reputation for humanity and compassion than the other European countries, Britain or America. But how many know that this too involved surmounting the active opposition of Zionist leaders ?

According to Rabbi Moshe Shonfeld :

'In 1939, with the intensification of persecution against German Jewry, the Swedish Parliament passed a law which permitted entry to tens of thousands of German Jews. The upshot of this decision would be their rescue from the certain death that would result if they had otherwise been sent east. The Swedish Parliament thus displayed an outstanding humanitarian approach. But then something happened which dumbfounded the Gentiles, resulting in weakening the hand of those who were true friends of the Jewish people.

Dr. Ehrenpreis, the 'Chief Rabbi' of Sweden (since 1914), together with the leader of the Jewish community in Stockholm, turned to the Swedish Government with the request that it not carry out the aforementioned decision of Parliament, using the excuse that the settling, even temporarily, of 10,000 additional Jews in Sweden could arouse a Jewish problem in this land that had never experienced anti-Semitism because of the small number of its Jewish citizens. The efforts of those two wicked community leaders succeeded in their goal and the Swedish Government voided its plan to carry out its own Parliament's law. But when, four years later, all of Danish Jewry was smuggled, overnight, into Sweden, Ehrenpreis did not succeed in thwarting that wonderful rescue effort, since it came to him as a surprise too.

Here it is appropriate to point out that the fear of anti-Semitism served only as an excuse for Ehrenpreis, enabling him to convince the head of the Stockholm Jewish community to join in his criminal plan. But the true motivation of this Jewish veteran Zionist was outstandingly and typically

⁷⁰ Ibid., pp. 286-287.

⁷¹ Ibid., p. 287.

Zionist, fitting in with the principle that even if death threatens the Jews, one should not find for them refuge outside of Eretz Yisroel. This principle also guided the British Zionists in 1942 in killing the proposed resolution which was virtually assured of being accepted, whereby Jewish refugees would be absorbed temporarily in areas under British protection... Chapter 5. Dr Ehrenpreis was shrewd enough to realize that in the event that his intention would be revealed, he would be unable to win support either in the Stockholm Jewish community or the Swedish government. He therefore chose to hide behind the selfish claim and seeming concern for the security of Swedish Jewry. Who else but Yitzchak Greenbaum, who served as Chairman of the Jewish Agency's 'rescue committee' in Jerusalem (the wolf in the role of the shepherd), could fathom the mind of Dr Ehrenpreis? He therefore strongly urged him to join the 'rescue committee' in Sweden, until, in 1944, Ehrenpreis acceded to Greenbaum's request.' (72)

On 18 January, 1945 the Swedish Parliament discussed whether Sweden had done enough about rescue during the war and before it. The official record shows a Government member, Moller, arguing that 'the Swedish government was no less generous than the Jewish community in Stockholm', while an opposition member, Kanut Peterssons replies :

'I do not deny this. On the contrary, the fact is well known to me that certain factions amongst the Jews here were not the least interested in encouraging acceptance of Jewish refugees, but I ask only to answer what I have already mentioned, when we took up these problems. It appears to me that the policy of handling refugees by the Swedish government does not have to be decided from such a point of view, but rather from protection and concern for our tradition of culture and humanitarianism and in accordance with our Meeting for justice.'

The government member then accepts this judgment and asks only that 'the blame be divided' and that 'we must note all the circumstances that influenced the policy'. (73)

This seems a fair analysis of the situation in all the countries that did not do enough to assist the victims of Nazi persecution, and that have been held up as examples by Zionists, to prove that Jews cannot rely on humanitarian concern from others, and need the protection of a State of their own.

The truth is that these countries are guilty. They are guilty of accepting Zionist advice instead of following their own 'tradition of culture and humanitarianism' and their own 'feeling for justice'.

It is no excuse for the American Government that it had the support of the Zionist Steinhardt, or for the British Government, that it had the support of British Zionists, Sweden is quite right to reject this excuse.

But for Zionists to turn around and blame these countries, for policies urged on them by Zionism, is truly sickening. And for Jews who suffered from the 'closed doors' of the 1930s and 1940s to imagine that they are 'protected' or 'insured' by a State that is even now working hard to drive Soviet and Iranian Jews from their homelands is truly stupid.

⁷² Shonfeld, op. cit., pp. 110-111.

⁷³ Ibid., p. 113.

Meanwhile, Dr. Mordechai Ehrenpreis, rightly continues to be regarded as one of the heroes of Zionism and one of the builders of the State of Israel today.

This friend and confidant of Herzl, participant in the first Zionist Congress, was indeed a Zionist hero, commemorated in special supplements to various Zionist periodicals. He was famous for having decreed, when Chief Rabbi of Bulgaria, that anyone who refused to donate to Zionist causes would be forbidden to have his sons circumcised.

He was a Zionist hero - and a vicious anti-Semite.

7.4 Selectivity

Even as regards Palestine, where despite popular myth, very substantial Jewish immigration was permitted by the British authorities, the Zionist aim, was for selective. Immigration, to build a Jewish State, not rescue of Jewish refugees. Thus, on February 1, 1940, Henry Montor, Executive Vice-President of the United Jewish Appeal, writes to Rabbi Baruch E. Rabinowitz of the congregation B'nai Abraham in Hagerstown, Maryland :

What Palestine needs today are young people who have an understanding of what the Jewish National Home is meant to be and whose energies and resources of talent are such as to create the possibilities for additional large immigration.

There could be no more deadly ammunition provided to the enemies of Zionism, whether they be in the ranks of the British Government or the Arabs, or even in the ranks of the Jewish people, if Palestine were to be flooded with very old people or with undesirables who would make impossible the conditions of life in Palestine and destroy the prospect of creating such economic circumstances as would insure a continuity of immigration...

Interestingly, this letter admits that :

No reasonable person has even said that Palestine could hold all the millions of Jews who need its shelter, even if legal and unregistered immigration combined were to make feasible the entry of all these millions of Jews... (74)

This Zionist tradition of selective immigration was firmly established long before the war, and in full knowledge of what, it meant for those not 'selected'. Thus Chaim Weizmann, first President of Israel, said at the Twentieth Zionist Congress in 1937 :

'...the hopes of six million Jews are centered on emigration... I was asked, 'But can you bring six million Jews to Palestine?' I replied, 'No'... In the depth of the Jewish tragedy – I want to save two million of youth... The old ones will pass, they will bear their fate or they will not. They are dust, economic and moral dust in a cruel world... Only a remnant shall survive... we have to accept it.'

⁷⁴ Ibid., pp. 93-94.

It follows that Zionist efforts to discourage havens outside Palestine, and even temporary havens in Palestine, were done in the knowledge that most of the Jews who needed refuge could not have gone there even if they had preferred to (which they did not), and if the British had let them. The doors were closed elsewhere not to divert actual emigration to Palestine, but solely in a coldly calculated move to increase the future pressure for a Jewish State in Palestine. It is difficult to imagine anything more callous.

This callous tradition explains both Kastner's actions and also the defense of those actions by the Supreme Court of Israel. Indeed, it was explicitly appealed to by the Attorney General of Israel, Chaim Cohen, in his defense of Kastner :

'He (Kastner) was entitled to make a deal with the Nazis for the saving of a few hundred and entitled not to warn the millions. In fact if that's how he saw it, rightly or wrongly, that was his duty...

If you don't like it, if it doesn't coincide with your own philosophy, you may criticize. Kastner and say his policy was a mistaken one. But what does all this have to do with collaboration?... It has always been our Zionist tradition to select the few out of many in arranging the immigration to Palestine... Are we therefore to be called traitors ...?

Kastner did nothing more and nothing less than was done by us in rescuing the Jews and bringing them to Palestine... You are allowed, - in fact it is your duty - to risk losing the many in order to save the few.

(Cohen continued explaining that this attitude had always been the system of the Zionist institutions, who gave emigration certificates to Palestine only to a few of the masses who wanted to emigrate) (75)

The answer to Chaim Cohen's question is 'YES!' - for continuing to 'select the few out of many in arranging the Immigration to Palestine', during the Holocaust, when the problem was how to get the many to any haven that would have them - Zionists are 'therefore to be called traitors'.

It was not a great jump from Weizmann's description of the masses of European Jews as 'economic and moral dust in a cruel world', to the Supreme Court of Israel's majority Judgment that Kastner was entitled to mislead the Hungarian Jews about Auschwitz because :

The Hungarian Jews was a branch which long ago dried up on the tree.

And :

This was a big Jewish community in Hungary without any ideological Jewish backbone'. (i.e. not much Zionism). (76)

As Ben Hecht remarks, it was not a much greater jump from there to Dr. Goebbels diary entry in 1943 :

In our Nazi attitude, toward the Jews, there must be no squeamish sentimentalism.

⁷⁵ Hecht, op. cit., pp. 194-195.

⁷⁶ Ibid., p. 271.

Indeed, as Ben Hecht also remarks, the sneer and belittlement of Dr. Goebbels who wrote : **'The Jews deserve the catastrophe that has now overtaken them'**, seems to echo in the voice of the Attorney General of the State of Israel who says :

For those and millions of Jews like them there came true the old curse. 'And, lo, they were meant to be taken like sheep for slaughter, for killing, for destruction, for crushing and shame.' There was no spirit in them. The Jewish masses in Warsaw were in the same condition.

(Court records, CC124/53 Jerusalem District Court) (77)

This basically Nazi philosophy, displayed here towards Jews instead of Arabs helps explain how the concept of saving the few at the expense of the many led Zionists to become the most suitable collaborators for the Nazis in administering the Jewish Councils or Judenrat in the ghettos, as will be described later.

Hersz Bernblat, deputy chief of the Bedzin Ghetto police, was unlike Kastner, actually tried under Israel's 'Nazis and Nazi Collaborators (Punishment) Law 5710/1950' and sentenced to five years imprisonment for having handed over children from the Ghetto's orphan home to the Nazis for extermination.

The Supreme Court of Israel unanimously quashed the sentence, in a judgment that indirectly exonerated the Jewish Councils in general, precisely on the grounds that they were trying to save some by sacrificing others (as indeed all collaborators always are - trying to save themselves).

Rabbi Shonfeld quotes Hertzberg, a witness in the Bernblat trial, and goes on to draw some interesting conclusions :

'The *Judenrat* served as an instrument for keeping things calm. It lulled both the youth and the adults into a false sense of security, so that they shouldn't think about rescue activities. Unfortunately, most of the members of the *Judenrat* were Zionists. They thought that by collaborating with the Germans, they were doing a good thing. By preparing the lists of Jews who were sent to their death they thought that they were saving other Jews. The heads of the Judenrat suffered from a superiority complex, thinking that they were doing an historic thing in order to redeem the nation – and the entire Jewish population feared them.' (*Ha'aretz*, 24 September, 1963)

Rabbi Shonfeld continues :

On the same subject, it is fitting to quote the words of the lawyer, Shmuel Tamir, in his concluding speech in the Kastner trial in order to prove that human nature is the same the world over. Whether in Poland, Hungary, the United States or Eretz Israel, the Zionists take one line of action : their ancient dream materialized : seizing the *Kehillos* (communities), even within the framework of the *Judenrat*, served as the precedent to the government of an independent state.

Tamir explains :

⁷⁷ Ibid., p. 149.

At that time, a very special process was occurring among Hungarian Jewry. The Zionist minority, which was a small minority within the Hungarian Jewry, was ruling over all of the Jews. The assimilated majority, called 'Neologists', and the religious, called 'Orthodox', retreated and gave way to the Zionists. Brand confirms this in his memorandum as does Freudiger in his testimony.

Among the Zionists themselves, after having received money from Eretz Israel through Kastner's group, 'I Chud', the minority governed. According to the testimony of Kraus, this group constituted less than a quarter of the Zionist movement, resulting in a situation that was paradoxical: The minority among the Zionists ruled over Hungarian Zionism, therefore controlling all of Hungarian Jewry. This minority headed by Kastner, controlled the internal lives of one million people. When the Germans searched for collaborators among the Zionists, they immediately met Kastner and his colleagues; for they, too, were doing all that they could to make contact with the Germans. ⁽⁷⁸⁾

7.5 Australia

We don't have to look to distant Britain, America or Sweden for evidence of this Zionist callousness and treachery in closing the doors.

The same thing was happening right here in Australia where the Zionist leadership violently opposed proposals for a Jewish settlement in the Kimberleys, agreed to by the Western Australian Government, or for an alternative in Tasmania proposed by the Tasmanian Government. This is a major topic in itself, which should be dealt with in separate evidence. ⁽⁷⁹⁾

In the meantime, we don't need JAZA to give evidence about it. Ask the heroic fighters against anti-Semitism from the VJBD to tell the story. They know.

⁷⁸ Shonfeld, op. cit., pp. 88-89.

⁷⁹ See I. Steinberg, *Australia the Unpromised Land: In Search of a Home*, London, 1948. See also Noel Hawken's column in the Melbourne *Herald*, 17 Jan 1979.

8. A DELIBERATE, CONSISTENT AND SUCCESSFUL POLICY

It needs to be clearly understood that collaboration between Nazis and Zionists was not accidental or expedient. It was not a matter of isolated individual actions.

We are showing how it developed step by step and how it flowed logically from shared aims. They were not 'strange bedfellows', and collaboration between Nazis and Zionists was not 'paradoxical' it was a logical development from the symbiotic relationship with anti-Semitism that has always existed since the first days of Zionism.

The Nazis wanted to get the Jews out of Europe. The Zionists wanted to get them into Palestine. It was as simple as that. These shared aims at first resulted in the 'non-criminal cooperation' described by Hannah Arendt, which involved selecting Jews for survival. Later,

'It was this fundamental error in judgment that fundamentally led to a situation in which the non-selected majority of Jews inevitably found themselves confronted with two enemies - the Nazi authorities and the Jewish authorities. (80)

The Nazis only adopted a 'final solution' of extermination when all other means of getting Jews out of Europe proved unsuccessful. Zionists only collaborated with this when all other means of getting Jews to Palestine proved unsuccessful - when the Jews they wanted for Palestine looked like being murdered along with the rest.

The 'selective' policies that ultimately led some Zionist leaders like Kastner into directly assisting the Nazi butchers to murder Jews, were not adopted on the spur of the moment, but flowed logically from deliberate policy decisions taken before the Second World War began.

The 'closed door' which sealed the fate of hundreds of thousands of Jews and enabled the Nazis to murder them was not the attitude of individual Zionists in various countries, but a conscious policy decision adopted by the Zionist leadership.

8.1 Choosing Between the Jews and the Jewish State

That policy is expressed most clearly in a letter from Israel's first Prime Minister, David Ben Gurion, to the Zionist Executive on 7 December, 1938 :

The Jewish problem now is not what it used to be. The fate of Jews in Germany is not an end but a beginning. Other anti-Semitic states will learn from Hitler. Millions of Jews face annihilation, the refugee problem has assumed world-wide proportions, and urgency. Britain is trying to separate the issue of the refugees from that of Palestine. It is assisted by anti-Zionist Jews. The dimensions of the refugee problem demand an immediate,

⁸⁰ Hannah Arendt, *Eichmann in Jerusalem*, pp. 59-61.

territorial solution ; if Palestine will not absorb them another territory will. Zionism is endangered. All other territorial solutions, certain to fail, will demand enormous sums of money. If Jews will have to choose between the refugees, saving Jews from concentration camps, and assisting a national museum in Palestine, mercy will have the upper hand and the whole energy of the people will be channeled into saving Jews from various countries. Zionism will be struck off the agenda not only in world public opinion, in Britain and the United States, but elsewhere in Jewish public opinion. If we allow a separation between the refugee problem and the Palestine problem, we are risking the existence of Zionism.

As the Israeli Socialist Organization *Matzpen* commented on this letter :

Saving Jewish lives from Hitler is considered by Ben Gurion a potential threat to Zionism unless the Jews thus saved are bought to Palestine. When Zionism had to choose between the Jews and the Jewish state, it unhesitatingly preferred the latter. ⁽⁸¹⁾

Quite clearly, Ben Gurion's concern is not that Jewish refugees will be unable to find sanctuary, because there was no Jewish State, but precisely that they might, in which case there never would be a Jewish State.

If Palestine, will not absorb them, another territory will. Zionism is endangered (Ben Gurion)

All other 'territorial solutions' refers to proposals for Jewish settlements in places like Dominica and the Kimberleys, and 'certain to fail' means simply that they would inevitably be assimilated by the surrounding population without becoming the basis for an independent Jewish State, not that the settlers would starve to death.

If 'mercy will have the upper hand and the whole energy of the people will be channeled into saving Jews from various countries' then 'Zionism will be struck off the agenda'.

Ben Gurion was quite correct in saying : 'If we allow a separation between the refugee problem and the Palestine problem we are risking the existence of Zionism.' If the Jewish refugees had been resettled elsewhere, and especially if Zionists had accepted this, then the last chance for a Jewish State would have been gone.

As it was, by tightly linking the refugee question with Palestine, the whole energy which should have been directed into rescue was diverted into demands for unrestricted immigration to, and a Jewish state in, Palestine, which for the first time won the support of a majority of Jews, and later of the United Nations. Without that link with the Holocaust refugees, this would never have been possible, and there would have been no such link if Zionists had accepted resettlement elsewhere.

This was not just some abstract idea. From it logically flowed, the efforts to sabotage the entry of refugees to Britain, America, Sweden, Australia etc.

The first practical implementation of this policy was at the Evian Conference

⁸¹ Arie Bober (Ed.), *The Other Israel: The Radical Case Against Zionism*, Anchor Books, New York, 1972, p. 171.

of July 1938, when 31 countries met to discuss the problem of absorbing refugees from Nazi Germany.

The Zionists demanded, as the only possible solution, immediate admission of 1.2 million Jews to Palestine (whose total population then was a little over half that). This completely impossible demand let other countries off the hook so that only Dominica made a definite concrete offer - to accept 100,000 refugees.

As Christopher Sykes later commented in his book *Cross Roads to Israel* :

From the start they regarded the whole enterprise with hostile indifference. Zionist writers scarcely mention it the fact is that what was attempted at Evian was in no sense congenial to the spirit of Zionism. The reason is not obscure. If the thirty-one nations had done their duty and shown hospitality to those in dire need then the pressure on the National Home and the heightened enthusiasm of Zionism within Palestine, would both have been relaxed and stopped this was the last thing that the Zionist leaders wished for. As things stood after Evian the outlook for the Jews was black throughout the world (except to quote Norman Bentwich again) for the bright spot of Palestine and the speck of Dominica.' The Zionist leaders preferred that it should remain that way. Even in the most terrible days ahead they made no secret of the fact, even when talking to Gentiles that they did not want Jewish settlements outside Palestine to be successful. They did not want Santo Domingo to become more than a speck. They wanted a Jewish Palestine and the Dominican Republic could never be that.

This outlook and conception of policy, typical of the increasing narrowness of Zionist thinking, may seem horrifyingly party-minded and harsh. It was all that undoubtedly, but it was something more besides. It was not compassionless. The Zionists, both the more large-minded and the most narrow, had a constructive aim. The Zionists wanted to do something more for Jews than merely help them to escape danger. They wanted to help them overcome their humiliation. They wanted to make them the object of respect not the object of pity. They wanted to enable them to stop being pathetic, and they conceived that there was only one way to do this, to make them come to Palestine and undertake a fully national life. Since the early thirties there had been much trouble between Jews and the Palestine authorities over illegal immigration, and the Jews had raised the defense, and were to continue to do so, that Palestine was the only country where they could go and be welcome. Before Evian the truth of this Zionist assertion was doubtful, but after Evian it was less so, and the latter state of affairs suited the Zionist leadership. If their policy entailed suffering then that was the price that had to be paid for the rescue of the Jewish soul.

It is hard, perhaps impossible, to find a parallel in history to this particular Zionist idea which was at the heart of the Zionist accomplishment during the ten years after 1938. That such was the basic Zionist idea is not a matter of opinion but a fact abundantly provable by evidence. It was an idea in whose reality people outside could not usually believe at first, and which often shocked them when they recognized its existence. There can be no doubt that there again one is confronted with an idea which even if judged as morally wrong, is such, as could only be conceived by a great people. As time went on it grew rather than diminished in strength. It formed another cross-

roads.' (82)

For Zionism, it was another cross roads to the State of Israel for millions of Jews, it was a cross roads to extermination, as the idea grew in strength in the way we have documented.

The logic behind this Zionist policy could not be put more sympathetically than it is by Christopher Sykes. He stresses that the Zionists weren't compassionless and weren't just out to deny refuge to Jewish victims of Nazism. They had a constructive aim - a Jewish State.

We can therefore believe him when he says 'That such was the basic Zionist idea is not a matter of opinion, but a fact abundantly provable by evidence'.

There seems no reason to doubt that :

If the thirty-one nations had done their duty and shown hospitality to those in dire need then the pressure on the national home and the heightened enthusiasm of Zionism with in Palestine would both have been relaxed. Equally, if they had done their duty, a large part of the Holocaust could have been avoided. Nevertheless, 'This was the last thing that the Zionist leaders wished for.'

Equally, if they had done their duty, a large part of the Holocaust could have been avoided. Nevertheless, 'This was the last thing that the Zionist leaders wished for.'

It is difficult to imagine what more effective action Zionists could have taken to assist Nazis to murder Jews. Being Jewish, they were not eligible for membership of the SS, but they made a contribution which SS members could not make, in keeping the doors closed.

For those of us who don't think Jews are 'pathetic'- or the need to 'undertake a fully national life,' for those of us who don't think 'the Jewish soul' needed rescuing, the Zionist accomplishment during the ten years after 1938 'In building their Jewish State on the ruins of a European Jewry whose rescue was sabotaged, will not be seen as an idea 'conceived by a great people', but as the idea of vicious enemies of all people.

This basic Zionist idea is indeed 'one in whose reality people outside could not usually believe at first, and which often shocked them when they recognized its existence'.

It is not surprising that many people, Jewish or not, do not believe, or are shocked by, 3CR programs about the consequence of this basic Zionist idea, when 'everyone knows' a very different story about heroic self-sacrificing Zionist rescue efforts, and how the Jews would have been saved if only there had been a Jewish State.

Nevertheless, the facts are clear.

8.2 The Jewish Agency Murders Jewish Refugees

If there is any remaining doubt that Zionists were prepared to collaborate with Nazism, and that they always put their aim for a Jewish state before the survival of the Jews, let us remember that it is on the public record that the Zionist

⁸² Sykes, op. cit., pp. 199-201.

'Haganah', the 'Jewish defense force', not only joined the Gestapo in organizing forced emigration of Jews from Germany to Palestine, but also did its share of directly murdering Jews, when this proved unsuccessful.

The VJBD has complained about a Palestine Speaks broadcast on 27 August 1978 which said 'Many people of Jewish faith or background have also died at the hands of Zionist terrorist over the years.'

Let us therefore examine the case of the S.S. Patria, full of Jewish refugees from Hitler, which was blown up on November 25, 1940 supposedly in a mass suicide protest against the British decision to transfer them to Mauritius instead of admitting them to Palestine.

On the 18th anniversary of their deaths, the Zionist leader Sharett together with Ben Gurion declared that they were martyrs to the cause and admitted complicity saying 'It is sometimes necessary to sacrifice a few in order to save the many".⁽⁸³⁾

But by that time the memoirs of Herzl Rosenbloom, a member of the central Zionist leadership, the so-called 'Small Actions Committee', were being published :

A session of the Small Actions Committee, of which I was a member, met in Jerusalem. At the table opposite me sat the commander of the Patria project, A. Golamb, Haganah spokesman in the Zionist shadow cabinet. When my turn came to speak, I rose and told the meeting openly everything I thought about this act ; namely, that this was not a blow against England, but an irresponsible, aimless mass-murder of Jews who had been saved from the European catastrophe. I added that if any of us believed that we had to fight the British by committing hara-kiri, let him commit hara-kiri, for hara-kiri is suicide and not an act of murder. I stated plainly that this road was open to Mr. Golamb, but that he could not sacrifice other Jews for his policy without first asking them, and particularly the children among them – a crime which I openly protested. At this point Mr. Golamb jumped up and attacked me with his fists. But the people next to him at the table held him back. I must add that Mr. Golamb's fists which I will never forget, did not annoy me as much as the servility of all the committee members, none of whom supported me.⁽⁸⁴⁾

As Rabbi Shonfeld comments, this incident:

'Served on a small scale as a tragic symbol of what the Zionists did to tens of thousands, in accordance with their rule that says: the merit to be saved belongs to a Jew only when in Eretz Israel, and if that is impossible, it is better that his death and great suffering be joined to the building of the future state.'⁽⁸⁵⁾

8.3 Continuing Zionist Threats to Jews

But the foundation of the State of Israel by no means marked the end of

⁸³ Shonfeld, op. cit. p.62. Even if, as is sometimes claimed the bombs were only meant to scuttle the ship, the subsequent justifications for the crime are an admission of criminality.

⁸⁴ Ibid., p. 62.

⁸⁵ Ibid., p. 63.

murderous Zionist attacks on innocent Jews, since there was still a need to promote immigration.

Thus there were a whole series of Synagogue bombings, distribution of anti-Semitic leaflets and so on by Zionist agents in Iraq in the early 1950's. The Iraqi incidents are described in the Israeli weekly *Haolam Hazeh* of 20 April and 1 June 1966 under the headline 'Bombs Against Jews'.

Prominent Zionist leaders have openly called for Zionist agents to be sent to Jewish communities outside Israel to commit anti-Semitic outrages, ⁽⁸⁶⁾ so we can say that this is a continuing tradition of Zionism. It stems from the basic anti-Semitic philosophy of Zionism which views diaspora Jews as a caricature of the normal, natural human, which feels a tiny bit of joy at outbreaks of swastika painting, which sees a little bit of anti-Semitism as good for keeping Jewish communities together, and so on.

The most disastrous consequences have been for European Jews in the Holocaust, and the next worst sufferers from Zionist promotion of anti-Semitism were the Arab Jews who were uprooted after the establishment of the State of Israel. Compared to these, and to the Jews of the Soviet Union and Iran, who are directly threatened by Zionist campaigns to 'save' them from remaining in their own countries, Australian Jews don't have much to worry about.

Nevertheless, one can only feel concerned about the continuing Zionist efforts to segregate Australian Jews into a completely closed off community, kept 'on ice' for hopeful future emigration to Israel.

This present Zionist campaign to have Australian Jews officially designated as resident aliens by an Australian Government authority, and recognized as representatives of a foreign state with interests hostile to freedom of speech in Australia, does pose a definite threat to the status of Australian Jews, just as real, even though less severe than other Zionist threats to Jewish communities they have uprooted.

If Australian Jews are to be identified with the State of Israel, in the way demanded by the VJBD, who knows what future situations could arise in another Great Depression, with the oil shortage, and a possible third world war starting in the Middle East? The State of Israel and its vicarious citizens could find themselves as unpopular tomorrow as they were popular yesterday. The Zionist dream of 'ingathering the exiles' from places like North America and Australia could then become as much a reality as it has already for Jews less firmly integrated into other societies.

8.4 A Successful Policy

If all these opinions, facts and documents seem just too incredible, let us remember that the 'basic Zionist idea' inscribed by Christopher Sykes was, however criminal, eminently successful. If it had not been followed through with ruthless consistency, there would be no State of Israel, and no Zionist dominated Jewish communities supporting it today.

It is no small achievement to have established a Jewish State in an Arab land, and to have done so amid world wide enthusiasm that has taken some 30 years to start wearing off. Even after the Holocaust, it was touch and go whether the State of Israel would be established or not. Certainly without the Holocaust no amount

⁸⁶ See, for example, Alfred Lilienthal, *What price Israel?* Henry Regnery, Chicago, 1953, p. 207.

of Zionist ravings about ancient biblical claims could have achieved this feat.

If Zionism had not adopted Ben Gurion's policy of tightly linking the rescue of Jews to the future of Palestine, then we don't know how many could have been saved from extermination. It would certainly have been a large number, and perhaps a majority, if it had tipped the balance in Allied policy and Nazi policy. But very likely a large number would still have been massacred. We just don't know.

But we do know, with complete certainty, that if Zionism had not adopted Ben Gurion's policy then it would have been endangered exactly as he said. There would have been no burning 'Palestine Question' at the end of the war, as the proposed solution to the problem of hundreds of thousands of Jewish refugees in displaced persons camps with nowhere to go (thanks to continuing Zionist efforts to close the doors of America, Australia, etc).

There would have been no link between the Palestine question and the Holocaust, and there would be no State of Israel today. Even the Zionist organization itself only dared to formally adopt the aim of an exclusive 'Jewish State' in 1943 and certainly nobody else would have gone along with this outrageous demand, which until then Zionists themselves had always indignantly denied was their real aim.

The ultimate Zionist aim has always been and still is, to 'ingather the exiles' by uprooting all communities of the Jewish diaspora and transferring them to a Greater Israel 'from the Nile to the Euphrates'. Even after the holocaust and the uprooting of Jewish communities in the Arab world, only a small minority of Jews have gone to live in Palestine.

Without the Holocaust, and without Ben Gurion's policy, there would have only been a few tens of thousands as there were up to the 1930's, or at most a few hundred thousand. The mass of Jews in Europe and in the Arab world would have shown as little interest in going to live in Palestine as those in Australia and the USA have shown. There would certainly not have been enough to expel the Arab majority and form a Jewish State.

Perhaps Zionism could have succeeded well enough without Rudolf Kastner's collaboration in the extermination of Hungarian Jewry. But the policies of Greenbaum and company, which led Kastner into collaboration, were the only policies that could have led to a Jewish State. And the defense and cover up of this crime is the only approach that can prevent a complete collapse of Jewish support for Zionism both in Israel and abroad.

8.5 Honorable Human Behavior and the State of Israel

Most Zionists today, as also then, know nothing about any of these matters, just as they know very little about what Zionism has done to the Palestinian Arabs. If they did know very few would remain Zionists. Most Nazis knew little or nothing about extermination camps.

Only a very hard core would believe that the 'atrocities stories' are true, and that 'historic necessity' makes them justifiable. Most Zionists, like most Nazis, prefer to just shut their eyes.

But not all can shut their eyes.

In writing *Perfidy* to expose the Israeli Government's support and defense of Kastner, the extreme Revisionist Zionist Ben Hecht, whose whole book says not one sympathetic word about the Arabs, unburdened himself saying :

'Such a book was not easy for me to write. For the heart of a Jew must be filled with astonishment as well as outrage... that a brother should be so perfidious' (87)

In reviewing the manuscript for the Israeli newspaper *Yediot Aharanot* of 4 April, 1959, Elie Wiesel quotes Ben Hecht as saying 'the best known, most respected leaders of Zionism - were actually criminals.' Wiesel adds :

'Somehow my typewriter refuses to write about Weizmann and about the heads of the Jewish Agency, who helped the Germans to destroy European Jewry.' (88)

Determined Zionists can continue to shut their eyes and believe that nothing dirty or vicious was done either to Jews or Arabs to establish the State of Israel. But a more widespread reaction is that quoted in *Yediot Aharanot* from a New York reader of *Perfidy*: 'I am totally shocked. If even a small part of what is stated in this book is correct, I don't know how we can continue to live peacefully. Everything I believed in, everything I held sacred, has been placed in question. We are all alarmed not daring to believe. (Letter from A. Golan, 8 Teves, 5722) (89)

It is this reaction that the VJBD wants to prevent by declaring itself 'offended' instead of attempting to answer the accusations.

Hard core Zionists can continue to believe that whatever was done was justified by the need for the Zionist State, and whatever lies are told to suppress the truth about what was done are justified by the need to protect that State.

After all, they can say : Look at the Gypsies. They were massacred just like the Jews, although no Gypsy Agency collaborated in sealing their doom. Today there is no Gypsy state and the remnants of the Gypsies have virtually disappeared through assimilation with other peoples. They are hardly even remembered.

But any Zionist with open eyes and a spark of decency would have to agree with Ben Hecht's conclusion : 'Honorable human behavior would have been of deeper worth to the world than a dozen States of Israel.' (90)

⁸⁷ Hecht, op. cit., p. vi.

⁸⁸ Shonfeld, op. cit. pp. 105-106.

⁸⁹ Ibid., p. 103.

⁹⁰ Hecht, op. cit., p. 193.

9. BETRAYAL IN THE GHETTOS

Zionists can react to 3CR broadcasts about these facts however they like. They can get angry, they can give up Zionism or they can just not listen. The one thing they cannot be permitted to do is to prevent other people from listening.

Having explained the Kastner case and its background, there seems little need to go into other individual cases in similar detail.

We will not tell the full story of Rumkowski, a Zionist leader in Lodz who, under Nazi auspices beat Weizmann and Ben Gurion to it, by trying to establish an autonomous Jewish State with himself as King, in the Kafkaesque setting of a large concentration of individuals destined for the furnaces. Or the stories of Merin, Moldetsky, Barash etc., and how these Zionists served the Nazis as leaders of the *Judenrat*.

Apart from Kastner, only one other name is mentioned in the list of complaints from the Victorian Jewish Board of Deputies, (VJBD) so we will take him as the other Nazi collaborator closest to the VJBD's heart.

9.1 Jakob Gens

Yes, after pointing out that the international Zionist movement failed to help the beleaguered ghetto fighters, *Palestine Speaks* did go on to say :

'...Many prominent European Zionists helped to sabotage Jewish resistance. Revisionist Zionist Jakob Gens, betrayed well known resistance leader Itzhak Wittenberg to the Nazis.'

It is not clear what part of this statement the VJBD is objecting to, or why it has stopped quoting this broadcast at the name of Jakob Gens and left out the other Zionists who collaborated with the Nazis named immediately after him.

But the facts are clear, Jakob Gens was prominent. He was a revisionist Zionist. He did betray Itzhak Wittenberg, who was a well known resistance leader.

For details see *Jewish Resistance in Nazi-Occupied Eastern Europe* by Reuben Ainsztein. ⁽⁹¹⁾ This book also tells about the other side of the coin from collaboration by a minority – extensive and heroic resistance against incredible odds. Jakob Gens was a Revisionist Zionist originally from Kovno. A member of the Revisionist para-military force, the *Brit Hakhayil*, he fought alongside other Lithuanian fascists on the side of the Axis against the Soviet occupation of Lithuania.

Along with many other Revisionists, Gens joined the Jewish Police and became its Deputy Commander in the Vilna ghetto, originally serving under fellow Revisionist Muszkat, a lawyer from Warsaw. He later became Chief of Police and then dictator of the whole Ghetto, appointing Salek Desler, another Revisionist, as his police chief.

⁹¹ Reuben Ainsztein, *Jewish Resistance in Nazi Occupied Eastern Europe*, Paul Elek, London, 1974, pp. 486-518.

It is notorious that the Revisionists provided a comparatively large number of the Jewish police and this is attributed both to their fascist outlook and their paramilitary training in the organizations commanded by Menachem Begin – the *Brit Hakhayil* and the *Betar*.

Known as 'blue shirts' in a similar way to the other fascists' 'black shirts' and 'brown shirts', these organizations enjoyed the distinction of being the only political organizations allowed to wear uniform and party insignia in Nazi Germany, apart from the Nazis themselves. We have our very own *Betar* in Australia, which, wearing the same 'blue shirt' uniform, provoked 'violent incidents that were used to cancel visas for a PLO delegation to avoid 'disturbances.'

The Jewish police were notorious as a corrupt instrument of Nazi oppression even worse than the *Judenrat* themselves. One survey showed that Zionists made up 98 percent of all Jewish police whose party affiliation was known, and Revisionists, a small minority among Zionists as a whole, made up nearly half of these. ⁽⁹²⁾

Gens was known as the worst of the Jewish police chiefs and ghetto dictators. He personally took part in the selection of Jews for extermination. In addition, his were the only Jewish police known to have actually participated in the extermination firing squads, rather than just handing people over for the Nazis to murder them. He was certainly prominent alright !

Not only did Jakob Gens betray Itzhak Wittenberg, the Communist leader of Vilno's United Partisan Organization, but he did so twice. The first time, Gens invited Wittenberg to a secret meeting and then pointed him out to Nazi police. After Wittenberg was freed by the partisans and the Nazis demanded his return, Gens mobilized 400 thugs armed with clubs to comb the ghetto for him. Wittenberg had to surrender to the Nazis because Gens thugs were threatening civil war within the ghetto at the same time that the Nazis were threatening to destroy the whole ghetto if he were not handed over.

Gens betrayals finally led to the Vilno partisans, which were among the best organized in Europe, being defeated with hardly a fight when the ghetto was finally liquidated. Gens himself, like most other collaborators, was finally killed in his turn by the Nazis, despite Dr. Foster's belief that this is an odd way to treat collaborators. Apparently the Nazis had this thing about Jews, whether collaborators or not. The Nazis were very odd people by normal standards, and even by Dr. Foster's standards too.

As Dr. Foster admits, the fact that most European Zionists, whether collaborators or not, were exterminated, like the fact of Zionist participation in resistance activities, 'cannot be unknown to anyone who has concerned himself with the details of the Holocaust.' Indeed it is unlikely to be unknown to anyone who has even heard of the Holocaust, without going into details, since the vast bulk of literature on the subject is Zionist propaganda and stresses these points.

Why then Dr. Foster believes it should be incumbent upon 3CR programs to drive the point home too, is hard to understand. Finally, it is also true that Itzhak Wittenberg was a 'well known' resistance leader. There is a Yiddish folk song commemorating him and there is even a study group named after him in Melbourne.

He will continue to be commemorated on 3CR, and his betrayers will

⁹² Isaiah Trunk, *Judenrat: The Jewish Councils in Eastern Europe Under Nazi Occupation*, Macmillan, New York, 1972.

continue to be accused, whether the Victorian Jewish Board of Deputies likes it or not.

9.2 Most Collaborators Were Zionists

Zionist collaboration with the Nazis in the other ghettos of occupied Europe is a different matter from the Hungarian collaboration, in that the people concerned were not acting as representatives of the Jewish Agency (World Zionist Organization) like Kastner, but as individuals out to save their own necks and make a bit on the side. Also, the Zionist movement as such has only tended to apologize for individual initiatives rather than explicitly endorsing them as with Kastner.

Not all Zionists collaborated and not all collaborators were Zionists.

Nevertheless, the fact that some two thirds of the hated Jewish Councils (*Judenrat*) were Zionists, tells us something about Zionism, remembering that Zionists were only a small minority of European Jewry.

That statistic comes from *Judenrat* by Isiah Trunk,⁽⁹³⁾ a disgusting 660 page well footnoted scholarly apologia for the behavior of these collaborators, apparently produced to counter the general reputation of the *Judenrat* expressed by survivors of their treachery and summed up in the material we quoted from Hannah Arendt.

This work aims to prove that even if the *Judenrat* had not collaborated, just as many would have been killed regardless. The fact that Zionists feel a need to prove something like that, and imagine it exonerates rather than damns them, also tells us something else about Zionism.

9.3 Only the Zionist Parties Collaborated

The only Jewish political parties implicated in collaboration with the *Judenrat* were Zionist parties. Although various 'community leaders' including some religious people as well as outright criminal elements collaborated, no non-Zionist political parties did so. The Jewish Communists certainly did not, and even the Bund, itself a 'Jewish nationalist' party never stooped so low as to collaborate with the Nazis, but honorably organized resistance. The Communists and Bundists were the two largest parties in the ghettos.

In contrast, almost the entire Central Committee of the General Zionist party were members of the *Judenrat*, and every Zionist party furnished its quota of collaborators.

The left-wing Zionists and the extreme right-wing Revisionists were the strongest in organizing resistance, but members of these parties were collaborators as well as other members being resistance fighters.

Generally left-wing Zionists collaborated far less than the centre and right, but they too provided individual collaborators. For example, Abraham Gancwajch, formerly head of Hashomer Hatzair in his native city became a Gestapo agent and head of the notorious 'Thirteenth' or Jewish Gestapo, which was even worse than the regular Jewish Police in the Warsaw ghetto.

⁹³ Ibid.

How did it come about that Zionists were so prominent among the collaborators when they were such a small minority of European Jewry? How did they come to be in positions of community leadership when they had not been before the war?

For answers to these questions we need to go back to the beginning of Nazi-Zionist collaboration.

10 ZIONISM IN GERMANY

Nazism started in Germany and so did Nazi-Zionist collaboration.

Since those like Dr. Foster who 'took the trouble to read the German Zionist press of those years' assures us it is so, we may take their word that the Zionists, like all other Jews, 'strenuously opposed the Nazi Party during its rise to power.' Even without this expert opinion, nobody who has not taken the trouble to read the German Zionist press of those years has ever imagined the contrary.

If Dr. Foster wants Zionist declarations against Nazism recorded as a point in Zionism's favor, then he is welcome to it. Let the record clearly show that the Zionists didn't want Hitler in power any more than Pétain wanted him to conquer France, even though their policies did help him to succeed.

But it is the speed and totality with which Zionism capitulated to Nazism once Hitler had come to power that has shocked observers.

10.1 Opposing the Boycott

No sooner had the first anti-Jewish pogroms been held, than the Zionist Union for Germany, on 21 June 1933, submitted a memorandum to the Nazi Government, proposing that the 'new German state' recognize the Zionist movement as the most suitable Jewish group in the new Germany with which to deal, that Jewish status in Germany thenceforth be regulated on the basis of a group status rather than individual rights and finally, that since emigration would provide a solution to the Jewish question, it should therefore receive government assistance.'

The memorandum held out bait - in the event the Germans cooperated - that the Zionists would try to get the Jews abroad to call off the anti-German boycott.

That description is from *The War against the Jews 1933-45* by Lucy Dawidowicz. ⁽⁹⁴⁾ Her description of Zionist behavior is especially interesting because she strongly disagrees with Dr. Arendt, and denies that there was collaboration.

Despite this specific Zionist offer to call off the boycott in exchange for Nazi recognition of their group as the representative of German Jewry, Dr. Foster claims that rejection of the boycott by the Eighth Zionist Congress was 'attempting to act in solidarity with the persecuted German Jews.' He says 'one may question the political wisdom of their actions: but one cannot doubt their intentions.'

This remarkable conclusion is based on the fact that non-Zionist German Jewish organizations protested against the boycott. According to Dr. Foster 'They did this because, as patriotic Germans they had no wish to see the German economy harmed and because, as Jews, they feared that the boycott would provoke increasingly severe anti-Jewish measures in Germany.'

Dr. Foster's touching belief in the patriotic concern of German Jews for the Nazi economy reveals perhaps more eloquently than anything else he has said, the real depths of his understanding of these questions, and the predicament the Victorian Jewish board of Deputies (VJBD) was in, trying to find an 'expert' who

⁹⁴ Dawidowicz, op. cit. pp. 231-232.

would agree with them.

The plain fact is of course that German Jewish organizations protested against the boycott for the same reason that they publicly urged the Jews to vote 'Yes' in the November 1933, plebiscite to approve Hitler's domestic and foreign policy. The Nazis had a gun at their heads.

According to Lucy Dawidowicz :

Goering, summoned all the leaders of the German Jewish organizations to his office on 26 March and ordered them to tell the Jews abroad to stop the boycott campaign 'otherwise pogrom'. Finally, however, they had to promise, under threat, to contact Jewish organizations abroad and deny the atrocity reports...

(The American Jewish organization realized that these telegrams had been sent under duress.) ⁽⁹⁵⁾

Even if Dr. Foster did not realize this, it is perfectly clear that the Eighth Zionist Congress did - but they preferred the Haavara agreement and other deals with the Nazis, even to the point of supplying Eichmann with intelligence information as part of these deals.

We can question their intentions as well as doubting their wisdom and there seems no obvious reason why 3CR broadcasters should be required to seek permission from any experts such as Foster before doing so.

10.2 Endorsing Nazi Racialist Philosophy

Returning to the Zionist memorandum to the Nazis, Rabbi Joachim Prinz, then one of German Zionism's leading lights, subsequently described this document as 'a statement notable for its pride and dignity.'

As N. Glaser comments in *Some of My Best Friends Are Nazis*, get ready for some pride and dignity *a la* Zionist. Here are some excerpts from that proud and dignified Zionist statement :

'Zionism believes that a rebirth of national life, such as is occurring in German life through adhesion to Christian and national values must also take place in the Jewish national group. For the Jew, too, origin, religion, community of fate, and group consciousness must be of decisive significance in the shaping of his life.

On the foundation of the new state, which has established the principle of race, we wish so to fit our community into the total structure so that for us too, in the sphere assigned to us, fruitful activity for the Fatherland is possible.

Our acknowledgement of Jewish nationality provides for a clear and sincere relationship to the German people and its national and racial realities. We do not wish to falsify these fundamentals because we too are against mixed marriage and are for maintaining the purity of the Jewish group and reject any trespasses of the cultural domain. Rooted-ness in one's own spirituality protects the Jew from becoming the rootless critic of the national foundations of German essence. The national distancing which the

⁹⁵ Ibid., pp. 83-84.

state desires would thus be brought about easily as the result of an organic development.

For its practical aims, Zionism hopes to be able to win the collaboration even of a government fundamentally hostile to Jews, because in dealing with the Jewish question not sentimentalities are involved but a real problem whose solution interests all people's, and at the present moment especially the German people.

The realization of Zionism could only be hurt by resentment of Jews abroad against the German development boycott propaganda – such as is currently being carried on against Germany in many ways- is in essence un-Zionist, because Zionism wants not to do battle but to convince and to build.' (Joachim Prinz *Wir Juden* Berlin 1934) ⁽⁹⁶⁾

This early support for what later became the Nuremburg laws should not be considered surprising since the Third Reich did not last a thousand years, Israel is today the only place in the world where Jews and non-Jews are prevented from marrying legally. ⁽⁹⁷⁾

It should be remembered that this memorandum from the Zionists was not the voice of German Jewry, but that of a small minority which in 1925 had only 8739 members (not even 2 per cent of the Jewish community) and was for example only able to elect one fifth of the delegates at the regional elections for representatives of Prussian Jewry.

The largest Jewish organization in Germany was the C.V. or Central Union of German Citizens of the Jewish faith. This organization was explicitly anti-Zionist and had seven times the membership of the Zionist Union, including some 60 percent of all Jewish families.

The C.V. had combating anti-Semitism as an objective and its leaders saw it as their special duty to represent the interests of the German Jews in the active political struggle. But Zionism stood for systematic non-participation in German public life. It rejected as a matter of principle any participation in the struggle led by the C.V.

10.3 Ammunition for Nazi Anti-Semitism

Thus as early as July 11, 1930, a declaration of policy by the C.V. published in the *CV-Zeitung*, IX, noted that recognition of 'certain postulates of the German Zionist nationalists', provided the anti-Semites with ammunition and was a 'stab in the back' in the struggle against fascism.

An example of what the C.V. was complaining about, is the book *Kris und Entscheidung* by the leading Zionist theoretician. Dr. Jakob Klatzkin. As Moshe Menuhin says, it is unbelievable, but it is factual :

We are not hyphenated Jews; we are Jews with no qualifications, or reservations. We are simply aliens ; we are a foreign people in your midst, and we emphasize, we wish to stay that way. There is a wide gap between you and us, so wide that no bridge can be laid across. Your spirit is alien to us ; your myths,

⁹⁶ Glaser, op. cit., p. 22.

⁹⁷ Legally, marriages must be Jewish, Christian or Islamic, but some Christian priests do marry Jews to non-Jews though a more common practice is to get married in Cyprus.

legends, habits, customs, traditions, and national heritage, your Sundays, and holidays... They are all alien to us. The history of your triumphs and defeats, your war songs and battle hymns, your heroes and their mighty deeds, your national ambitions and aspirations, they are all alien to us. The boundaries of your lands cannot restrict our movements, and your border clashes are not of our concern. Far over and above the frontiers and boundaries of your land stands our Jewish unity... Whosoever calls the foreign land the Fatherland is a traitor to the Jewish people. Jewish heroes in foreign wars mean nothing to us. The Jewish people has no reason to decorate them with medals ; they are not Jewish heroes... A loyal Jew can never be other than a Jewish patriot.

We recognize a national unity of Diaspora Jews, no matter in which land they may reside. Therefore no boundaries can restrain us in pursuing our own Jewish policy.

Jacob Klatzkin, *Kris Und Entscheidung* [Crisis and Decision], Germany 1921)
(⁹⁸)

This was written when the German Jews were enjoying full, civil and political rights in the Weimar Republic. Naturally, Hitler's ideological theorists like Theodor Fritsch ; K.E. Wolff ; F. Rose ; G. Feder ; F. Muller and others quoted Zionists and especially Klatzkin, to prove that Jews are inassimilable and 'indigestible'.

Equally naturally, most German Jews were not impressed. As a report to the 24th session of the Zionist Union noted in 1932, the year before Hitler came to power, '...it should never be forgotten that we in Germany have to reckon not only with the indifference of extensive Jewish circles, but also with their hostility. (⁹⁹)

10.4 Assistance from the Gestapo

However, the Nazi takeover the following year resulted in an immediate change of fortunes for German Zionism. For example circulation of the Zionist weekly, *Die Jüdische Rundschau* jumped immediately from around 6,000 to nearly 40,000.

One factor was the credibility given to Zionist views about assimilation by the facts of Jewish life under the Nazis. Assimilation had become impossible and Zionism was an alternative.

But there were other factors too. Among them was the fact that all the non-Zionist organizations were quickly suppressed by the Nazis, while the Zionists were allowed to keep operating.

While all newspapers published by progressive organizations were banned, Jewish or not, and all publications not banned were placed directly under the supervision of the Ministry of Propaganda, the Zionist *Jüdische Rundschau*, was allowed to appear unhindered provided it was not sold to non-Jews. As Winfried Martini, then Jerusalem correspondent of the *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung* notes :

'Of all papers, it was the Jewish (read 'Zionist') press that for years retained a certain freedom which was completely withheld from the non-

⁹⁸ Moshe Menuhin, *The Decadence of Judaism in Our Time*. Institute for Palestine Studies, Beirut, 1969, pp. 482-483.

⁹⁹ Polkehn, op. cit., p. 56.

Jewish press.'

Until 1938 many publishing houses (among others, the *Jüdische Verlag* in Berlin Charlottenberg and *Schocker Verlag*, Berlin) could publish Zionist literature unhindered. Thus works by Chaim Weizmann and David Ben Gurion appeared quite legally under the regime that considered it necessary to burn the works of Heinrich Heine because that great German poet was a Jew.⁽¹⁰⁰⁾

The Victorian Jewish Board of Deputies (VJBD) has complained about the following broadcast on *Palestine Speaks* of 8th October 1978 :

'During the first days of fascist domination in Germany the Zionists held a direct line to the fascist repression apparatus which developed into collaboration between the Zionist leadership and the terror organizations of the Nazis Reich, the Gestapo, the S.S. etc.'

We have seen how collaboration with the Gestapo and the S.S. developed, but how early did it start ?

It seems the first official response to the Zionist overtures was an S.S. report in mid 1934 which proposed that the Nazis give official preference to those Jewish organizations that promoted Jewish nationalism and separatism.

According to Lucy Dawidowicz :

'Precisely such official encouragement was extended by the Bavarian political police, when Heydrich issued a directive to all police offices in the state on 28 January 1935 :

'The activity of the Zionist-orientated youth organizations that are engaged in the occupational restructuring of the Jews for agriculture and manual trades prior to their emigration to Palestine lies in the interests of the National Socialist state's leadership'.

These organizations, therefore, 'are not to be treated with that strictness that it is necessary to apply to the members of the so-called German-Jewish organizations (assimilationists)'.

By spring, this approach had been legitimated, according to a directive of April 1935 that asserted that 'the attempts of German-Jewish organizations to persuade Jews to remain in Germany' directly contradicted National Socialist principles and were to be prevented. The Jewish press, too, was to be monitored 'to see that the more subtle forms of this propaganda are not disseminated'.

One way the policy was executed was to deny permission to speakers to address public Jewish gatherings if they were known to advocate a Jewish presence in Germany. Persons who did express such views were often brought to the Gestapo for interrogation and threatened with detention in a concentration camp.

On 15 May 1935 the Schwarze Korps, official organ of the S.S., supported this policy as the correct ideological posture for national socialists, the Jews, it was argued, had to be separated into two categories - Zionists and assimilationists ;

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., p. 62.

'The Zionists adhere to a strict racial position and by emigrating to Palestine they are helping to build their own Jewish state.' But the assimilationists were objectionably tenacious: 'The assimilation-minded Jews deny their race and insist on their loyalty to Germany or claim to be Christians, because they have been baptized, in order to subvert National Socialist principles.'

The enactment of the Nuremberg laws encouraged this approach. The Zionists and proponents of emigration to Palestine were less badgered in their activities by the Police and the S.D. and the non-Zionists. Pressure was constantly exerted on Jewish communal leaders to pursue a policy of emigration, especially to Palestine. ⁽¹⁰¹⁾

With the support of these explicit directives from Gestapo chief Heydrich and from the S.S., the Zionist Union promptly issued a declaration demanding reorganization of the entire Jewish community to ensure due recognition of their influence.

They specifically demanded parity on the board of the national roof body of German Jewish organizations where they had previously been a minority. According to Lucy Dawidowicz :

'Publicly no-one attributed the Zionist power bid to the Heydrich directive and to then current nationalist Socialist policy favoring the Zionists, but the connection did not pass unnoticed. The non-Zionists were convinced that there was a connection and that the Zionists themselves believed that the Gestapo favored them over the non-Zionists. The Zionist demand for parity stunned the non-Zionists.

The *CV-Zeitung* of 9 May 1935 branded it 'unjustified, disruptive, and astonishing', an attempt to turn present events in Germany to Zionist profit. Nonetheless, the Zionists did eventually win parity, perhaps because the Reichsvertretung feared the Gestapo intervention perhaps because it had yielded to fatigue and a sense of defeat.' ⁽¹⁰²⁾

10.5 Zionist Takeover of the Jewish Community

After this Gestapo-induced Zionist takeover the Reichsvertretung (Board of Deputies) for the first time adopted a pro-Zionist program. According to Lucy Dawidowicz :

'The Fifth item explicitly expressed the emotional identification of the Jewish community with Palestine, and the readiness on the part of the Reichsvertretung to establish institutional ties with the Jewish National Fund in Palestine. The heavy hand of the German Dictatorship was evident. There were no longer any declarations of love or loyalty to Germany, its language or culture. The Jews had become completely isolated.' ⁽¹⁰³⁾

From then on, the intrusion of the Gestapo in the Jewish community became

¹⁰¹ Dawidowicz, op. cit., pp. 118-119.

¹⁰² Ibid., p. 241.

¹⁰³ Ibid., p. 242.

ever more oppressive. Every public Jewish leathering was aware of the Gestapo's listening ear and watchful eye. Jewish organizations had to conduct their business in the presence of Gestapo agents. Documents were scrutinized or subject to scrutiny. Any hint or suspicion of criticism of the Nazis brought immediate reprisals. Censorship of the Jewish press went to extraordinary lengths.

According to Lucy Dawidowicz :

'Above all, the Gestapo wanted to gain control of the *Reichsvertretung* or, failing that, other communal Jewish organizations. In pre-1938 days the Jewish community had not yet fallen wholly under the 'legal' jurisdiction of the Gestapo as it would in post-1939 days. In their ambition to capture the Jews, the Gestapo tried to place a man they could trust on the *Reichsvertretung* Executive.

Their man was George Kareski, a General Zionist suddenly turned Revisionist in the spring of 1933. To this day no one knows what hold the Gestapo had over Kareski or why he lent himself to the ugly drama. Yet in spite of several forceful efforts by the Gestapo beginning in 1935, Kareski was rebuffed, partly by happenstance, but mainly because Jewish communal leaders resisted Gestapo pressure. (Later, in Eastern Europe, similar resistance brought certain death) ⁽¹⁰⁴⁾

Unable to appoint their General Zionist turned Revisionist to the Board of Deputies Executive, the Gestapo finally dissolved it completely and replaced it with their own outfit, the *Reichsvereinigung*, directly under Gestapo orders. As we already noted from Hannah Arendt :

'...all Heading positions in the Nazi appointed *Reichsvereinigung* were held by Zionists (whereas the authentically Jewish *Reichsvertretung* had been composed of both Zionists and non-Zionists), because Zionists, according to the Nazis, were the decent Jews since they too thought in 'national' terms...'

The real function of this Zionist or Gestapo organization was to preside over the final liquidation of German Jewry.

It is quite true, as Dr. Foster says, that 'from the moment the Nazis seized power, Jewish communities first in Germany and then throughout Europe - increasingly lost their freedom of action, and were forced more and more to operate within the constraints of the different stages of the Nazi persecution...Jews were hostages and then victims - they were never free agents.'

This does explain why first German Jews, and later Jews throughout Europe had to put up with Gestapo appointed Zionist 'leaders'. One cannot condemn them for this - they had no choice.

But it does not 'make nonsense of any claims that Zionists - or Jews of any persuasion - collaborated...' The point Dr. Foster has missed is that the 'community leaders who collaborated were appointed by the Nazis, not by the Jews.'

The Zionists did not have to accept those Gestapo appointments. Few others did.

These facts about Zionist collaboration with the Nazi repressive apparatus

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., p. 244.

from the earliest days of the Third Reich are not some deadly secret. They are accepted and established conclusions in authoritative studies of the history of the period, even when the author, like Lucy Dawidowicz, is by no means unsympathetic to Zionism. The following excerpt from an abstract noticed accidentally in the *Journal of Modern History* seems to sum up the situation pretty well :

'Zionism in National Socialist Jewish Policy in Germany. 1933 -1939 by Francis R.J. Nicosia, Saint Michael's College, Winooski, Vermont.'

The Zionist movement attracted considerable encouragement and support from anti-Semitic circles in Germany and elsewhere from the second half of the nineteenth century to World War II. From its beginnings early in the 1920's, the National Socialist movement sought to utilize Zionist ideology and the Zionist movement to achieve the dissimilation of the Jewish community and to promote its emigration from Germany.

After 1933, the Hitler regime actively supported the efforts of the German Zionist movement in a variety of ways which included preferential treatment for German Zionists over other German Jewish organizations, encouragement and support for Zionist efforts to retrain German Jewish emigrants destined for Palestine, and active cooperation with a underground Zionist groups in the so-called illegal immigration of Jewish refugees into Palestine between 1938 and 1940...' (105)

Apart from hysterical abuse, the only answer Zionists have to these facts is the claim that any means of getting Jews out of Germany was justified and that if more had listened to them, more would have been saved.

This sounds plausible until one remembers that Zionist emigration was selective, and was given special financial concessions by the Nazis (the *Haavara* agreement), not extended to **other** emigrants whose accounts were completely blocked and not merely heavily taxed.

By 1935 almost **all** Jews in Germany were agreed that they, or at least the younger generation, had to get out of the country. The controversy between Zionists and non-Zionists was no longer about whether emigration was necessary, but where to. **Zionists stood for the selection of pioneers for Palestine, while others just wanted to get out.**

In exchange for assistance from the Nazis in their own projects of little relevance to the mass of German Jews, the Zionists not only assisted the Nazis to embarrass the British administration in Palestine, but also helped them isolate the Jewish community from German life and disrupt their resistance to Nazism. The Nazis were useful to the Zionists in catapulting them into positions of Jewish community leadership which they could never have reached on their own merits.

Before the *Reichsvereinigung* was created by the Gestapo, no major Jewish community anywhere outside Palestine had been led by Zionists. Even in Palestine, the orthodox religious community of Jerusalem rejected not only Zionists but also anyone who had anything to do with Zionists. They had been there for more than a hundred years before the Zionist invasion and, like the Arabs, they rejected British attempts to force them to take part in Zionist institutions.

¹⁰⁵ *Journal of Modern History*, Vol.50, No.4 (Dec. 1978).

Zionists did not come to be the collaborationist leaders of European Jewish communities as a result of pre-war elections. The Jews did not elect the collaborators. The Gestapo appointed them and they accepted the job.

11 CONCLUSION

11.1 Zionist enthusiasm about the Holocaust

The State of Israel is often referred to as something 'for which six million died'. The concept that Israel was established at such great 'cost' and its existence as a State is therefore very precious, is widely, even though unconsciously, accepted by most Australians whether Jewish or not.

As we have shown, there is more unconscious truth in this concept than might have been thought. A lot of Jews did die for Zionism. But they were not martyrs, who died for the Zionist 'cause', and the creation of the State of Israel was not some sort of 'compensation' for those deaths, it didn't make them 'worthwhile'.

Apart from being complete nonsense, the Zionist propaganda usually associated with any information about the Holocaust is extremely offensive to anti-Zionist Jews. As Isaac Deutscher points out in *The Non-Jewish Jew and Other Essays* :

It should be realized that the great majority of Eastern European Jews were, up to the outbreak of the second world war, opposed to Zionism. This is a fact of which most Jews and non-Jews in the West are seldom aware. The Zionists in our part of the world were a significant minority, but they never succeeded in attracting a majority of their co-religionists. The most fanatical enemies of Zionism were precisely the workers, those who spoke Yiddish, those who considered themselves Jews; they were the most determined opponents of the idea of an emigration from Eastern Europe to Palestine.
(¹⁰⁶)

These were the people who were exterminated en masse, by the Nazis.

The Holocaust victims did not die in order that there should be a 'Jewish State'. They died, because they were cold-bloodedly murdered by the Nazis in accordance with Nazi racialist theories.

Millions of Jews, together with millions of Communists, Gypsies, Poles, homosexuals, people with Jewish grandparents and other 'undesirables', were murdered by the Nazis. That was not a crime against the State of Israel, it was a crime against humanity.

This crime cannot be compensated by the creation of a 'Jewish State' or a Gypsy State or any other State. It cannot be 'compensated' at all. The only thing is to learn from it that movements and ideologies like Nazism, and the social system that breeds them, are extremely dangerous to humanity.

It seems perfectly commonplace and ordinary for a pro-Zionist politician to be reported in the *Australian Jewish News* saying :

'However tragic the Hitler period was, it led to the rejuvenation of Australian Jewry.'

¹⁰⁶ Isaac Deutscher, *The Non-Jewish Jew and Other Essays*, Oxford University Press, London, 1968.

Such sentiments are expressed over and over again by Zionists. They do not imply that Zionists support Hitler or welcomed the Holocaust, but they do imply that there is something terribly wrong in the Zionist approach to this question - something so wrong that it cannot be let pass but must be brought into the light of day and repudiated.

Hitlerism did not lead to the 'rejuvenation of Jewry'. It led to a mass murder of Jews. The shock and demoralization, and also the moralization suffered by the survivors of the Holocaust goes far to explain how a poisonous ideology like Zionism could, for the first time in history, gain a real mass following among Jews, just as the Versailles Treaty paved the way for Nazism to spread among the Germans.

But to call the mass murder of Jews followed by the decline and decadence of traditional universalist Jewish values and the takeover of Jewish community institutions by narrow nationalist zealots, a 'rejuvenation of Jewry', takes real gall.

Most people who call themselves Zionists today would not make the leap from pretence that the Jews in the Holocaust died for the Zionist cause, to indifference to their deaths. They would not stand by and watch European Jews being exterminated and do practically nothing about it, except shut the doors to their rescue.

Nevertheless, we have shown, as a well-documented historical fact, that the top Zionist leadership did exactly that. And these people are still leaders in Israel today.

There is also a big leap from standing by passively while people are being murdered, to actively assisting in their murder. Yet that is exactly what some Zionist leaders did. Very few, but some. The appalling thing is that the actions of those who did were justified and are still being justified by most of the Zionist leadership today. They are being defended at this inquiry, by witnesses for the Victorian Jewish Board of Deputies. (VJBD)

11.2 Is Rabbi Shonfeld also 'offensive' ?

If the word 'collaboration' still sounds too 'offensive' when used on radio 3CR, let us sum up with the words of Rabbi Moshe Shonfeld, as published in a Hebrew magazine in the State of Israel under the heading 'I Accuse - From the Depths':

'The Zionist approach, that Jewish blood is the anointing oil needed for the wheels of the Zionist state is not a thing of the past. It remains operable to this very day.

Since the existence of Zionism, one constant trend of thought has been the direction of Weizmann, Greenbaum, Sharett, Ben Gurion, Ehrenpreis, Kastner, Stephen Wise, the councils in the ghettos and the rescue committees of the free world. The only yearning was for the State. The people as a whole, or a segment thereof, were merely the means for the realization of a 'homeland'. Whoever did not serve this purpose might as well have not been created.

'Jewish war criminals' is a phrase that was not included in the lexicon of either the '*yishuv*' in Eretz Yisrael or in the diaspora. It is not even found in

the remotest fantasies, and imaginations of anyone's mind.

On the contrary, from the hundreds of books, tens of thousands of articles and millions of words written and spoken on the Holocaust (which itself, has been turned into a Zionist battle-cry which we abhor, but have been forced to use for identification purposes), the opposite seems to be suggested – that there were no Jewish war criminals.

For this reason, the author of this work has unfolded before everyone's eyes his uncovering of the mask worn by the Jewish collaborators, who stood at the helm of the Zionist movement and gave their hands to the Nazi beasts.

There were Jews who could not resist the test of boot and whiplash and, by turning informer upon their brethren by surrendering them unto the hangman or making them scapegoats of the Kapos and the Jewish councils, gained their own freedom. Since we were not subjected to their trials, thank G-d, it is questionable if we can judge them in the full severity of the law. Not every generation merits foremen who are willing to sacrifice themselves as did their Jewish foreman in ancient Egypt. But here lies the paradox : the state which designates itself as 'Israel' has on its books a law demanding justice to be meted out to Nazis and their collaborators, but for those laden with guilt who stood at the helm of Jewry during the Holocaust there is no law to call them to account. Not only that, but those who have died in the interval are lauded and revered, and those who are yet alive maintain their respective positions, as they continue to prop themselves up as representatives of the Jewish people...

Zionist leaders during the Holocaust did not stop at manipulating lives. They also controlled the sources of finance and communications, representing themselves before the world as the spokesmen of the Jewish nation. They alone are responsible for the unfulfilled potential in rescuing the Jewish people.

In three vital areas they failed and impeded others efforts: (1) Communications, (2) in material aid, (3) in preventing annihilation. Had these failures stemmed from ignorance or mistakes one might excuse their lack of ability, but the bitter truth is that their actions were determined by explicit policy and a fundamental principle. The first and foremost aim was to establish the 'state' – and the masses of Jews merely served as convenient means. And wherever there existed a contradiction between the two, the needs of the masses and even their salvation were subordinated to the 'state'-in-formation.

It is common knowledge that Eichmann proposed to doctor Kastner's committee that Jewish lives be exchanged for merchandise, a proposal which he termed, 'merchandise in exchange for blood'. Zionist leaders read this bid differently. 'Blood in exchange for the state'. ⁽¹⁰⁷⁾

In advertising Rabbi Shonfeld's book *The Holocaust victims accuse* in the *New York Times*, orthodox Torah Jews of the 'Neturei Karta' say clearly :

The author accuses the Zionists of having collaborated in the murder of six million Jews. ⁽¹⁰⁸⁾

¹⁰⁷ Shonfeld, op.cit., pp 2, 3, 8, 19, 20, 24, 28.

¹⁰⁸ *New York Times*, 12 Dec. 1977.

They quote scriptures to express the fact that knowledge of this collaboration will not forever be suppressed :

The truth will sprout forth from the earth (*Psalms* 85:12)

And the stones from the wall will scream (*Habbakuk* 2:11)

The mere attempt at suppression in Australia has already resulted in the truth sprouting forth in print as well as on the radio.

Without relying on either Divine intervention or 3CR, we can confidently predict that actual suppression will cause the walls to scream. That is what **always** happens with censorship.

11.3 Internationalism versus self hatred

The facts are clear.

Zionists should pause to reflect on them.

They should try to answer N. Glaser's question :

If this isn't the record of a bunch of Jewish Self-haters and Nazi collaborators then why doesn't the Zionist movement itself publish the whole story of Zionist-Nazi relations ? The answer is simple : They don't dare. ⁽¹⁰⁹⁾

While there has been a mass of Zionist propaganda to refute claims that Zionism is racism, to prove that the Arabs weren't driven out of Palestine and so on, there has never been, and there probably never will be, any serious Zionist attempt to refute the sort of serious accusations raised and documented here.

When such accusations are raised by non-Jews, they are simply branded as anti-Semites. When they are raised by Jews, the term is 'self haters'. That term 'self-hater' does have a definite meaning, apart from its use by Zionists who don't like to admit that it is their racist ideology we hate, not ourselves.

The phenomena of self hatred, does exist. It is quite common for oppressed people to internalize the world view of their oppressors and see themselves as inferior. Many women do it. In America some blacks used to buy a lot of skin whitening creams and hair straighteners.

Among European Jews, too, some accepted that there was something unnatural about being a Jew. They did not like being part of a people that had been dispersed among the nations for thousands of years. They accepted that there was something wrong with the internationalism and universalism of the Jews which had prompted the hatred of fascists. They accepted the anti-Semitic hatred and contempt for traditional values of diaspora Jewry and didn't want to be Jews anymore. They wanted to become something else instead of a Jewish minority.

They wanted to become Israelis - a 'nation like any other nation', although most of them never actually did so.

The origins of Zionism, unlike its victories, lie much earlier than the

¹⁰⁹ Glaser, op. cit., p. 24.

Holocaust.

When the East European Jews were emancipated, three trends emerged.

A remnant clung to the old ways and continued trying to live according to the Torah. Their lifestyle may be peculiar, but they do no harm to anyone else, and they are welcome to it. If the Messiah comes they will get their reward.

Such religious communities still exist in places like London, New York and Jerusalem. Only in Jerusalem are they subject to any significant degree of ill treatment. They claim to be victims of anti-Semitic Jew baiting in Jerusalem because they remind Zionists about what they hate in themselves - having originated from the Torah Jews.

The overwhelming majority of Jews rejected the old way of life and took part in the enlightenment. Where assimilation was checked by anti-Semitism, two reactions developed.

The positive reaction of struggling for the universalist ideals of the enlightenment drove many Jews into the progressive, democratic and socialist parties in much larger numbers than their percentage of the population would have warranted. As a result, Jews contributed greatly to progressive movements. So much so, that anti-Semites still see Communism, and even Liberalism, as Jewish plots.

Those Jews who contributed the positive side of their own Jewish culture to the developing common culture of progressive humanity, and left behind the negative side, have become ordinary citizens of the various countries in which they live.

They may feel friendly towards the State of Israel, out of ignorance, as most ordinary citizens of Western countries do, and they may even feel that way more strongly than average, because they have relatives there and so on, but they are not Zionists.

The negative reaction to anti-Semitism after the enlightenment was Zionism. It accepted anti-Semitism as natural and inevitable and accepted the anti-Semitic view that there was something unnatural about the Jews. It set itself against all progressive movements.

The fight between Zionists and progressive Jews started long before Zionism's war against the Arabs, and also before Zionism collaborated with Nazism in the Holocaust, Jewish opposition to Zionism began when Zionism first came into existence and immediately became, and was recognized and branded as, the deadly enemy of everything progressive. This was the attitude even of Jewish nationalists like the Bund, let alone revolutionary socialist Jews.

In Zionism we have a movement which characterizes Jews as aliens and as living an inadequate and unnatural life in 'exile', a movement which has actively fought, alongside anti-Semites, to prevent Jewish immigration to countries like Australia, has bombed Synagogues and painted up swastikas to drive Jews out of their homelands, has murdered hundreds of Jews in cold blood, ill-treats religious Jews in Jerusalem and did collaborate with the Nazis in murdering hundreds of thousands. ⁽¹¹⁰⁾

Jewish opposition to Zionism is not only a matter of humanitarian or internationalist solidarity with the Arabs, but a pretty natural reaction against a fundamentally anti-Semitic movement that has already managed to uproot the

¹¹⁰ For example, Shonfeld, *op. cit.*, p. 62. On 25 November 1940, the SS *Patria*, with some 1770 Jewish refugees on board, was blown up by the Irgun *Zvai Leumi*, a Zionist terrorist group. About 250 refugees died.

entire Jewish populations of all the countries of the Arab world, is currently trying to do the same in both the Soviet Union and Iran, and would not be averse to doing so in Australia if it could.

The fact that Zionist self-haters collaborated with the Nazis is something that anyone sympathetic to Zionism should think about carefully.

If they find it upsetting, that is good. They should go on to think about what Zionism has done to Arabs as well as Jews. They should work out whose interests it actually serves.

It ought to be upsetting and if anyone does not find it upsetting there is little hope for them. But there is no use complaining to 3CR about being upset. It is no business of 3CR's to prevent its affiliates from discussing these matters publicly.

Nor is it any business of the Australian Broadcasting Tribunal to compel 3CR to censor its affiliates. If it tries it would not succeed.

If 3CR did shut up about Nazi-Zionist collaboration, there is no way that Jews ever will.

As an Israeli religious newspaper said of the Kastner case, it 'will have deep echoes in our generation and in generations to come.' ⁽¹¹¹⁾

The echoes are not dying out.

They are growing louder.

¹¹¹ Hecht, op. cit., p. 185.

Nazi-Zionist Collaboration:

Appendix A

Proof of evidence from John Harvey Foster

I, John Harvey Foster of 200 XX Street North Melbourne in the State of Victoria state:

1. I am a lecturer in German History at the University of Melbourne. I hold the degree of Master of Arts in German from the University of Melbourne and Doctor of Philosophy from the University of Wales. I have also studied in the University of Tübingen and the Free University of Berlin. I teach the history of Nazi Germany and the Holocaust at the University of Melbourne in courses for second and fourth year students and I supervise post-graduate and doctoral research in modern Jewish history and the history of the Holocaust. I am engaged in research in the history of German Jewish communities, and have worked in this connection at the archives of the Holocaust Memorial (Yad Vashem) in Jerusalem, the Central Archives of the Jewish people at the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, the Wiener Library in London, and at the Institute for Contemporary History at Munich.

2. I have read transcripts of material broadcast on 3CR concerning pre-war Germany, the Holocaust and allegations of a Nazi-Zionist collaboration. I consider much of the material to be a gross distortion of the historical facts in a way which is calculated to be deliberately misleading.

3. The attempt to equate Zionism with racism thoroughly misrepresents the intentions and aims of the Zionist movement. Zionism should be understood as a classical nationalist movement in the same sense as other nineteenth century movements, such as those to establish nation states in Italy, Czechoslovakia or Poland. Zionist claims to nationality-rose from consciousness amount some Jews of being an identifiable historical community, with a clear continuity of existence, an affection for the Biblical land and a common cultural inheritance. These are typical of characteristics by which nineteenth century nationalistic movements are usually defined. Racism, on the other hand, is a distinctly different kind of doctrine, which has nothing to do with Zionism. In particular Nazi racism was conceived in terms of a permanent struggle between races so that by definition a claim to racist superiority would be demonstrated by the subjugation, persecution or even physical elimination of other races considered to be inferior. Zionism has never made similar claims. The claim that 'racism and Zionism are like Hitler's Germany (27th August 1977) defies not only the rules of grammar, but also the facts. In Israel many different ethnic, religious and political groups live side by side in a way which would be intolerable to a racist state.

4. *Palestine Speaks* makes frequent reference to alleged collaboration between Nazis and Zionists. In particular, it has claimed on 8th October 1978, 'that the collaboration between the Zionist and the Nazi fascists was neither accidental

or expedient. It flowed logically from shared aims. They were not strange bedfellows but common bedfellows.' Such statements are extremely misleading ; in the first place the German Zionist organization - together with the other German Jews - strenuously opposed the Nazi Party during its rise to power, both through public statements and through substantial financial contributions to the political fighting funds of the democratic parties. This would be well known by anybody who took the trouble to read the German Zionist press of those years. In the second place from the moment the Nazis seized power, Jewish communities - first in Germany and then throughout Europe increasingly lost their freedom of action, and were forced more and more to operate within the constraints of the different stages of the Nazi persecution. Consequently any rational or unprejudiced account of Jewish political activities in the following twelve years has to be understood within the context of oppression and mass extermination. Jews were hostages and then victims - they were never free agents : This makes nonsense of any claims that Zionists – or Jews of any persuasion - collaborated voluntarily with 'the fascist repression apparatus' (*Palestine Speaks*, 8th October 1978).

5. It has been argued elsewhere that even those Jews who walked unresistingly into the gas chambers assisted the Nazis in the execution of their extermination policy. Whatever one thinks about the political morality of this argument, it makes abundantly clear the absurdity of attempting to derive conclusions about a person's political ideology from particular actions in such an extreme situation.

6. Three examples will make clear how maliciously the broadcasts distort the facts:

- (a) The *Haavara* Transfer Agreement of 1933 (*Palestine Speaks* 5th June 1977, 16th October 1977). This agreement was concluded between Zionist authorities in Palestine and the Nazi regime, as a means for transferring the capital of German Jews emigrating to Palestine. The broadcasts refer to the agreement as an example of Nazi-Zionist collaboration. What they fail to mention is that, according to German exchequer figures, a Jew who transferred his capital under the terms of the agreement had to surrender between two-thirds and three-quarters of the total to the German Government in the form of special taxes and administrative expenses.

The agreement was, clearly no normal business arrangement. The desire to emigrate, the need to transfer capital and to accept such enormous losses were solely dictated by the Nazi persecution. This was no piece of Nazi-Zionist 'collaboration' ; it was an attempt to salvage some Jewish property, the rest of which was expropriated by the Nazis in 1938-39.

The broadcast of 5th June 1977 concludes that 'the moral effort by anti-racist Jews to boycott Nazi products was undermined by the *Haavara* agreement and the refusal of the Eighth Zionist Congress to even participate in the boycott'. This statement is intended to create the impression that, unlike other Jews, the Zionists collaborated with Nazi racism. However, it suppresses the fact that the official representation of German Jewry overwhelmingly anti-Zionist in their convictions at that time - had themselves protested against the boycott. They did this because, as patriotic Germans, they had no wish to see the German economy

harmful and because, as Jews, they feared that the boycott would provoke increasingly severe anti-Jewish measures in Germany.

Far from betraying their fellow-Jews, the Zionist Congress was attempting to act in solidarity with the persecuted German Jews. In retrospect one may question the political wisdom of their actions : but one cannot doubt their intentions. They were the very opposite of what the broadcast misleadingly implies.

(b) The Kastner Case:

In attempting to bolster up this charge of Nazi-Zionist Collaboration, the broadcasts make much use of the Kastner Case (16th October 1977 ; 7th and 8th October 1978). Here again, the broadcasts reveal their prejudice by the use of the term 'collaboration'. It is true that there were negotiations between Kastner, the Zionist Relief and Rescue Committee and the Nazis concerning the purchase of Jewish lives for money and military equipment. These took place in the context of the almost completed destruction of European Jewry. The Hungarians were the last on the list ; and the sole purpose of the negotiations was to preserve some Jews from their otherwise inevitable fate at Auschwitz. In these circumstances, to talk of collaboration is malicious and absurd.

The broadcast of 16th October 1977 again deliberately suppresses information to create its effect. It is true as the broadcast states, that there was a trial involving Kastner's activities, in which the Jerusalem District Court found against him. But the broadcasts omit to mention that when the case was appealed before the Israeli Supreme Court, the verdict of the lower Court was overturned, and Kastner, though now dead, was fully rehabilitated.

Finally, the claim that without Kastner's collaboration the Nazis would not have been able to exterminate the Hungarian Jews is simply untrue. It flies in the face of all that we know about the machinery of the Nazi destruction process.

(c) The third example concerns a sin of omission.

In presenting the Zionists as Nazi collaborators, the broadcasts entirely omit to mention two basic facts :

(1) Most European Zionists, along with their fellow Jews, were exterminated. An odd way to deal with 'collaborators' ;

(2) Zionists were at least as prominent as others in all phases of the Jewish resistance. The most striking example of this is the well documented Zionist participation in the Warsaw Ghetto uprising, but there were countless other cases as well.

Both of these facts are willfully ignored by the broadcasts. They cannot be unknown to anyone who has concerned himself with the details of the Holocaust.

7. With their deliberate distortion of some fact and their willful omission of others, I can only conclude that the broadcasts intend to falsify history for propaganda purposes. There is nothing new in the attempt to tar the Zionists with the Nazi brush : It was one of the chief propaganda weapons of the Soviet Press during the anti-Zionist trials of 1971. Nothing could have been more calculated to ferment anti-Semitism in the U.S.S.R. than lurid comparisons between Nazism

and Zionism ; and I believe the same to be true in this country.

8. The propaganda broadcast by *Palestine Speaks* is typically anti-Semitic. The broadcasters attempt to absolve themselves of the politically damaging charge of anti-Semitism by claiming that they are not racists ; and a submission to the Tribunal from a group who 'call themselves 'Jews against Zionism and anti-Semitism' is intended to give substance to this claim, by demonstrating that some Jews are opposed to Zionism, and that anti-Zionists are therefore not opposed to all Jews.

9. This attempt at self-absolution rests upon the assumption that anti-Semitism is identifiable with an overtly racist ideology. But this is not the case. Racial anti-Semitism - in a technical sense - is a recent development which emerged in the late nineteenth century in Europe and reached its most extreme form under the Nazis. It represents only one phase - though the most terrible one - in the history of anti-Semitism. It was preceded, for instance, by hundreds of years of Christian anti-Semitism, which operated with a **theological** rationale, derived ultimately from the accusation of [presumably: the murder of Jesus, son of God. aaargh]. Jews were harassed and persecuted, ostensibly for religious reasons ; and conversion offered the only escape.

10. Anti-Zionist anti-Semitism is simply another variant of an age-old theme. It operates with a political (rather than a religious or racial) rationale, and attacks the great majority of Jews who identify with Zionism either 'organizationally or emotionally, while exonerating the relatively few who dissociate themselves from Zionist sympathies. In this respect the Jews against Zionism fulfill the same objective function as the Jewish converts in pre-modern (i.e. Christian) anti-Semitism.

11. Political opposition to Zionism need not be anti-Semitic, any more than religious opposition to Judaism need be anti-Semitic. That the broadcasts in question are anti-Semitic can be demonstrated by the fact that they employ almost the whole range and vocabulary of traditional anti-Semitic propaganda. All of these slogans existed long before the Nazis, who tailored them carefully to correspond with their own political circumstances. The broadcasts of *Palestine Speaks* simply present a re-arrangement of the traditional material, again adjusted to meet the requirements of a new political situation.

The following examples will make the point abundantly clear :

11.1. The Zionist 'is like poison in the world' (24th July 1977) echoes the mediaeval theme of Jews poisoning the food and water of the Christian population.

11.2. That Zionists aim 'to suck the blood of the working man' combines the racist theme of the Jew as a parasite on the body of the German people with the populist theme of the Jew as an insatiable capitalist exploiter (2nd December 1978).

11.3. That Zionists control the press and the media, (16th July 1978) and that they operate a world wide conspiracy (16th October 1977) is a variation of a familiar anti-Semitic claim used by the Nazis and fully developed in the notorious anti-Semitic forgery, *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*.

11.4. Zionists are 'criminals' (19th November 1978) ; they endanger the good order of society (19th November 1978) ; they operate 'behind the Jewish

community' (11th September 1977). These claims are all familiar ingredients of anti-Semitism, in which the Jew was seen as a secret agent of social decomposition. Both the *Protocols* and Nazi propaganda offer numerous parallels.

11.5. Even the claim that the Zionist cultivate anti-Semitism for their own political ends (25th September 1977; 16th July 1978) is an argument which is fully developed in the *Protocols* and elsewhere. By an exquisite irony the victim becomes responsible for his own misery.

11.6. The threat and the reality of violence is a standard part of such propaganda. It does not take much imagination to find parallels for the claim (16th April 1978) that 'the Palestinian people are continuing to wage an uncompromising struggle to wipe Zionism off the face of the earth.'

12. Leopards do not change their spots, and anti-Semites do not change their arguments. There is a remarkable consistency in the imagery and language of anti-Semitism in mediaeval times to the present day. The broadcasts *Palestine Speaks* stand squarely in that tradition.

Nazi-Zionist Collaboration:

Appendix B

The Enquiry that never was by Albert Langer

After preliminary hearings from March to August, the Australian Broadcasting Tribunal made no findings about Melbourne's Community Radio Station 3CR and announced that its six-month-old inquiry had never actually begun.

3CR made a unilateral declaration reaffirming its policy 'that Zionism is a form of racism', its policy 'to exclude Zionist organizations and viewpoints from membership or 3CR's programming' and its 'determination to continue, to broadcast Palestinian and anti-Zionist viewpoints through programs such as 'Palestine Speaks', 'Palestine Voice.' and 'JAZA'.

The declaration even rubbed salt in the wounds by declaring that the station's long-standing right of reply (which the Victorian Jewish Board of Deputies had never applied to use) would be restricted to purely factual rebuttals and would be given 'to people who apply in good faith' and 'entirely at 3CR's own discretion'.

Previously for example, Norman Rothfield of the 'left-wing' Zionist magazine *Paths to Peace* had been allowed to present three half-hour programs advocating his views, as a 'right of reply' to attacks on those views, although 3CR drew the line at giving Rothfield a regular program.

Now Rothfield would be restricted to purely 'factual rebuttals to specific grievances' about the section of the community he represents (i.e. Israeli agents) being maligned or misrepresented - and then he would only be let on in the unlikely event that 3CR was satisfied, 'entirely at 3CR's own discretion', that the application was in 'good faith' and was not just a continuation of Rothfield's campaign against the station.

Moreover, the declaration underlined that 3CR 'will not voluntarily enter into any agreements, or give, any undertakings, to the Board of Deputies, the Tribunal or any other outside body'.

The only consolations for the Board of Deputies were clauses saying that material will not be broadcast which 'promotes hatred against or hostility towards', or 'brings into contempt or ridicule' groups 'distinguished by their sex, race, religion, color or ethnic or national origins'. This provision is not great consolation since it simply reaffirms 3CR's long standing opposition to racism.

The point at issue was whether the anti-Zionist broadcasts were racist, not whether racist material should be broadcast, and 3CR has kept on right on insisting that the programs were not racist and will be allowed to continue as before.

Implicit understandings.

Indeed, at 3CR's general meeting of affiliates an amendment was moved by JAZA (Jews Against Zionism and Anti-Semitism) to spell this out : 'This guideline does not inhibit the continuing broadcast of material similar to that complained about by the Victorian Jewish Board of Deputies, since 3CR has repeatedly declared that it does not consider this material to be racist or anti-Semitic in any

way.'

That amendment was defeated by one vote only after the movers of the declaration repeatedly stated that it was implicit anyway, having been said many times before, and that it was well understood by the Board of Deputies. (They argued that rubbing it in would make it difficult for the Board to withdraw from the inquiry and 3CR could not afford the legal fees just to humiliate the Board further.)

A further general meeting of listener sponsors will be held at the Collingwood Education Centre on Monday 24 September at 8 p.m. and probably will result in a future general meeting of affiliates amending the unilateral declaration or rescinding it entirely.

Humiliating defeat.

The Board of Deputies or at least its leadership were well aware of the situation through their 'observers' at 3CR meetings (one of whom even tried to register as the proxy for an inactive affiliate!). The fact that a unilateral declaration could be unilaterally interpreted, amended or rescinded was also spelt out to them in public at the Tribunal hearings. Yet they were determined to get out of the inquiry.

Why, after spending two years and thousands of dollars campaigning for a public inquiry into 3CR, did the Board of Deputies accept such a humiliating slap in the face? The best proof is the dog fight that has already broken out among the Zionists as to who should bear responsibility for the disaster, and the fact that while 3CR has mailed out copies of its declaration to all 3000 listener sponsors, the *Australian Jewish News* has studiously refrained from publishing its text at all.

Already Board President, Arnold Bloch, is issuing pathetic statements defending his stand, and seeking popularity on the basis that at least he is not as Neanderthal as the notorious Rabbi Rapaport, while Isi Leibler, who kept his Executive Council for Australian Jewry (normally responsible for Commonwealth matters) well clear of the 3CR inquiry, has already stuck the knife well and truly into Bloch and is beginning to twist it.

The normally voluble Rabbi John Levi has been strangely silent, while Norman Rothfield, who had hoped by his attacks on 3CR to re-establish 'left-wing' Zionism and the Labor Party as a legitimate influence on the VJBD (as it is for example in NSW), has been driven back to his previous position of being only slightly more respectable than JAZA within the Jewish community.

Dr. Knopfelmacher is saying 'I told you so' (which indeed he did), and even the Bundist fossils are hoping they will again have a chance to unseat the dominant Mizrahi Religious Zionists from their hold on the Board.

The Board of Deputies didn't even want the Tribunal to read the 3CR declaration it accepted as a basis for withdrawing its complaint, and tried to slip them a copy omitting the crucial preamble and conclusion - which resulted in some rapid document shuffling with 3CR's counsel as well, when the subterfuge was discovered.

So why on earth did the Board of Deputies withdraw its complaint on the basis of a declaration it didn't want the Tribunal, let alone the Jewish community, to read? Certainly it wasn't because the Boards' demands had been met.

What they wanted and what they got.

The Boards' first demand was for an anti-racist clause (similar to that adopted as an internal guideline by 3CR), to be imposed as a license condition so that it could be enforced externally in line with the Board's interpretation that anti-Zionist views are racist and Zionist views are not.

Instead, 3CR will continue to be the only commercial broadcasting station in Australia with an explicitly anti-racist policy and will continue to implement this policy in line with its own interpretation, not subject to outside review, that Zionist views are racist, and anti-Zionist views are not.

Although the Board explicitly disassociated itself from 3CR's declaration that Zionism was racist etc., it accepted without comment point 1 of 3CR's declaration, which 'strongly supports the concept of self-regulation within broadcasting' and holds that licensees should not have 'arbitrary standards imposed and enforced by Government regulatory bodies'. Instead of getting the license condition it wanted, the Board accepted a general declaration against license conditions of any kind.

The Board's second demand was that: '...where a station...chooses to give a substantial time, and attention only to one point of view on a public issue, then those who have an interest in presenting an opposing view on that issue should be given rights of access to present their view...'

What they got, and accepted, was a declaration, point (iii) and paragraph 2 of which explicitly excludes Zionism from access to 3CR.

The Board's third demand was that: '... those organizations which wish to affiliate to Radio Station 3CR (for example *Paths to Peace*) should be entitled to affiliate if otherwise entitled to do so. They should not be disqualified because 3CR chooses to characterize them as Zionist.'

What they got, and accepted, was a declaration, point (iv) and paragraph 3 of which explicitly excludes 'Zionist organizations and viewpoints from membership or 3CR's programming...'

Perhaps the ultimate humiliation was that supporters of *Paths to Peace*, in their desperation to get out of the inquiry, voted at the 3CR listener sponsor general meeting, in favor of this resolution to exclude themselves.

This may explain the extreme bitterness of the personal attacks in the latest issue of their magazine.

Fools rush in

Originally the inquiry was meant to support the current Zionist campaign to prove that 'anti-Zionism is a form of anti-Semitism' as a counter to the UN declaration that 'Zionism is a form of racism'.

In the Board of Deputies' annual report, President Arnold Bloch boasted that this would be: '... the first judicial... inquiry into the relationship between anti-Zionism of a certain type and anti-Semitism, which has taken place since the UN resolution of 1975 equating Zionism with racism.'

Keen to have such an inquiry, Bloch even rejected a request from the Tribunal to attempt to resolve differences with 3CR at a private meeting. On 18 October 1978, he smugly declared: 'Even were 3CR to concede full so called 'rights of reply' this would not conclude the matter since we have asked the Tribunal to impose certain conditions on 3CR's license.'

'It is accordingly our view that the matter should proceed direct to a public inquiry by the Tribunal.'

After insisting on it so eagerly, what made the Board suddenly change its

mind? Before the inquiry began, the Board's campaign against 3CR was simply a matter of media manipulation, at which the Board is very skilled indeed. Once the inquiry started, it became a matter of hard evidence instead of press releases, and the Board suddenly discovered that it didn't have any, while 3CR had plenty.

3CR produced some 700 pages of evidence and was backed up by impressively documented submissions from the United Palestine Workers and from its affiliates the Campaign Against Racial Exploitation, the Palestine Australia Solidarity Committee and JAZA, as well as over 100 shorter statements of support from interested organizations and prominent individuals.

Apart from the Board of Deputies' half a dozen familiar faces (Rabbi Levi, Rabbi Gutnick - who also reckons President Carter is an anti-Semite - Sam Lipski etc.), a grand total of only two complaints from Jewish listeners to 3CR were received in response to the Tribunal's advertisements in every major newspaper. There were more complaints about programs on Malaya, South Africa and Turkey (i.e. one each).

JAZA called more Jewish witnesses to say that they were offended by Zionism than the Board called to say that they were offended by 3CR, and a whole reading room at the Deputy Crown Solicitor's office had to be set aside to house JAZA's several hundred volumes of documentary evidence.

All the Board had was not evidence but assertions, and they were totally isolated from non-Zionist support. They even had to go all the way to WA to find ALP politicians who would support them (Perth being the farthest spot in Australia from 3CR's reception area).

Nazi-Zionist collaboration

At the very centre of the Board's complaints were certain 3CR broadcasts alleging that the Zionist leadership collaborated with the Nazis in the extermination of European Jews. The Board claimed that this was simply an extremely offensive anti-Semitic conspiracy theory designed to bait the Melbourne Jewish community, and they called an 'expert witness' to prove it.

As usual with attempted censorship, the result was the exact opposite of what the censors wanted. JAZA produced a whole book of evidence on Nazi-Zionist collaboration, drawing on official transcripts of Israeli court cases and based on sources such as *Perfidy* by Ben Hecht, the well-known American supporter of Israeli Prime Minister Begin (from his early terrorist days), and *The Holocaust Victims Accuse* by Rabbi Moshe Shonfeld of the extremely orthodox 'Guardians of the City' in Jerusalem.

Some of that material, on the notorious 'Kastner case', has already been published in *Nation Review* (28 June 1979, p. 660). It was met with silence from the Board of Deputies, although it did cause their expert witness to reverse some of his views. 'Informed sources' tell us that it was mainly to avoid a public inquiry into these matters, that the Board withdrew its complaint. But never mind, the evidence will be available shortly in book form.

It may sound fantastic to say the Board backed off because they were afraid of what would come out. But anybody who doesn't believe this should check through the material already published, and to be published shortly, and try to find another explanation for the Board's humiliating withdrawal.

People in the Jewish community especially should take note of Isi Leibler's remarks that a Tribunal hearing would have been 'disastrous' for the Jewish community (read 'for Zionism') as it would have given splinter groups a platform

on which to publicize their views. (*Australian Jewish News*, 7 September.)

People who believed the Board's allegations about 3CR will want to check out exactly what 'views' Leibler was so desperate to prevent being publicized. They will be especially interested in the question of Nazi collaboration.

What about 3CR?

The only remaining question is why did 3CR let the Zionists off the hook ?

Given the Board's extreme weakness, 3CR could have used the inquiry as a platform to counter some of the extremely damaging allegations about anti-Semitism that have been made over the past few years, and to have this issue resolved, one way or the other, so it could not be kept alive to be used as grounds for not renewing 3CR's license.

Although Arnold Bloch has now publicly admitted, and the Board's counsel, Alan Goldberg QC, has confirmed, that the Board didn't think it could win anything at the public inquiry (*AJN*, 7 September), 3CR Committee members were just too scared of 'the bosses court' to believe this when they were told it a few weeks ago. By leaving the whole situation open, 3CR has allowed the Board to mount a more carefully prepared attack at the renewal hearings in 18 months, when 3CR's license really will be up for grabs.

Exactly as 3CR was warned, the Board has already declared its intention to do just that (although whether this intention is carried out remains to be seen). According to Arnold Bloch : 'I have, no regrets about what we have done, and I hope I will have no regrets if we take action again, as I believe probably we will have to do.' (*Australian Jewish News*, 7 September - so much for 'good faith').

'There is no doubt that 3CR will continue, to broadcast anti-Israel and anti-Zionist propaganda. (Whatever happened to 'anti-Semitic'? - A.L.). We will have, to consider in due course whether we ought to oppose the renewal of 3CR's license.'

'We have to keep two issues completely separate. The first is whether or not a station which is avowedly and rabidly anti-Zionist (note, not 'anti-Semitic' - A.L.) should be allowed to hold a license at all.'

'That is one issue which we think that the Tribunal would not have resolved in our favor in the context of the present inquiry.'

'However we do not exclude that as an issue in the future.

(*AJN*, 17 August).

Quite clearly, despite previous hypocritical declarations, the Board of Deputies is still out to get 3CR's license and they hope to be in a stronger position to do it at the renewal hearings than if the inquiry had gone ahead now. As Arnold Bloch says : 'We have achieved what was feasible (i.e. nothing - A.L.), and if we come back (to the Tribunal) we will be in a substantially stronger position.' (*AJN*, 7 September).

The only explanation for 3CR's accepting this seems to be a panic reaction to the high cost of legal representation (which proved entirely worthless throughout the inquiry), and the general demoralization within the station as a result of certain internal problems which are mentioned in the version of this article appearing in *Nation Review*.

3CR won the battle hands down. But it failed to press home this victory to win the war. So the war may well continue.

Originally published in *Free Palestine*, No. 8, 1979, Melbourne, Australia.

Nazi-Zionist Collaboration:

Appendix C

Unilateral declaration by Radio 3CR

A, That consistent with

- (i) its general policy,
- (ii) its anti-racist policy,
- (iii) its policy that Zionism is a form of racism,
- (iv) its policy to exclude Zionist organizations and viewpoints from membership or 3CR's programming,
- (v) PBAA policies which it supports, and
- (vi) its determination to continue to broadcast Palestinian and anti-Zionist viewpoints through programs such as 'Palestine Speaks', 'Palestine Voice' and 'JAZA', and without prejudice to the above, the CRF makes the following statement of principles :

1. Community Radio Federation Limited (CRF) as a member the Public Broadcasting Association of Australia (PBAA) strongly supports the concept of self-regulation within broadcasting and holds that licenses should be assessed on the degree to which they have met their Promise of Performance and the PBAA's Code of Ethics at the time of the license renewal rather than have arbitrary standards imposed and enforced by Government regulatory bodies.

2. CRF, along with all broadcasting and publishers, has the right to decide its own editorial standards and to exclude from its programming any viewpoint which it considers contrary to the station's broadcasting guidelines.

3. CRF has no obligation to admit to its membership or to its broadcast facilities any person or organization. At any time community organizations may apply to the CRF for affiliation and such applications are always considered by the CRF on their merits and on the terms of the station's policies and guidelines. This applies to Paths to Peace and did apply to their former application and would continue to apply to any future applications.

4. CRF has developed a body of internal program guidelines which serve to ensure that its Articles of Association and Promise of Performance are not infringed. As further clarification of these standards by which 3CR assesses the suitability of broadcast material the following clause will be incorporated into the station's broadcasting guidelines.

Material will not be broadcast which is :

(A) threatening, abusive, or insulting and promotes hatred against or hostility towards groups of persons distinguished by their sex, race, religion, color or ethnic or national origins, or

(B) brings into contempt or ridicule groups of persons distinguished by their sex, race, religion, color or ethnic or national origins.

5. The CRF will raise at the PBAA Annual General Meeting the following clause for incorporation into that body's Code of Ethics :

'Broadcasters should adopt a policy for programming which opposes and

breaks down prejudice on the basis of race, nationality, ethnic background, sex or religion.'

6. Notwithstanding paragraphs 2 and 3 above, the station's broadcasting guidelines allow the opportunity for a person or an organization to apply to the Management Committee for the Right of Reply to broadcast material which maligns or misrepresents that person or organization or a section of the community which that person or organization substantially represents.

Such 'Right of Reply' is granted to make factual rebuttals to specific grievances (which must be set out in the complainant's application) related to that person or organization or a section of the community which that person or organization substantially represents.

Such 'Right of Reply' and the form it takes is entirely at 3CR's own discretion. It will be given in good faith, to people who apply in good faith.

7. CRF will incorporate clauses 4 and 6 into its self-regulatory machinery namely the station's broadcasting guidelines and will actively observe them.

8. CRF endorses the resolution of the PBAA which urges all broadcasters to avoid material which creates unnecessary or gratuitous offence.

B. This is a unilateral declaration by 3CR, 3CR will abide by any lawful directions from the Tribunal, but it will not voluntarily enter into any agreements, or give any undertakings, to the Board of Deputies, the Tribunal or any other outside body, since this would not be self-regulation.

NAZI-ZIONIST COLLABORATION 7 June, 1979 (Jews Against ZIONISM)

Evidence presented to the (1979) Australian Broadcasting Tribunal Inquiry into Melbourne Community Radio Station 3CR by **Jews Against Zionism and Anti-Semitism** a group based in Melbourne, Australia.

Click on the chapter headings below to access the material

CONTENTS

[Foreword by British Anti-Zionist Organisation – Palestinian Solidarity \(BAZO-PS\) 1981](#)

[Authors' Preface](#)

1. [INTRODUCTION](#)
2. [JEWISH COMMUNITY REACTIONS](#)
 - 2.1 Anti-Semitism and Anti-Zionism
 - 2.2 How Zionists stir up hostility to 3CR
 - 2.3 How Zionist misrepresentation of 3CR can be effective
3. [WHAT IS COLLABORATION?](#)
4. [HANNA ARENDT](#)

- 4.1 Zionist emigration and Gestapo expulsion
- 4.2 The Jewish Councils
- 4.3 The Zionist response to Arendt
- 4.4 The campaign backfires

- 5. THE KASTNER CASE
 - 5.1 Introduction
 - 5.2 The accusations
 - 5.3 The verdict
 - 5.4 The reaction
 - 5.5 The majority judgement
 - 5.6 The minority judgement
 - 5.7 Conclusion

- 6. THE BACKGROUND TO COLLABORATION
 - 6.1 Failure to support resistance
 - 6.2 Extremist Zionists and the Axis
 - 6.3 The Haganah reports to Eichmann
 - 6.4 Zionist priorities during the Holocaust
 - 6.5 Suppressing the news
 - 6.6 Zionist leaders admit inactivity
 - 6.7 A message Zionist leaders ignored
 - 6.8 Other Zionists accuse
 - 6.9 The very existence of the 'Jewish Agency' helped the Nazis

- 7. CLOSING THE DOORS
 - 7.1 Britain
 - 7.2 The USA
 - 7.3 Sweden
 - 7.4 Selectivity
 - 7.5 Australia

- 8. A DELIBERATE, CONSISTENT, AND SUCCESSFUL POLICY
 - 8.1 Choosing between the Jews and the Jewish State
 - 8.2 The Jewish Agency murders Jewish refugees
 - 8.3 Continuing Zionist threats to Jews
 - 8.4 A successful policy
 - 8.5 Honourable human behaviour and the State of Israel

- 9. BETRAYAL IN THE GHETTOS
 - 9.1 Jakob Gens
 - 9.2 Most collaborators were Zionists
 - 9.3 Only the Zionist Parties collaborated

- 10. ZIONISM IN GERMANY
 - 10.1 Opposing the boycott
 - 10.2 Endorsing Nazi racialist philosophy
 - 10.3 Ammunition for Nazi Anti-Semitism
 - 10.4 Assistance from the Gestapo
 - 10.5 Zionist takeover of the Jewish community

11. CONCLUSION

- 11.1 Zionist enthusiasm about the Holocaust
- 11.2 Is Rabbi Shonfeld also 'offensive'?
- 11.3 Internationalism versus self hatred

12. REFERENCE NOTES

APPENDIX A: [Proof of evidence from John Harvey Foster](#)

APPENDIX B: [The enquiry that never was](#)

APPENDIX C: [Unilateral declaration by Community Radio Station 3CR](#)

Créé par [anita](#)

Retrieved (Nov. 2005) from

<http://www.lastsuperpower.net/docs/nzcccontents>