

THE REVISIONIST CLARION

OOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOO

MONTHLY NEWSLETTER ABOUT HISTORICAL REVISIONISM
AND THE CRISIS OF IMPERIAL POWERS
OOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOO
TOWARDS THE DESTRUCTION OF ISRAEL
AND THE ROLLING BACK OF USA

Issue Nr. 10 - November 2004
oooooooooooooooooooo

<revclar@yahoo.com.au>
<<http://aloofhosting.com/revisionistclarion/index.html>>
oooooooooooooooooooo

**WHAT WE WANT :
THE DEMISE OF ISRAEL**

PALESTINE BELONGS TO PALESTINIANS

COLONIALISTS : LEAVE THE MIDDLE EAST

**IRAQ : THE QUAGMIRE
US OUT OF IRAQ
THE LONGER YOU STAY
THE MORE YOU'LL SUFFER**

RESISTANCE SHALL WIN

CONTENTS

The Vision of No-State By Israel Shamir

A Jew With a Program for Peace By Tom White

On target Scott Taylor

Bin Laden's wealth not the force behind 9/11

US payouts for Taliban and al-Qa'ida captures are attracting strange and dangerous adventurers to the 'Wild East' By **Kim**

Sengupta and **Paul Lashmar** and **Nick Meo** in Kabul

BUTZ REVIEWS HOGGAN'S BOOK

How Wars Are Made – Introduction by **Jackie Patru**

Poliakov, at last in the dustbin

Symposium: Feminist Anti-Semitism, By **Jamie Glazov**

Christian Zionism and its impact on justice, by **Dr Rev Stephen Sizer**

The Harvard Law Professor Who Sat On An Israeli Assassination Target Review Panel
Liaquat Ali Khan

You Can't Bomb Beliefs, **Naomi Klein**

Return to the Dark Ages - Censorship is on the rise. Is it coming to America? (II) by **Jared Taylor**

Interview of Norman Finkelstein by **Giovanni De Martis**, Grand Satrap

Concerning free speach and revisionism in Europe by **Lars Thirslund**

Books Seized from Fair on Jewish Outcry

France to distribute copies of 'Shoah' film in anti-hate drive

Sy Hersh: U.S. Soldiers Massacre Non-Combatant Iraqis

Professor Bruno Gollnisch in Lyon (France)

I am personally horrified that your state, after your fellow Jews had suffered from so much discrimination and hatred in Europe, should now oppress, rob and murder the indigenous people of Palestine, just because they are followers of Christianity or Islam. It is also extremely unpleasant to learn that your definition of who is a Jew, for the purpose of automatic accession to Israeli citizenship, owes nothing to Rabbinic teaching, but is based solely on the criteria defined by the Nazis.

Robert Thompson

In America, you may 'slander and libel' Germany as much as you like, and be paid for it, but you must not discuss the Jewish problem, you must not assert that there is a Jewish problem. **Douglas Reed**

STATE-MENT

The Vision of No-State

By **Israel Shamir**

In his discussion of a future desirable condition for Palestine/Israel, Noam Chomsky proposes to consider, besides the One State and Two State solutions, the possibility of "No-State." He writes:

"No-state settlement, generalizing multi-nationalism (in the broad sense indicated) beyond the borders of a state... based on the recognition that the nation-state system has been one of the most brutal and destructive creations of Europe ... For the region, it would mean reinstating some of the more sensible elements of the Ottoman system (though, obviously, without its intolerable features), including local and regional autonomy, elimination of borders and free transit, sharply diminishing or eliminating military forces, etc."

The No-State option should certainly be considered, but Chomsky actually proposes to 'reinstate' the Ottoman system of millets as a form of no-state. Millets were self-governing ethno-religious communities in the Turkish Empire, including Palestine. Thus, the Jewish, Armenian, Greek communities were rather autonomous, had their own courts and administration, collected taxes and instituted punishments. They formed non-territorial states within the Empire. In Europe, the Jews formed a millet until 18 c. and their leaders were quite content with it. Not so their dissidents: Spinoza suffered a lot after being pushed out of the Jewish millet.

If Noam Chomsky's proposal were to be implemented in the US today, he would find himself under the gentle rule of Messers Bronfman and Foxman, the titular heads of American Jewry. This idea is so close to apartheid that is indeed Tribes with Flags, in the idealised American pre-1950s form. While some cultural autonomy is created naturally, by people's preference, it would be a big mistake to legalise the segregation of peoples sharing the same territory. Chomsky proposes to use this idea in the partly Hispanic states of the US. He writes:

"Applied to North America, it would entail reversing Clinton's post-NAFTA militarization of the (previously quite porous) Mexico-US border, and dealing in a humane way with the fact that the US is sitting on half of Mexico, acquired by brutal conquest."

This sounds good but it is not: the Hispanic residents and Mexican immigrants would have to share their meagre resources and manage their "autonomy" facing the much more prosperous Anglos. Parallel systems of welfare would make the inequality even greater. In Europe, such a system would entail the creation of separate Muslim millet complete with its own courts, welfare, schools; it would set back the attempt to integrate immigrants.

Does this critique mean that no-state idea should be discarded? Not at all. But instead of non-territorial millets, we may support small semi-independent territorial communes, as envisaged by Marx in his Civil War in France and by Lenin in his The State and Revolution, or indeed by Plato in his Republic. Such a solution is extremely suitable for Palestine and for the US, and for the rest of the world.

In the US, it would solve many problems; people would be able to choose whether to live in a mixed or a separated community, a liberal or conservative one, with or without abortions and gay marriages, and would not be imposing their social vision upon others.

The federative framework consisting of independent units would not be an aggressive state prone to send troops to Iraq, but it would be able to organise its mutual self-defence. It would mean undoing the lifework of a Bismarck or Garibaldi, and good riddance, too!

Full autonomy for every commune would slow down if not eliminate migration flow and would help people to regain their roots. Indeed, let the people of Boston or Atlanta decide whether they want to accept immigration from Ghana or Sweden, instead of having this question decided for them by the New York-based media and Washington lobbies.

This was the rule in Switzerland: Alexander Herzen, a Russian noble and dissident of 19th century, discovered that the Swiss federal government had no power to grant citizenship or even rights of residence to a stranger; it was a prerogative of a local commune. This wise rule can be implemented today everywhere.

For the US, such transfer of power from Washington downstream to the grassroots, to states and to small autonomous communes, is extremely desirable. The current Presidential election campaign with identical twins Bush and Kerry is a clear sign that the political process in the Republic has reached an impasse. The preferred solution would be to leave Washington to care for the US Mail, while all other functions would be transferred to the states, during the first stage, and to communes during the second stage.

Relationship to local autonomy allows us to form a meaningful criterion to understand

political groups in modern society, in addition to the old left-right division. Parties and movements supportive of local power form a localist wing while parties supportive of the central government express the centralist tendency. Thus, the modern American liberal Left is in full union with the flag-worshipping right as they both prefer centralism and the federal powers against these of the states. On the other side, there is libertarian radical Left and 'paleo-conservative' individualist and traditional Right who have much in common.

Arms to the People

The centralists have an obsession with disarming people. This obsession begins with our manicure scissors being taken away at the airport check-in, it continues with Hollywood's paranoid hatred of American militias; it comes into full bloom with the drive to disarm Iran. This disarmers' obsession was characteristic of medieval Jews who feared most a moujik with an axe, who is liable to dismiss the legal intricacies and sweep away the carefully woven web of debt and deceit with one mighty blow.

The way to a new setup of independent communes lies through empowering of people by shifting the weight down to grass roots. In the American controversy of Montana militias, Vladimir Ilich Lenin would support the right of local folks to bear arms and to form militias. Like George Washington, Lenin considered the right to bear arms as an unalienable and most important right of people. Lenin would reject Bowling for Columbine as bourgeois demand for monopoly on arms. Indeed, it is a misunderstanding that Lenin, the leading libertarian of 20th century is considered totalitarian, while totalitarian American liberals, enemies of militias and of arms are considered proponents of freedom.

A leading American libertarian, Noel Ignatiev writes in his magazine *The Race Traitor*:

"Time was one might have expected opponents of official society to welcome a grassroots movement arming to defend individual liberties against federal encroachment. Contrary to such expectations, many who are pleased to locate themselves on the 'left' have raised a cry of alarm at the militia movement surpassing even that from government circles. A flyer published by a group that describes itself as 'Against Hate' seeks to warn the public about the militia movement. 'Blood will be spilled in the streets of America,' it quotes one militia leader saying. People join militias for various reasons, explains the flyer:

'They see the violence at Waco, Texas or the incident between white supremacist Randy Weaver and federal officials and believe they too will be attacked; others see the ban on assault weapons in 1994 as a sure sign that the Federal Government is out to subvert the Constitution.'

'The Government did make mistakes at Waco and with Randy Weaver,' admits the flyer. So the incineration of eighty people and the assassination of a woman and child by federal officials are 'mistakes,' when they happen to people these opponents of 'hate' disagree with. But the militias are paranoid, we are told. 'They believe that there will be an armed confrontation with the Federal Government sooner or later. Militias say that our [our?] government and the United Nations are going to create the New World Order, where Americans will be slaves to international bankers and if you resist, militia leaders claim, you'll be hauled away to a concentration camp.'

"If the authors of the flyer expect these views to turn us against the militias, they will be disappointed. So far we have agreed with the opinions cited above. The flyer advises us, 'The key to protecting the rights and civil liberties of all Americans does not lie in forming armed paramilitary groups who want to take the law into their own hands.' We can think of no better way. We think it was Dwight Macdonald who said that what gave him hope for the future of this country was the deeply ingrained tradition of lawlessness."

In an American context, "arms-to-the-people" was and remains a valuable slogan. Activists-for-disarmament like Daniel Lazare of the Nation weekly manifest their deep distrust of the general populace; they are 'Hobbesian' in their belief that the State acts as an arbiter and a benevolent policeman. Indeed, Lazare wants people disarmed and forced to conform to his set of ideas focusing on gay marriages and active anti-racism. In order to enforce this vision, Lazare accepts a high degree of centralism. Thus he constructs the left leg of the centralist and aggressive America of Pentagon and Wall Street.

For left and right radicals, the State is a form of Mafia-like control in the interests of the rulers; it should be limited and eventually dismantled. Let people bear arms; let them decide

their civil matters locally, let us shift power to the grassroots, whether in Palestine, in Europe or in the US. There is no chance within the two-party system to have a good president of the US: both Bush and Kerry will bomb Iran and suppress freedom. Thus the office of the president and of the central government should be emptied of its powers; in order to achieve it the localist left and right should join forces, confront and reject centralist tendencies.

Sep 21, 2004,

< http://www.axisoflogic.com/artman/publish/article_11995.shtml >

A VOICE IN THE WILDERNESS

A Jew With a Program for Peace

By Tom White

Israel Shamir is an Israeli writer who marches to the beat of a distinctly different drummer. He lives in Jaffa and pops up here and there around the world-Malaysia, Russia, England, Spain, but not-not that I know of-in the U.S. His emails, however, in English and sometimes French, span the globe, and they are intensely interesting to anyone, like myself, trying to make heads or tails of the present international scene. Shamir was born in Novosibirsk in Siberia, a grandson of a professor of mathematics. He is a descendant of a rabbi from Tiberius in Palestine. He read math and law at Novosibirsk University. In 1969 he immigrated to Israel and fought as a paratrooper in the 1973 war. I would guess he was then in his 20s and therefore is now in his 50s. There followed several years as a freelance journalist covering the last stages of the Southwest Asian war in Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia.

In 1975 he moved to London and joined the BBC. In the late 70s he lived in Tokyo and worked for the Israeli daily Maariv. He published his first book there, *Travels with My Son*. He returned to Israel in 1980, worked for Haaretz and other papers, was in the Knesset as spokesman for the Israeli socialist party, published a number of translations from English (for example, Joyce's *Ulysses*), and from Hebrew, and advanced his own writings. His most popular work is *The Pine and the Olive*, the story of Israel and Palestine and their near-fatal embrace.

But Shamir's life, though astonishing-as is his evident skill with many languages-is not so astonishing as his present intellectual position. A highly visible and, I should say quite distinguished Israeli writer, he has become a Christian and is a radical opponent of the entire Zionist enterprise. In the emails I mention he advances his views with zero regard for anybody's notion of political correctness. To sign up for his emails go to

<http://groups.yahoo.com/group/shamireaders/>

His website is www.israelshamir.net

(As I write a Shamir essay is featured on his home page, "The Stumbling Block: How 'The Passion of the Christ' may help bring Peace to the Middle East." Shamir contends that Gibson's film has broken through the dizzy thrall of the evangelical "rapture" Christians and shown them that the alliance of Christ-hating Zionists and Christ-loving Christians was an absurdity from the beginning. May it be so.)

My best guess is that Shamir remains a socialist of some sort, but he does not seem to write about that much. I tend to personally lament that position, if he holds it, since socialism seems to me a bankrupt social program, as I believe has been convincingly demonstrated by Shamir's fellow Russian, Igor Shafarevitch, in his great book *The Socialist Phenomenon*. Shamir does, however, write much about his view that the only solution to the Israeli-Palestinian battle is to go to a single state, "one man, one vote," and proceed to live in peace and tolerance. I am not sure whether this is proof of invincible innocence, naiveté, and sheer Panglossian optimism, or whether it is indeed, as he evidently thinks it is, the only decent human answer to a crying human and horrible dilemma. In any case he deplores the brutality of the present Israel stance and would end it at once if he had power.

My reason for writing about Shamir now is to call attention to a recent email in which, in a

few strokes, he reviews some high points of Western history since Christ and gives a striking slant to them from the point of view of someone who takes seriously the long-running effort of the "revolutionary Jew"-in the sense that E. Michael Jones has used that term in recent issues of this magazine-to impose his ethos on the entire world, it being understood that Zionism is just the most recent phase of a determined opposition to the Christian order that goes back all the way. (I think Shamir's term, "Masters of Discourse" can be taken for present purposes as a rough equivalent of Jones's "revolutionary Jew.") Shamir says things I can hardly imagine any gentile saying without falling under indictment as a wicked anti-Semite. What he has up for description is the famous "elephant in the living room" that nobody is supposed to notice or mention: the extraordinary assertiveness and effectiveness of a tiny Jewish minority in political and cultural affairs, most notably in the U.S. lately in the heavily Jewish and warlike neoconservative domination of our foreign policy with its marked pro-Israel bias.

Despite his open hostility to Sharon and all he stands for, however, Shamir appears to go back and forth from Israel unimpeded by government. For all the government's iniquity, Israel seems to be relatively open to disagreement among its citizens, perhaps more than we are with our notorious and pusillanimous self-censorship. In the email I cite, Shamir records a talk he gave in Spain to launch there his book, *The Green Rain of Yasuf or Masters of Discourse*. The same book is called *The Flowers of Galilee* in English (Tempe, Arizona: Dandelion Books, 2004) and *The Other Face of Israel* in French. (I am unable to find any other Shamir titles on Amazon.) Shamir complimented the Spanish on their decision to pull their troops out of Iraq. And then said something I think quite true:

When I wrote so [that the war was about Israel] in the series of articles presented in this book over a year ago, it was a wild opinion shared by a selected few; while majority was fed by stories of a war for liberation of Iraqis, a war for democracy in Iraq, a war to terror, a war to stop Saddam's WMD, or a war for oil. A year passed and all these explanations vanished like smoke in the night. No WMD were found in devastated Iraq; no connections to al-Qaeda were revealed by tortured prisoners of Abu Ghraib and Guantanamo; liberation of Iraq turned out to be the brutal occupation regime; as for oil, at the beginning of the war, oil price stood at 20 dollar a barrel, while now it is about 40 dollars. The oil companies that were blamed for pushing for the war, are pulling out of Iraq, and oil production is well below its pre-war levels. On 29th of April, 2004, the Guardian reported that BP decided to leave Iraq saying that the oil company has no future there. It leaves us exactly with one reason for war, the reason we stated over a year ago. Sometimes it is called 'the war for Israel', but this definition misses the point: the state of Israel does not need this war for its safety; Israelis do not need this war for their well-being. The Jews can live as equals in Palestine or elsewhere; but they want to dominate water, land and souls of the others. For this reason they kill children and ruin homes of Palestinians in Gaza and Iraqis in Faluja. This is the war for Jewish supremacy waged by the US adepts of this concept, against the principle of equality of all dwellers in the Holy Land. In such a war, Spain has no reason to side with the forces of Jewish supremacy, to provide cover for mass destructions in Palestine and for mass tortures in Guantanamo.

After this start, Shamir keeps going. He is a determined blaster of tidy, time-honored notions of history, particularly, I might remark- with a touch of Irish Schadenfreude-those that are over-kind to our English brethren. For example, it is an old English custom to go on and on about how bad the Spaniards were as colonizers. Here is Shamir: Spain had no reason to fight for Jewish racism as your country has a glorious anti-racist record often distorted in modern Jewish narrative, which became the dominant Anglo-American discourse. You are blamed for so-called Expulsion of 1492. But majority of exiled Jews came back, gave up their racist tradition of superiority, agreed to share bread and wine with other Spaniards-for that is the meaning of Eucharist-and became honourable citizens of Spain. S Teresa of Avila and S Juan de la Cruz are the shining examples of their glory.

On the other hand, England under Cromwell accepted the exiled Jews and received kudos from the Masters of Discourse for this deed. They do not speak of its connection with fencing out the English commoners, with massacre of Irish peasants and Scots, and with massive genocide of Native Americans in their colonies, but the regimes that are 'good for Jews' are rarely good for anybody else. The same Masters of Discourse vilify Spain for its treatment of Native Americans. But in the end, Spaniards married natives and brought forward the modern nations of Latin

America, while the North American colonists, who were very good to Jews and considered themselves 'new Jews', killed off almost all natives and transferred the remainder into reservations.

I remember just this point being made (without reference to the influence of Judaism) by Garrett Mattingly, author of *The Armada*, when I took a course in European history under him at Columbia in 1947. I never forgot it. He said the Spanish and Portuguese accepted Indians as fellow human beings; the great Bartolomé de las Casas argued that very thing before Spanish legists. They left the native gene pool (if that is the correct term) in place; in fact they joined in it. The English goal was racist-to extirpate it. That is one reason I do not join in the anti-Hispanic frenzy with quite the enthusiasm of some of my "Anglo" neighbors here in Texas; the Indians owned the place to begin with, and, God-willing, may be good for it in the long run. Shamir deals with 20th century Russia and the U.S., their cold war, and where the U.S. is today in a paragraph of striking force and simplicity that points to a grim future (unless):

Indeed it is a mistake to think that theology is an irrelevant occupation of useless clerics, while only material possessions matter. Theology is the deep foundation courses on which the palace of a society is built. Without foundations, the palace will collapse at a blow of a strong wind, let alone earthquake. It was the reason of Soviet collapse: quasi-religious communism had no strong theological foundation and did not survive. In the 'neo-Jewish' US, the Judaic paradigm came forth in place of apostolic Christianity, and with it the New World Order of dwindling middle class, vast security apparatus, growing social gap and impoverishment of spirit. It is not the first time the Judaic paradigm rises in the world; but such societies invariably collapse for they lack broad social base. Now its adepts decided to ensure its survival by making it globe-wide; this is the reason of wars and expansion, for their design would not survive on any smaller scale. And here is a revisionist look at World War II and the tired political face-off of "left" and "right" :

The tragic and destructive confrontation of Left and Right reached its peak in your [Spanish] Civil War and at the World War Two, where the two great anti-bourgeois movements, 'left and right disciples of Hegel' shed their blood ad majoram US gloriam, to the greater glory of the neo-Judaic US, the ultimate winner of war. . . .

Nowadays we have pseudo-Left and pseudo-Right, for there is no difference between Thatcher and Blair, Bush and Kerry - both equally support Israel in its drive for supremacy. In Spain and France, the left and the right-wing newspapers were united in their condemnation of *The Passion of The Christ* by Mel Gibson as 'offensive to Jews'. Thus, instead of Left and Right, we have a new dichotomy, a new split, by attitude to Judaic supremacy. Today the US fights the Muslims for Israel, but Huntington, the leading theorist of the war, already calls to contain the Hispanics in the US, as they are not sufficiently devoted to the Jewish cause Shamir's last words to his Spanish audience are moving, particularly so because of his appeal to the central Christian tradition of Spain:

Spain has an important role to play, for Spain is inherently connected with the Land of Christ and St. James, your favourite saint whom you call Santiago. This Palestinian fisherman was beheaded by orders of Sharon's predecessor, King Herod Antipas, and his head was taken by his disciples to your shores to be interned in Santiago de Compostella, but his heart remained buried in Jerusalem, and Cathedral of St James rose above his tomb equally venerated by Palestinian Christians and Muslims, for in our land Christians and Muslims live together in great peace and harmony sharing same places of veneration and-no less important-same enemy. Their enemy is not 'the Jew', for Jews can live peacefully with Spaniards and Palestinians, but the spirit of Judaic supremacy, which has to be defeated and it will be defeated.

For my part I take heart from the assurance of this Jew, Shamir, that our common enemy is not the Jew, or Jews, but "the spirit of Judaic supremacy." I leave it to Shamir to castigate Sharon and the government of Israel for their hideous campaign of domination over Palestinians. I intend to concentrate on writing and praying against the equally hideous campaign of domination of the world indulged in by our resident U.S. regime, staunch allies of Sharon and conductors of an illegitimate war against an aggrieved people in Iraq. We have been irreversibly shamed by the overall conduct of the war with its slaughter of innocents and now by

the awful photos and stories of torture from Abu Ghraib. We have been set before the world as enemies of peace and decency in a way we shall never live down, and in fact don't deserve to live down.

Shamir, who does not get much mention in the "respectable" press, seems to me a noble spirit and a penetrating analyst of the world scene today. His love of Christ, of the Holy Land, of the Palestinians, and indeed of his fellow Jews, shines in his writing. I shall be interested to see if my notion of him as a giant of world literature (based, I admit, on a very limited reading of his works), and as a paradigm of virtuous political protest, holds up in the years ahead. My guess is it will.

Tom White's article on Israel Shamir and his book *Galilee Flowers* appeared in the *Culture Wars Magazine*, in the July-August issue.

HARROWING DAYS IN IRAQ

On target

Scott Taylor

From Sept. 7 to 11, I spent four harrowing days as a hostage of the Ansar al-Islam terrorist group in northern Iraq. Originally captured in the embattled enclave of Tal Afar, I spent a lot of my captivity being transported between various safe houses, farms and hideouts before eventually being released beside a highway in the city of Mosul.

Although I spent a lot of that time blindfolded and bound, I was still able to get a first-hand view of the Iraqi resistance and how it operates.

According to the Turkish intelligence official who debriefed me after my release, the Ansar al-Islam organization has never before freed a westerner, so I realize that such insight is extremely rare. The most startling observation that I made was that members of the mostly American-funded, newly constituted Iraqi Police Service are working openly alongside the resistance.

It was a police officer at the Tal Afar checkpoint who first instructed me to climb into a car full of masked gunmen. I had falsely presumed that if a dozen uniformed Iraqi police were present, then those wearing the hood must be some sort of special-force unit allied with the American and government forces. Only when it was too late did I realize that the police had handed me over to the Ansar al-Islam - the very same mujahedeen that the Americans are paying the Iraqi police to eliminate.

I saw several other similar examples of police collusion over the next few days. As we drove through checkpoints, the mujahedeen in our six-car convoy made no attempt to hide their Kalashnikovs and rocket-propelled grenades from view. The other prisoners and I were in the back seats, our bonds clearly visible, but the police on duty made no effort whatsoever to intervene. In fact these "cops" displayed broad smiles as they shouted encouragement to the resistance fighters and offered them cigarettes.

"They support the Emir (resistance leader) in Mosul," I was told by one of my captors. "Many of the police here donate part of their U.S. salaries to our cause. So, indirectly, America is paying to fund the Iraqi resistance."

It was also readily apparent that it is not only the police who support those who have taken up arms against the "occupiers." On the road out of Tal Afar, we encountered small groups of young boys and men who gathered to cheer the mujahedeen. The fighters shook hands with the well-wishers and took from them gifts of food, cigarettes and water.

Another thing I found amazing was the sheer enormity and complexity of the resistance network. The Tal Afar fighters were an Islamic fundamentalist group composed mostly of Iraqi Turkmen. However, during the course of my captivity, these mujahedeen received support and assistance from ethnic Kurdish groups and former Baath party members. In the end, we were handed over to members of an Arab cell who referred to themselves as "the pupils," and it was

these fundamentalist extremists who tortured and threatened me with beheading.

From what I could determine, the various factions in Iraq - regardless of ethnicity or religious basis - are all working together toward the common goal of battling the American occupation. Munitions and hostages seem to be easily transferred among the different groups, along with the provision of safe houses.

From the setup at the house where I was tortured, the facility must have been frequently used for this purpose as all the necessary equipment - batons, rods, ropes, blindfolds, etc. - were carefully stored in the small anteroom that served as the torture chamber. And I noticed that the gear was carefully stored after its use on me.

The building itself was a large unoccupied house in a wealthy district of Mosul's northern suburbs. The crew of pupils that entered to prepare the facility for our interrogations seemed to know exactly what was expected of them. They moved quickly through the house, covering the windows with blankets.

Similarly, the last home where I was taken before my release was also well stocked with all the necessary equipment to house and guard a prisoner: handcuffs, chains, shackles, blindfolds, duct tape and various handguns - not exactly your average household accessories.

Travelling with the resistance, I also had the opportunity to see just how limited the Americans are in terms of being able to contain the widening insurgency. On two separate occasions, our convoy and safe houses were approached by American helicopter gunships and armoured vehicles. The mujahedeen had displayed no alarm under these circumstances and, in both instances, the American forces turned away without investigating the convoy's presence.

"We know exactly where and when they will patrol," said one of the mujahedeen. "They see only what we want them to see."

The stockpiles of ammunition and weaponry stored in the bunker in Tal Afar indicated to me that before this latest offensive, the resistance conducted a long-term buildup and that they are fully capable of mounting a protracted struggle against the Americans. As for the heretofore-quiet city of Mosul, this appears to be a ticking time bomb set to explode against an already over-stretched American garrison.

It looked to me as though the Americans have yet to realize they are sitting on top of a bustling anthill of Iraqi resistance. More than ever, I'm convinced now that the U.S. army cannot possibly win this peace.

And having seen things from the inside, I would say that things will only get worse, much worse, for the Americans in Iraq in the months leading up to the proposed January 2005 elections.

The Halifax Herald, September 20, 2004

<http://www.herald.ns.ca/stories/2004/09/20/fOpinion197.raw.html>

HOAXES AND LIES EXPOSED

Bin Laden's wealth not the force behind 9/11

Washington (AP) -- Recent investigations into al Qaeda, including by the September 11 commission, have substantially altered the commonly held view that Osama bin Laden's inheritance and massive fortune are being used to finance his international terror operations. While bin Laden isn't poor, he's not worth the \$300 million once believed. Nor is he thought to be directly financing his terror group with his personal wealth or a network of businesses in Sudan, where he operated from 1991 to 1996.

"There has been a revision of collective thinking," said Kenneth Katzman, a Congressional Research Service expert who has studied terror groups. "The new thinking is that bin Laden's fortune didn't really enter into al Qaeda that much, or wasn't the driving force in al Qaeda." The report from the September 11 commission concluded that al Qaeda has many financing avenues

and could easily find new sources, particularly given the attack's price tag of just \$400,000 to \$500,000 over two years.

While the report said the government has been unable to determine the source of the attack's financing, the commission said it appears al Qaeda's financial support doesn't come from bin Laden personally. "The CIA now estimates that it costs al Qaeda about \$30 million per year to sustain its activities before 9/11 and that this money was raised almost entirely through donations," the report said.

The belief that bin Laden was worth such staggering sums gathered steam shortly after the September 11, 2001, attacks when Katzman released a report -- drawing on a 1996 State Department fact sheet, he said recently -- indicating that al Qaeda was tapping bin Laden's \$300 million personal fortune, along with other sources. By February 2002, Katzman had updated the estimate, indicating that bin Laden may be worth anywhere from \$50 million to \$300 million, but that the group had apparently become self-sustaining. The change got little notice.

Charitable contributions

Bin Laden was believed to have inherited money from his father, who oversaw the growth of a construction empire, making the bin Ladens one of the richest families in Saudi Arabia. The 17th of 52 children, bin Laden was thought primarily to be using the money to finance operations in Afghanistan and Sudan, as well as to help him secure his place as the leader of al Qaeda. The Sudanese businesses were believed to include an Islamic bank, an import-export firm, and other operations that exported agricultural products. But the September 11 commission said that the businesses did not provide significant income, and that when bin Laden left in 1996, it appears the Sudanese government took his assets.

"He left Sudan with practically nothing," the commission found. "When bin Laden arrived in Afghanistan, he relied on the Taliban until he was able to reinvigorate his fund-raising efforts by drawing on ties to wealthy Saudi individuals that he had established during the Afghan war in the 1980s." Responding to an inquiry from a Senate panel late last year, the Treasury Department's Office of Foreign Assets Control said the overstated estimates about bin Laden's wealth and his financial backing of al Qaeda actually trivialized the threat posed by his group.

Perhaps even more dangerous, bin Laden's benefit to radical Islam is that he -- "coming from a wealthy and influential family" -- was considered a trusted person and had the ability to receive and dispose of charitable money, the office wrote in a memo, obtained by The Associated Press in April. Bin Laden could then direct the money to support local institutions in many countries, in an attempt to radicalize those communities and give him a base to recruit and train.

Still, bin Laden is not thought to be poor. U.S. officials found information in early 2000 indicating that from 1970 to 1994 bin Laden received \$1 million a year, the September 11 commission found. Bin Laden was effectively cut off from the money in a 1994 crackdown, the commission said, when the Saudi government revoked his citizenship, forced his family to find a buyer for his share of the company and later froze the proceeds of that sale. His family disavowed him. However, in a recent interview with the AP, bin Laden's estranged sister-in-law said she does not believe that family members have cut him off entirely.

Carmen Binladin, who has changed the spelling of her name and lives in Switzerland, said bin Laden is not the only religious brother in the family, and she expects his sisters support him, too. "They are very close to Osama," she said. Today, U.S. authorities do not believe bin Laden is tied to businesses anywhere, given that he is in hiding, said a counterterrorism official, speaking on the condition of anonymity.

"There is no doubt that he and his organization have been financially hurt and have had trouble moving money around," said the official, who couldn't put a dollar figure on bin Laden's worth now. "That said, the al Qaeda organization still has the capability and financial wherewithal to plan and launch terrorist attacks."

<<http://www.cnn.com/2004/WORLD/meast/09/02/binladen.wealth.ap/index.html>>

FOR A HANDFUL OF DOLLARS

US payouts for Taliban and al-Qa'ida captures are attracting strange and dangerous adventurers to the 'Wild East'

By **Kim Sengupta** and **Paul Lashmar** and **Nick Meo** in Kabul

11 July 2004. It was a discovery startling and disturbing even by the standards of the anarchic violence of Afghanistan. Prisoners hanging upside down in a private prison, tortured by heavily armed soldiers of fortune seeking the millions of dollars in bounty on offer from the Americans. The arrest of Jack Idema and two companions after a shootout in Kabul gave a glimpse of a savage and largely unreported war taking place in the shadow of the Iraq conflict, and the assortment - mercenaries and misfits, fortune-seekers and fantasists - who have come to take part. Idema, now in custody of the notorious Afghan security chief, Baba Jan, in many ways epitomises these latter-day men who would be king in this part of the "Wild East". His is a colourful background across three continents: author, adventurer and convict.

Some of us first met "Jack" in 2001, when the Taliban had retreated from Kabul, victorious Northern Alliance fighters were parading in the streets, and US and British forces were pouring into Bagram airbase. A dapper man in a black T-shirt and combat trousers, a Glock pistol strapped in his shoulder holster, Idema gave a graphic account of his supposed experiences as a former US army Green Beret who had trained with the SAS and, as an adviser to the Tajik and Uzbek militias, had helped plan the operation to take the Afghan capital.

The meeting took place at the Mustafa Hotel, then being built in the city centre. It was another example of the seemingly endless carpetbagging opportunities then on offer. The owners were, and continue to be, a family of Afghan expatriates from New Jersey, the hotel named after one of three brothers. Sipping whiskey, then retailing at \$140 a bottle at the Chelsi supermarket off Chicken Street, Idema offered to organise a convoy to Tora Bora, where the Taliban and al-Qa'ida were making what was thought to be their last stand and where, the Americans were confident, Osama bin Laden was trapped.

After making a few checks with the British military, some of us decided to decline his offer. Those who went were robbed at gunpoint a quarter of the way through the journey by their "guards" and made their way, bedraggled, back to Kabul. Jack professed to be outraged. He would take the matter up immediately with his "good friends" General Quononi, the new Defence Minister, and Abdul Rashid Dostum, the warlord, and the bandits would be summarily executed.

After that Idema would regularly turn up at the Intercontinental Hotel, where most of the foreign journalists were staying, attempting to sell videos and photographs purporting to show Taliban and al-Qa'ida terrorists training for assassinations and rehearsing gas attacks using dogs.

Some of these were bought for large sums of money, and one tape was shown on American network TV. However, Idema later declared he was going to sue over alleged breach of contract, and also threatened to "punch out" Geraldo Rivera and a Fox TV presenter in a dispute over the recordings.

Idema had also taken legal action against the director Stephen Spielberg and his DreamWorks production company, accusing them of plagiarising a biographical book he had written, *Red Bull Rising*, in making a film, *The Peacemaker*, with George Clooney and Nicole Kidman. Idema, who was said to be demanding a \$130m settlement, maintained that Clooney's character, a special forces soldier who heroically prevents rogue Russian soldiers from exporting a nuclear warhead to Iran, was based on his own life in Lithuania, where he worked as an "undercover intelligence source".

His mission, undertaken on behalf of "private interests", was sabotaged by the CIA and FBI, he claims, because he was exposing deals with terrorists that embarrassed President Bill Clinton's attempts to improve relations with the Russians. Idema has co-authored another book, *Taskforce Dagger: the Hunt for Bin Laden*, with Robin Moore, who wrote *The French Connection* and *The Happy Hooker*, in which he develops his theme of playing a pivotal part in the fall of the Taliban. The cover has a dramatic picture of him, bare-chested, semi-automatic rifle in his hand, flanked by two Afghan guerrillas.

Back in America, however, Idema, known as Keith rather than Jack, was known for another type of combat - paintball. He ran a magazine called *Paintball Planet* and produced "combat helmets" for the game. It was while running another company, Idema Combat Systems, which sold military clothing and equipment, that he was convicted in 1994 of swindling 60 companies out of \$200,000. Sentencing Idema to three years in federal prison, the judge ordered that he should undertake psychological tests. Timothy Connolly, then an assistant secretary of defence at the Pentagon, appeared as a character witness for the defence. Records show that Idema served with the 11th Special Forces Group as a "rigger" - essentially a supporting role ensuring that equipment and supplies reached those in the frontline.

Whatever Idema's credentials are, the fact remains that he and others like him are common sights in Afghanistan. They have an eye for bounty, the top prize being the \$25m offered by the US government for Osama bin Laden. There are also claims that some are involved in heroin trafficking - in the country that produces three-quarters of the world supply - and smuggling antiquities.

The Mustafa, now much expanded, is the favourite hangout in Kabul. Men in cropped hair, camouflage clothing and keffiyehs, packing guns, lounge in the Irish Bar, drinking bourbon with the Thai girls flown in to work at the hotel's new massage parlour.

Some operating in this murky world do indeed have official connections. David Passaro, a former Green Beret who arrived on a CIA security contract, is currently under arrest, accused of beating a 28-year-old Afghan detainee to death. US federal prosecutors have filed a protective order seeking to restrict the use of classified material at his trial.

The war on terror is lavishly funded when it comes to bounties. The US State Department is offering \$340m in bounties for information leading the capture or killing of 30 top suspects worldwide. The reward for Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, the al-Qa'ida commander believed to be a leading player in the Iraqi insurgency, was recently doubled to \$25m, the same as Saddam Hussein and Bin Laden. So far, \$56m has been paid out internationally. Small wonder, then, that all kinds of adventurers are now buzzing round this honeypot.

<http://news.independent.co.uk/world/asia/story.jsp?story=539995>

HOW REVIONISTS WORK

BUTZ REVIEWS HOGGAN'S BOOK

In November 1976 Prof. Arthur R. Butz received a letter from Noontide Press, publishers of *The Myth of the Six Million* Noontide had read on p. 12 of the first British edition of *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century* that Butz considers "Myth" a "terrible" book, and asked for an explanation. The problems involved faults in Harwood's *Did Six Million Really Die?*, in connection with which negative comments were also made on p. 12 of "Hoax" (note that the page has been altered slightly in subsequent editions). Here we republish Butz's reply to Noontide, complete except for four unimportant deletions.

28 November 1976

Mr. Lewis Brandon
The Noontide Press
P.O. Box 76062
Los Angeles. California 90005

Dear Mr. Brandon:
(paragraph deleted at request of A. R. Butz)

Some of your comments are difficult to understand. It is true that in my book *The Hoax of the twentieth century* I do not specifically point out that *Myth* was the first book in English, but that fact is clearly implicit in my discussion of the prior literature. Moreover I do not make the preposterous assumption "that American and English readers on a large scale read the books of Rassinier at a time when they existed only in French and German. I don't know what you are thinking about. Perhaps you are thinking of my remark that *Myth* was "a clear retrogression in relation to the prior work of Rassinier." I think that, when I first read the book, I noted the material in the appendices concerning Rassinier. and naturally assumed that author and publisher. being aware of these works. had taken them into account in some sense, so that the implication was that *Myth* was supposed to represent some sort of advance over Rassinier. That a "college professor" would be familiar with significant works in his own field in French seemed axiomatic to me. Thus. when I made my negative evaluation of *Myth*, I must also have implicitly made a negative evaluation of Rassinier. because I didn't take the trouble to get Rassinier's books until much later. after my own research, it turned out, had gone beyond Rassinier. Therefore, although it is true that I first read of Rassinier's books in *Myth*, it is difficult for me to acknowledge an intellectual debt in even that sense.

I used the word "terrible" in the sense of *Myth's* intellectual content. The judgment was not made in relation to any other work, such as Rassinier's or mine. The book can be shown to be unforgivably deficient in terms of the least demanding standards of scholarship that a sane man could admit.

At the time *Myth* was written, the principal expression of the extermination claims had become Reitlinger's book, as minted out in *Hitler's*. Hilberg's book only appeared in 1961. The evidence for Reitlinger's claims is and was mainly the Nuremberg Trial's materials. One would therefore think it perfectly obvious that a book such as *Myth* would closely consider the specific claims that the leading bearers of the legend had made and also the specific Nuremberg evidence. This is where *Myth* fails, The sad fact is that it does not merely treat the problem inadequately. It never really addresses itself to the right problems, and that is the main reason why it is terrible. The author wrote on only a hazy conception of the specific claims, and he seems to not know a damn thing about the Nuremberg testimonies and documents.

Consider the last point. There are a very large number of wartime German documents available to researchers, both those that were put into evidence at Nuremberg and some others. Many of these are cited by Reitlinger and others as support for their claims, so it is obvious that the author of *Myth* had at least some responsibility to say something about what is in the wartime German documents. What does *Myth* have to say? As far as I could see on my recent rereading of the book, there are only three points where reference is made to a document. First. on p. 52 there is a reference to the protocol of the Wannsee Conference (which did take place). However the author of *Myth* does not take the elementary step of

telling us that there is nothing about extermination in the protocol, only deportation to the East. Second, on pp. 82ff there is a reference to Reitlinger's mention of the alleged protocol of a meeting between Hitler and Horthy. Since Reitlinger himself pointed out (p. 416n of the 1953 edition and p. 450n of the 1968 edition) that the Dr. Schmidt whose Nuremberg testimony constitutes the evidence for the authenticity of the alleged protocol changed his story in his later book, you would think that *Myth* would at least pass this fact on to us. Alas it does not even rise to this and, indeed, we do in fact get more valuable treatments of the documents from the other camp. Third, on p. 90 there is a reference to a "memorandum" by Goebbels (actually the "Goebbels Diaries") and again *Myth* does not raise the obvious questions of authenticity (see pp. 195 & 197 of *Hoax*) and also suppresses the fact that there is indeed material in the "Diaries" that supports the extermination legend. This is all we get from *Myth* on the subject of wartime German documents. Stop and reflect on this. This "college professor" in producing a work on the true nature of German policies in a certain area has not bothered to refer to German documents of the time as being relevant to his subject in some sense. except for the flimsy and ineptly executed exceptions noted. That transcends mere weak scholarship.

If we now proceed to consider what *Myth* reports was said at Nuremberg, we are again appalled. On p. 63 we are told that Morgen and Pohl testified that they had known nothing about an extermination program during the war, In fact. both men testified that an extermination program had existed and that they had learned about it during the war. This testimony was given for the self-serving reasons that I gave in *Hoax* in Ch. 6. In the case of Pohl indeed, his testimony, that he knew of the existence of the program and had even seen gas chambers at Auschwitz is printed on p. 664ff of the very same volume that *Myth* cites in connection with Pohl. However, that is not all to note in this connection. We also read on p. 63 that "all the testimony permitted Pohl at his trial is confined to seven pages in Trials of War Criminals, vol. 5. pp. 555ff". Here the author has revealed his own complete incompetence to handle the subject, because he shows that he does not understand the difference between the complete trials transcripts (in which the Pohl testimony runs to over 800 pages) on the one hand and on the other hand the selected documents and excerpts from testimony that were published in the 15 volume set that I refer to in *Hoax* as the "NMT volumes" which historians refer to as the "green series" and which is woefully inadequate in itself, for studying the 12 trials covered.

Indeed the situation seems even more horrid, because there are not "seven" pages of Pohl testimony reproduced in the volume cited in *Myth*, but about seventy. and I don't think a misprint is involved there, because there is indeed Pohl testimony on pp. 555-563. and the rest that is reproduced is in bits that are scattered around in 8 other sections in the volume. Moreover, in a footnote that appears at the beginning of each of these sections, the page numbers of the Pohl testimony in the complete transcript are given. What is strongly suggested, therefore, is that the author of *Myth* actually relied on some intermediate source for his remarks about Pohl's testimony, and did not even attain the "green series" point in his "study" of the Nuremberg Trials! Mind now that the point involved here isn't just the number of pages of Pohl testimony: that, would be nitpicking. The point is that the author doesn't know the first thing about using the Nuremberg Trials records.

Now let us raise the second major question suggested above. Has the author attempted to consider and reply to the specific extermination claims that are made?

To put essentially the same question in a more practical way, can I read a book such as Reitlinger's, after I have made myself familiar with the contents of *Myth*, and feels that *Myth* confronts Reitlinger to a respectable extent? Alas, no. *Myth* either fails to make the simplest confrontations, or makes losing confrontations. An example of the former is *Myth*'s failure to bring out the fact that the hoaxers have had the colossal audacity to claim that the well known and widely used insecticide, Zyklon B was the source of the gas used for mass exterminations at Auschwitz. The very oblique reference to that fact in connection with the remark about Gerstein in the first paragraph on p. 75 is no satisfactory substitute for the point that should have been made. An example of the second form of a failure to confront arises if we read in Reitlinger (pp. 130ff of 1968 edition) that Morgen testified that he had known during the war that the extermination camps had existed. Since we read the opposite in *Myth* our hopes are raised: at last we have a specific confrontation, and we can dig up the Morgen testimony for confirmation but, alas, we find that Reitlinger is right, and *Myth* dead wrong. *Myth* is a total failure in the sense of confrontation with the bearers of the legend.

The preceding represents an expert evaluation but I think a non-expert evaluation is also of considerable interest. So let me tell you my reactions to *Myth* when I first read it in, I think, 1970, when I was a propagandized American but nevertheless willing to be convinced on the subject of the six million. I thought the book sort of rambled inconclusively. There were a couple of points, which I don't remember now, that I tried without success to confirm, but there was another that I remember most clearly. I thought that the book's strongest point was the claimed International Red Cross estimate (p. 102) of a 300,000 figure for "loss of victims of persecution because of politics, race or religion who died in prisons and concentration camps between 1939 and 1945 (not incl. USSR)". By implication, that figure supposedly appeared in the Red Cross publications mentioned on p. 99. I assumed that nobody would be so brazen as to invent such a thing, so shortly thereafter I happened to mention the point to a casual acquaintance. However, I also took the steps to confirm this point, which took a little while because not all of the publications cited were in Northwestern's library. To my dismay and genuine surprise, I could find neither the 300,000 or any other figure for the category of people in question. And in the six years that have since elapsed, I have heard of no confirmation of this "Red Cross" figure from any source.

Myth had the effect of driving me in the direction opposite to that intended, and it was specifically *Myth* that I had in mind in my remark in my Foreword near the top of p. 7 of *Hoax*. What got me going in the right direction was the literature on the other side, especially Hilberg.

About a year later I ran into my acquaintance and it turned out that he had been quoting Professor Butz on the 300,000 "Red Cross" figure. Imagine my embarrassment as I tried to explain myself.

In summary, the author of *Myth* knows very little about the Nuremberg Trials, he does not know the most elementary facts about how they may be studied. He is essentially unconscious of relevant wartime German documents, he fails to confront the specific claims of the bearers of the legend, he is totally unreliable in reporting his sources, he serves up major and inexcusable errors of fact, and the book can have the effect of driving the open-minded and discerning reader in the direction opposite to that intended. That is "terrible".

It is not the case that, just because something is true, it must be said in a book. So I am sure you are interested in my motivation for writing what I wrote. One is obvious. I wish to win the confidence of the reader who has seen that the prior literature is defective in some sense. There must be many such people. This is particularly called for in view of the fact that my publisher is also the publisher of the Harwood booklet which, as I point out on p. 12 of *Hoax* "has some weak points."

Indeed most of the glaring errors in Harwood are almost certainly things that he carried over, naively, from *Myth*. The most disastrous was the 300,000 "Red Cross" figure, which Jewish critics in Britain had themselves a jolly time with (see *Patterns of Prejudice*, July-August 1974, p. 14; *Books and Bookmen*, April 1975, p. 8). It is true that Harwood gave as his source the Swiss newspaper *Die Tat* which was, however, said to be reporting an official Red Cross figure, but one is still entitled to assume that Harwood was led into this blunder because he naively put too much confidence in *Myth* (and as I also had, as, described above).

Another error Harwood carried over from the appendices of *Myth* was the claim that Mayer Levin authored the *Diary of Anne Frank*, another point that was raised against Harwood with damaging effect in the controversy in Britain over his booklet. Levin was involved with the English language adaptation for the stage. The *Diary*, while almost certainly a forgery or at least an edited and interpolated version of a real diary, was first published, some years earlier, in Dutch.

Other errors that Harwood carried over from *Myth* are (1) the claim that the six million figure has its origin in a book published by Lemkin in 1943 (it was published in 1944, the only figure I could see, in looking at pages suggested by the Index, is on p. 89 where the American Jewish Congress is quoted as saying in 1943 that 1,702,500 had been exterminated, and anyway the six million figure is indicated in the propaganda of late 1942 and early 1943) and (2) the way the "Gerstein statement" was treated (as if there were evidence that Gerstein actually made the statement attributed to him) and (3) the claim that Hoettl was an Allied agent during the war (although it is possible Harwood had other sources for this) and (4) the claim that Pohl denied having seen a gas chamber at Auschwitz when he gave his Nuremberg testimony. Closer readings would probably reveal more such examples.

This is not to imply that Harwood merely parroted *Myth* in his booklet. Harwood treats correctly the major German documents that deal with the German policy, he treats the Wannsee Conference correctly and does not follow *Myth* in denying it took place, and he says quite a bit that isn't in *Myth*. All I am saying is that some glaring errors in Harwood seem to have their origin, for the most part, in the excessive trust Harwood put in *Myth*.

The second and more important reason for my "terrible" remark is that I really wanted to strike a blow against *Myth*, at least with readers who are alert enough to register my remark. The book is propagating and perpetuating disastrous errors. If there is anything more pernicious than a lie, it must be the unsound argument in favor of a thesis which is nevertheless true. This is no idle academic observation. When Colin Wilson opened up the issue in the November 1974 *Book and Bookmen*, it was a profoundly important event. However, on account of the weaknesses of the Harwood booklet, many of which had their source in *Myth*, Wilson carried significant handicaps into the controversy that then erupted in the "Letters" section of that

Journal. That is sad but it is not all that one can cite in this connection. When about two years ago a controversy over the six million broke out at 'the University of Colorado, the truth was ill served by some of the errors that both had spread and a reliable source tells me that "Red Cross" figure was again made the basis for an embarrassing phase of the controversy. There have probably been and there will probably be more such episodes like these for, as you write in your letter, *Myth* has been favorably received by "thousands of scholars, intellectuals and thought-leaders." That fact may have caused you to fail to realize what sort of "information" they have been getting from the book, and with what results when the readers of the book used it as a basis for prosecuting public controversy on the subject.

I appreciate your courage in publishing *Myth* and I have at least a general idea of the handicaps under which you labor. I am sure that, when you published the book, you believed it to be good work. I can also appreciate your feelings when, after all this, I bang out "terrible" on my typewriter, especially if this is the first time anybody has sat down to explain to you just how bad the book is. Therefore you should try to understand my feelings, when I observe some of our most intelligent and independent minded people getting messed up in important public controversies partly because you, quite innocent of the fact, published disastrously defective work on a subject where there is scant allowance even for the most minor slips. Will you contend that I should nevertheless have kept silent about *Myth*? Writing this long letter, indeed, has made me realize that perhaps I should have made a longer and more specific attack on *Myth* in my book, and I should also have written you earlier on this subject.

(paragraph deleted at request of A.R. Butz)

With best wishes,

Sincerely,
Arthur R. Butz

(Addition of 7 feb 2002: However I think my critique really is obsolete and of no interest. In 1976 that little piece of shit had attained some significant circulation and had to be cut down, but it has long been irrelevant. I still wonder if Hoggan really wrote it. I would think that anybody who could read and write could do better. Hoggan was a Harvard history Ph.D..)

See the second internet edition of the book that includes Butz' letter :
<<http://aaargh-international.org/fran/livres/hoggan2.pdf>>

HOW DOES ONE WAGE A WAR ?

How Wars Are Made - Introduction

By Jackie Patru

We had originally intended to title the section: 'Wars of the Past -- Who Wants Them?' In truth, they are all one and the same -- an extension of the World Revolution which did, in our time, begin in earnest with the French Revolution, leading us into the immediate presence and into the neverendingwar on Terror.

Operation Northwoods

U.S. planned fake terrorist attacks on citizens to create support for Cuban war in 1962.

Excerpts from "Body of Secrets", by James Bamford.

Unclassified D.O.D. Documents

Actual documents detailing the plans to terrorize citizens in order to create a war with Cuba. "MEMORANDUM FOR THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE - Subject: Justification for U.S. Military Intervention in Cuba - 13 March 1962"

World Revolution

A chapter from Doug Reed's book, *Controversy of Zion*. (1956) This begins us at the beginning -- sort of. "If you'd rather not take the time to read; if you'd rather remain in the dark, you'll have lots of company. If you care enough to **seek the truth** (as Jesus said we must), you will be among the few; **I salute you and welcome you to the land of the living** (as compared to the walking dead)." —Jackie

The World Significance of the Russian Revolution

Book - By George Pitt-Rivers, June 1920

"... In their vision of the 'New Birth of Society', it is the blood of the Caesarean section they hope to practise on the expiring mother society, not the fate of the offspring which is their chief concern. . . And still their crazy priests and fanatical votaries, **mad with frenzy and drunk with blood, shriek for ever more victims, never content until the whole world is infected with their madness and rocks helpless in an orgy of self-destruction.**"

World War I

"It was arranged well ahead of the planned first Great War, that England would declare Turkey its enemy, gain control of Palestine, and hand it over to the Jews. It happened as planned. During the war British leaders beholden to Zionist powers diverted men, weapons and planes from France to Palestine just prior to the German invasion of France, endangering the lives of hundreds of thousands of soldiers, and the possible outcome of the war ... except they knew the U.S. would come to their rescue."

The Balfour Declaration

"Dear Lord Rothschild, I have much pleasure in conveying to you, on behalf of His Majesty's Government, the following declaration of sympathy with Jewish Zionist aspirations which has been submitted to, and approved by, the Cabinet."

The Aberration of Mr. Balfour

A chapter from *Controversy of Zion*, by Doug Reed

"Then in 1906 one Mr. Arthur James Balfour, Prime Minister of England, met Dr. Weizmann in a hotel room and was captivated by the notion of presenting Palestine, which was not his to give, to "the Jews."

The Revolution Extends WWII - Part One

From *The Controversy of Zion*, by Douglas Reed - "Lenin, in his *Collected Works*, wrote: 'The World War' (1914-1918) 'will see the establishment of Communism in Russia; a second world war will extend its control over Europe; and a **third war will be necessary to make it worldwide**'."

The Revolution Extends WWII - Part Two

Stalin hosted the Yalta conference after WWII: ". . . the [world leaders] fell victim to one of the oldest tricks in negotiation known to wily Asiatic mankind: plying with liquor. . breakfast, medium-sized tumbler containing Crimean brandy. . repeated servings of caviar and vodka. . final course (breakfast) consisted of tumblers of tea with brandy served in snifter. . Elliot Roosevelt, who went with his father to the conference, said that 'practically everyone was drunk'."

The Nameless War - A Book

By Captain A. H. M. Ramsay, 1952

Another "little gem," suppressed. More history we were never taught. Capt. Ramsay, WWI veteran, former member of H. M. Scottish Guard, Member of Parliament, was arrested and imprisoned for nearly three years under an Orwellian law in England, without formal charges or a trial, because he had discovered and was attempting to expose the orchestrators of WWII.

Germany and England

By Nesta Webster, 1938

THIS is the little book (35 pages) that opened my eyes about the mass of massive lies we've all been told about Germany under National Socialism, and specifically it's Chancellor, Adolf Hitler. To my mind the greatest lie was that "Adolf Hitler planned to conquer the world and enslave the inhabitants of all nations". In reality the ones making those accusations are the ones who plan to conquer the world. The defeat of Germany was a defeat for all the inhabitants of the world, just as Adolf Hitler predicted. —Jackie

German White Book

Documents Concerning the Last Phase of the German/Polish Crisis — from the German Library of Information, New York

Witness to History

A Book by Michael Walsh - MUST READ!

This book will not break your heart, it will crush your heart in sorrow and compassion for all Mankind. This one book, ABOVE ALL OTHERS I've read, puts together information using statements from historical figures in a way that, I believe, will erase doubts from any doubting Thomas that one of the biggest lies -- or masses of massive lies -- we've ever been told involve WWII, German National Socialism; its Chancellor, Adolf Hitler; and in fact WHO made that war happen. —Jackie

Samuel Untermyer's Speech

From our ISRAEL section

A transcript of Samuel Untermyer's speech made on WABC, declaring a 'holy war' by the Jews against Germany, and appealing to the masses of non-Jewish humanity to boycott German-made imports and all merchants who have German-made items in their establishments. The entire speech was published in the New York times on the morning following the broadcast (August 7th, 1933) which was mentioned by Benjamin Freedman in his talk before a group of patriots.

Pearl Harbor: The Mother of All Conspiracies

" FDR asked: the question was how we should maneuver them [Japanese] into the position of firing the first shot without too much danger to ourselves. . . We realized that in order to have the full support of the American people it was desirable to make sure that the Japanese be the ones to do this so there should remain no doubt in anyone's mind as to who were the aggressors." —War Secretary Stimson's diary

Franklin Delano Roosevelt: Communist Dictator

By Mike Rose

As the story about Pearl Harbor is called the 'mother of all lies', this mostly-hidden information on FDR could surely rank as the 'grand daddy'.

Admiral R. K. Turner Report

On the possible effects of embargoes on Japan.

"An embargo would probably result in a fairly early attack by an [sic] on Malaya and the Netherlands East Indies, and possibly would involve the United States in early war in the Pacific." (Instigating Japan to strike first — resulting in the Pearl Harbor attack)

FDR's Armistice Day Address - November 11th, 1941

FDR telling Americans why they fought in the first Great War, and why we must fight eternally, if necessary. This was November 11th, 1941 - less than four weeks before the orchestrated Pearl Harbor attack: "We know that it was, in literal truth, **to make the world safe for democracy** that we took up arms in 1917. It was, in simple truth and in literal fact, to make the world habitable for decent and self-respecting men that those whom we now remember gave their lives. They died to prevent then the very thing that now, a quarter century later, has happened from one end of Europe to the other." —FDR

Cordell Hull's Final Ultimatum to Japan: 11-26-1941

"The document that touched the button that started the war."

Senator Books of Illinois Exposes FDR's Lies

". . . Then came an ultimatum first to Germany and afterwards to Japan. After the ultimatums came the shoot-on-sight order, followed by the news that the shooting has started. That was the end Roosevelt had in view. All the while he was guaranteeing his leadership as a course calculated to keep us out of war."

Adolf Hitler Declares War On U.S.

December 11, 1941

"The German Reich never took part in any war against the U.S.A. It itself had war imposed on it by the U.S.A. in 1917, and then for reasons which have been thoroughly revealed by an investigation committee set up by President Roosevelt himself. There are no other differences between the Germans and the American people, either territorial or political, which could possible touch the interests let alone the existence of the U.S.A."

The Lend-Lease Act

March 11, 1941

An act passed by congress to allegedly 'support' friendly nations in WWII before the U.S. was officially involved. As you will discover, the greatest recipient of Lend-Lease was 'Uncle Joe' (as FDR lovingly called him) Stalin's Communist Soviet Union.

From Major Jordan's Diaries

Out-of-print book

Read the shocking revelations from Major Jordan's Diaries about the billions of dollars, airplanes, tanks, munitions, foodstuffs, whole factories, blueprints and material for building the Atomic Bomb, personal luxuries for despotic Bolshevik Communist rulers, as well as the paper and plates enabling them to print U.S. Federal Reserve Notes — all this sent to the U.S.S.R. from UN Depot No 8, Newark, N.J., U.S.A.!!

The Zionist State (Harbinger of WWII)

By Douglas Reed

A microscopic look behind the scenes at the manipulations, threats, bribes and murders committed in order to secure the vote by the United Nations, mandating the 'state' of Israel as a homeland for the so-called Jews. A gruesome picture of the bloody terror in Palestine that began simultaneously with the UN mandate. **This a MUST READ, even for those who believe they know the facts.**

Now We Proudly Bring You...WORLD WAR III

Following the Great success of WWI and WWII, Jewish power centers announced World War III.

<<http://www.sweetliberty.org/issues/wars/>>

BALONEY

Poliakov, at last in the dustbin

A somewhat naive reader asked the H_Holocaust list if reading the [former Russian Jew, then French writer] Léon Poliakov was worthwhile. We extract from the answer this assessment of a ridiculous clownish figure who was "historian" (without training) only in a joking sense. He landed a good job in the research institute (CNRS) only because he paraded as a Jew.

From: "Albert S. Lindemann" <lindeman@history.ucsb.edu> 12 septembre 2004

Poliakov's standing is a large topic, one that might be more appropriately the subject of a book, or at least a lengthy bibliographical essay, rather than a brief e-mail exchange. But I think a few brief points should be made.

I would caution against considering Poliakov's volumes [*a so-called history of antisemitism in 5 volumes*] as "authoritative," a word that I think best avoided in this most contentious of fields. Poliakov might be termed "fascinating," "provocative," "unorthodox," and much else of that tenor, but not authoritative. Moreover, there are so many points covered in his volumes that it would be impossible, or pointless, to make a general statement about them -- to state, for example that he is not well regarded by current historians, or that they no longer pay much attention to him. Bernard Lazare, too, is dated (he wrote in the 1890s), yet still of interest, (Nebraska Univ. Press has recently republished his history [*recently : 1995*]) -- although reading him -- as at times with Poliakov -- can seem a little like fondling dynamite.

Poliakov's volumes were for the most part conceived and written a half century ago, and they cover some three thousand years of history. Few writers -- and even fewer professional historians -- would attempt to write a history of such scope today. Indeed, even teams of scholarly experts have trouble coming together to write a common history covering so many centuries. There have been histories of the Jews that do something comparable, but no scholarly history specifically of anti-Semitism from Moses on (many histories of the Jews, of course, tend to be centrally concerned with anti-Semitism, but they are still in a different category). Similarly, there have been a large number of popular, not really scholarly works on the origins of anti-Semitism, but they don't really qualify as competition to Poliakov's volumes, if for no other reason than length, centuries cover, and amount of detail.

The five decades or so that have passed help to explain, too, how Poliakov's volumes must rank as "old" history, in the sense that they are devoted to the analysis of ideas in published texts, and virtually all of those ideas were formulated by European males, mostly "elites" (however much that word is stretched in regard to men like Marr, Drumont, or Rosenberg). Poliakov's work, then, is intellectual history of a quite traditional if also often brilliant sort. Of course, it could be argued that a history of anti-Semitism by definition limits itself to intellectual history. But Poliakov gives relatively little attention to analyzing where anti-Semitic ideas come from or how they spread. Similarly, he does not pay a lot of attention to anti-Semitic acts, movements, or more subtle issues of social exclusion and marginalization.

Reading these volumes, to repeat, can certainly be considered worthwhile, but the sense in reading them is more akin to that of reading, say, Will and Ariel Durant's volumes, as distinguished from the products of modern professional historians. Even beyond that, Poliakov's volumes are unusually personal, idiosyncratic to the point of being self-indulgent or quirky ; he does not hesitate to follow tangents that interest him, while ignoring or slighting other important topics. Such is frequently the case with histories that cover so much ground, but Poliakov, who revealingly writes in the first person, nonetheless sets some records in that regard.

Poliakov was born in Russia in 1910 to a wealthy, highly cultivated Jewish family that emigrated to Paris in 1920. Thus, his formative young adulthood was in the late 1920s through the 1940s. One has to remember that he was not a trained historian and did not have a body of interpretive historical literature on which to base his books; his volumes are to an important degree a one-man show, a dialogue of Poliakov with his primary sources, not with other historians -- a strength but also finally a weakness. Specialists in ancient or medieval history, or

of early modern Spain, will find passages that seem dated, superficial, or uninformed in Poliakov's first two volumes. So, too, though perhaps less so, with the third and fourth volumes.

This is not the place, nor do I have the time, for an extended examination of the reaction of individual scholars to Poliakov, but they have hardly been unanimously positive. Raoul Hilberg, for example, dismissed Poliakov's work as simplistic: Nazism for Hilberg is more than Poliakov's "breviary of hatred"; the bureaucrats of the Third Reich were in truth not versed in anti-Semitic literature -- they were not even people with anti-Semitic pasts in some instances. The Holocaust thus could not be explained, as far as Hilberg was concerned, primarily with the tools of traditional intellectual history. Lionel Kochan complained that Poliakov's history lacked a genuine sense of the character of the victim; one hears about the "antis" in his work but not much about the Semites themselves. Would a history of anti-Americanism be acceptable if it said as little about the Americans themselves as Poliakov does about the Jews? Arthur Hertzberg, similarly, complained that Poliakov so ignores the Jewish victims as to leave them seemingly without character -- thus implicitly excluding from consideration the possibility that Jews themselves, through their actions and attitudes may have contributed to the growth of anti-Semitism. (Hertzberg's perspective, it should be noted, has been fiercely criticized by such authors as Cynthia Ozick and Leon Wieseltier, who have insisted that Jewish victims have had nothing or very little to do with provoking the hatred they have faced.)

In conclusion, let me say that each time I re-read parts of Poliakov, I am struck with how much is in the volumes. I always learn something that I either missed in previous reading or simply forgot. But I am not sure those volumes are the best place to begin reading about the history of anti-Semitism, and certainly not the place for someone to find the last or "authoritative" word.

Albert S. Lindemann, Professor of History, University of California, Santa Barbara

Note of the reprinting of Bernard Lazare. Here is the presentation by University of Nebraska Press. With a preface by a very politically correct Israeli historian. This happens to be a reprint of the old English edition by Britons Publishing Company in 1967. This is a very much abridged and very mistaken, anonymous translation. It is very astonishing to see a serious "historian" vouch for such a botched work. A real proper and clean translation is much needed.

Antisemitism, Its History and Causes

By Bernard Lazare Introduction by Robert S. Wistrich

Bernard Lazare's controversial magnum opus, originally published in France in 1894, asks why the Jews have aroused such hatred for three thousand years. The journalist, though severed from his Jewish upbringing, was fiercely committed to social justice and could not ignore a shocking antisemitism in the fin-de-siècle circles he knew. In search mg for its historic causes, he was also searching for his own roots and place in the world. As biographer Nelly Wilsonhas noted, young Lazare was "constantly engaged in a dialogue with himself" when he wrote *Antisemitism, Its History and Causes*.

Lazare begins his "impartial study" by considering whatever in the Jewish character might be to blame for antisemitism. Then he looks outward to those nations among which the Israelites dispersed, examining the different faces of antisemitism from Greco-Roman antiquity to the end of the nineteenth century. Lazare brings his research and study to bear on whatever form antisemitism has taken: ethnic, nationalist, economic, social, literary, philosophical. Recognizing that antisemitism is fundamentally based on fear of the stranger and the need for a scapegoat, Lazare concludes with a surprising scenario for the future. This remarkable book conveys Lazare's own spiritual growth. France's Dreyfus Affair in the 1890s would galvanize him to a passionate baffle against antisemitism.

Introducing this Bison Books edition is Robert S. Wistrich, Neuberger Professor of **Modern Jewish History at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem** and the author of *Antisemitism: The Longest Hatred*.

<<http://unp.unl.edu/bookinfo/2950.html>>

GENDER APARTHEID

Symposium: Feminist Anti-Semitism

By Jamie Glazov

One would think that **if contemporary leftist feminists supported all of their own ideals, they would today be wholeheartedly behind Israel**, since it's the only society in the Middle East where feminism actually exists. But radical feminists today side -- ferociously -- with the Palestinians, whose society practices a ruthless form of gender apartheid. **Why?**

To discuss this issue with us today, *Frontpage Symposium* has the pleasure to introduce:

Tricia Roth, a feminist activist who spent 10 years with the National Organization for Women (NOW). She has worked to defeat anti-gay and anti-affirmative action proposition campaigns, and is the author of successful California legislation prohibiting the introduction of the victim's manner of dress in rape and sexual assault cases. She is currently one of the producers of KPFK radio's weekly program, *Feminist Magazine*. For the last 2 years, her focus has been on the Left's depiction of the Israeli-Arab conflict and the anti-Semitism of its anti-Zionist ideology;

Elinor Burkett, a former leftist whose travels throughout the Muslim world made her change her ideological views. She is the author of *So Many Enemies, So Little Time. An American Woman in All the Wrong Places*; and

Phyllis Chesler, an Emerita Professor of Psychology and Women's Studies and the author of twelve books including the best-selling *Women and Madness* and most recently, *The New Anti-Semitism. The Current Crisis and What We Must Do About It* (Jossey-Bass/John Wiley). She may be reached at her website www.phyllis-chesler.com.

[...]

FrontPageMagazine.com, August 27, 2004

<<http://www.frontpagemag.com/Articles/ReadArticle.asp?ID=14838> >

AMERICA'S PRIMITIVE MINDS

Christian Zionism and its impact on justice

by Dr Rev **Stephen Sizer**

Dr Rev. Stephen Sizer is a Vicar at Christ Church, Virginia Water and an area Tutor at the School of Theology, Westminster College Oxford. He holds several positions of a trustee and is renowned for his lectures on Christian Zionism. He besides having numerous articles published on the Palestinian issue also has a book published by Eagle Publishers, The Panorama of the Holy Land, a spiritual tour guide of important sites in Palestine.

A Definition: What is Christian Zionism?

At its simplest, Christian Zionism has been defined as 'Christian support for Zionism.' In 1975, the United Nations General Assembly passed resolution 3379 defining Zionism as, 'a form of racism and racial discrimination.' Contemporary Christian Zionism is in part a reaction to increasing world-wide criticism of Israel's form of apartheid.

So, for example, in 1967, following the passing of U.N. Resolution 242 condemning Israel's occupation of the West Bank when the entire international community closed their embassy's in Jerusalem, the International Christian Embassy moved to Jerusalem expressly to show solidarity with Israel.

Christian Zionists see themselves as defenders of and apologists for the Jewish people and in particular, the State of Israel. This support involves opposing those deemed to be critical of, or hostile toward Israel. Anti-Zionism is equated quite wrongly with anti-Semitism. Yet it is also rare therefore to find Christian Zionists who feel a similar compassion or solidarity with the Palestinians. Walter Riggans defines the term 'Christian Zionist' in an overtly political sense as, '...any Christian who supports the Zionist aim of the sovereign State of Israel, its army,

government, education etc; but it can describe a Christian who claims to support the State of Israel for any reason.'

Christian Zionism then describes a broad coalition of agencies, some predominantly Gentile, others Jewish Christians who believe Jesus is their Messiah. There are today well over 250 Christian Zionist organisations operating in America alone.

The History of Christian Zionism

In *Der Judenstaat*, published in 1896, Theodor Herzl forcefully articulated the aspirations of Jewish Zionists for their own homeland, but the Zionist dream was largely nurtured and shaped by Christian Zionists especially from the 1820's long before it was able to inspire widespread Jewish support a century later. This was in part a result of the rise of Evangelicalism - a belief in the literal interpretation of the Bible and especially the Hebrew scriptures, the growth in travel literature about the Middle East, the rise of 19th Western pilgrimages to the Holy Land, and above all by French and British Colonialist strategies for controlling the Middle East as a bridgehead to the trade routes to India and China. British politicians like Lord Shaftesbury, Palmerston, Lloyd George, Balfour, T.E. Lawrence and General Allenby were all Christian Zionists. Just one example, writing to the British ambassador in Constantinople in 1840, Lord Palmerston claimed, "there exists at the present time among the Jews dispersed over Europe, a strong notion that the time is approaching when their nation is to return to Palestine... It would be of manifest importance to the Sultan to encourage the Jews to return and to settle in Palestine because the wealth which they would bring with them would increase the resources of the Sultan's dominions; and the Jewish people, if returning under the sanction and protection and at the invitation of the Sultan, would be a check upon any future evil designs of Mohamet Ali or his successor... I have to instruct Your Excellency strongly to recommend [the Turkish government] to hold out every just encouragement to the Jews of Europe to return to Palestine." In the 20th Century many leading American politicians were Christian Zionists including Ronald Reagan and Jimmie Carter.

The Theology of Christian Zionism

1. Biblical Literalism

Christian Zionism originated essentially in the 1820's when a group of influential Christian leaders began to speculate that promises made in the Hebrew scriptures that has not been yet fulfilled literally must therefore await future fulfilment. So for example the borders of the land promised to Abraham and the descendents of Isaac - from the Nile to the Euphrates - will Christian Zionists claim, become the future borders of the State of Israel. Because the Jewish temple as described by the prophet Ezekiel has never been built, it must one day be built in place of the Masjidul al Aqsa and the Dome of the Rock. Promises made during the exile of Jews in Babylon in the 5th Century BC are made to apply 2500 years later to the emigration of Soviet Jews to Palestine today. It is this biblical literalism - where every word must be taken literally and unconditionally - that fuels Christian Zionism. Instead of allowing Jesus and his Apostles to interpret the Hebrew Scriptures they are made to speak about present and future events almost as if the Christian Scriptures were never written. Just one quote from the New testament that refutes this position.

By calling this covenant "new," he has made the first one obsolete; and what is obsolete and aging will soon disappear... The law is only a shadow of the good things that are coming--not the realities themselves. For this reason it can never, by the same sacrifices repeated endlessly year after year, make perfect those who draw near to worship. (Hebrews 8:13; 10:1)

Under the Old Covenant, revelation from God came often in shadow, image, form and prophecy. In the New Covenant that revelation finds its consummation in reality, substance and fulfilment in Jesus Christ. The question is not whether the promises of the covenant are to be understood literally or spiritually as Christian Zionists like to stress. It is instead a question of whether they should be understood in terms of Old Covenant shadow or in terms of New Covenant reality. This is the most basic hermeneutical assumption which Christian Zionists consistently fail to acknowledge.

2. Covenant Chosenness

Because of their biblical literalism Christian Zionists believe that the Jews remain God's chosen people and have a unique relationship to God. The promises made to Abraham remain true today for the descendants of Isaac, Jacob and Joseph. In Genesis 15 God indicates the extent of that land, "On that day the LORD made a covenant with Abram and said, "To your descendants I give this land, from the river of Egypt to the great river, the Euphrates." (Genesis 15:18) Christian Friends of Israel insist, The Bible teaches that Israel (people, land, nation) has a Divinely ordained and glorious future, and that God has neither rejected nor replaced His Jewish people. Bridges For Peace similarly affirm, "Through programs both in Israel and world-wide, we are giving Christians the opportunity to actively express our biblical responsibility before God to be faithful to Israel and the Jewish community. The Messianic Jewish Alliance of America (MJAA) claims to be the largest association of Messianic Jewish believers in the world, founded in 1915. MJAA has affiliations in 15 countries, 250 Messianic Synagogues, and 350,000 Messianic Jews world-wide. They insist they are 'the leading representative organisation for American Jews who believe in Messiah Yeshua.' Their simple statement of belief states, We believe in G-d's eternal covenant with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. We, therefore, stand with and support the Jewish people and the State of Israel and hold fast to the Biblical heritage of our forefathers. Christian Zionists err because they fail to recognise in the Hebrew and Christian scriptures, 'chosenness' becomes the gift of God's grace to all who trust in Him, irrespective of their racial origins.

3 Restorationism

The theology of Christian Zionism is based on a belief in Restorationism, that is the promise of the land made to Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and Joseph was unconditional and eternal. Therefore, Christian Zionists encourage Jews to return to Palestine and occupy what they see as their eternal heritage. The International Christian Embassy is the most politicised Christian Zionist organisation. At the Third International Christian Zionist Congress held in Jerusalem 25-29 February, 1996 under the auspices of ICEJ, some 1,500 delegates from over 40 countries unanimously affirmed an affirmation of Christian Zionism including the following, **"The Lord in His zealous love for Israel and the Jewish People blesses and curses peoples and judges nations based upon their treatment of the Chosen People of Israel...** According to God's distribution of nations, the Land of Israel has been given to the Jewish People by God as an everlasting possession by an eternal covenant. The Jewish People have the absolute right to possess and dwell in the Land, including Judea, Samaria, Gaza and the Golan." Lewis Sperry Chafer, founding president of Dallas Theological Seminary, United States, the most influential Christian Zionist academic institution in the world, claims, 'Israel is an eternal nation, heir to an eternal land, with an eternal kingdom, on which David rules from an eternal throne' These ideologies forms the basis on how their theology influences or determines their politics.

The Politics of Christian Zionism

Three aspects of the politics of Christian Zionism that impact the search for justice in the Middle East.

1. Attitudes toward Arabs and Palestinians

Christian Zionists while lovers of Israel are invariably also hostile toward Arabs and Palestinians. The demise of the Soviet Union, the rise of militant Islam, the success of the Allies in the Gulf War, and the beginning of third millennium have only fuelled more imaginative speculations among fundamentalists, while the same anti-Arab prejudices and Orientalist stereotypes persist.

Hal Lindsey is the most popular Christian Zionist writer author of over 20 books with sales exceeding 50 million copies. He insists, Long ago the psalmist predicted the final mad attempt of the confederated Arab armies to destroy the nation of Israel... The Palestinians are determined to trouble the world until they repossess what they feel is their land. The Arab nations consider it a matter of racial honour to destroy the State of Israel. Islam considers it a sacred mission of religious honour to recapture Old Jerusalem.

Charles Dyer, a professor at Dallas Theological Seminary warns that Saddam Hussein plans to attempt to repeat Nebuchadnezzar's conquest of Israel, the only Arab ever to have done

so. 'The Middle East is the world's time bomb, and Babylon is the fuse that will ignite the events of the end times.'

For American Christian Zionists, in particular, America is seen as the great redeemer, her role in the world providentially and politically preordained. The two nations of America and Israel are like Siamese twins, linked not only by common self interest but more significantly by similar religious foundations. Together they are perceived to be pitted against an evil world dominated by Communist and Islamic regimes, antithetical to the values of America and Israel.

2. Apocalyptic View of the Future

The 1967 'Six Day War' marked a significant watershed for evangelical Christian interest in Israel and Zionism. For example, Jerry Falwell did not begin to speak about modern-day Israel until after Israel's 1967 military victory. Falwell changed completely. He entered into politics and became an avid supporter of the Zionist State... the stunning Israeli victory made a big impact not only on Falwell, but on a lot of Americans... Remember that in 1967, the United States was mired in the Vietnam war. Many felt a sense of defeat, helplessness and discouragement... Many Americans, including Falwell, turned worshipful glances toward Israel, which they viewed as militarily strong and invincible. They gave their unstinting approval to the Israeli take-over of Arab lands because they perceived this conquest as power and righteousness... Macho or muscular Christians such as Falwell credited Israeli General Moshe Dayan with this victory over Arab forces and termed him the Miracle Man of the Age, and the Pentagon invited him to Vietnam and tell us how to win the war.

The titles of Hal Lindsey's books show an increasingly exaggerated and almost pathological emphasis on the apocalyptic, on death and suffering. They are replete with categorical assertions that biblical prophecy is being fulfilled in this generation signalling the imminent destruction of the world. Hal Lindsey dogmatically asserts, "We are the generation the prophets were talking about. We have witnessed biblical prophecies come true. The birth of Israel. The decline in American power and morality. The rise of Russian and Chinese might. The threat of war in the Middle East. The increase of earthquakes, volcanoes, famine and drought. The Bible foretells the signs that precede Armageddon... We are the generation that will see the end times ...and the return of Jesus." Lindsey's last but one book, *The Final Battle*, includes the statement on the cover, "Never before, in one book, has there been such a complete and detailed look at the events leading up to 'The Battle of Armageddon.'"

Lindsey confidently asserts that the world is degenerating and that the forces of evil manifest in godless Communism and militant Islam are the real enemies of Israel. **He describes in detail the events leading to the great battle at Megiddo between the massive Russian, Chinese and African armies that will attempt but fail to destroy Israel.** He offers illustrated plans showing future military movements of armies and naval convoys leading up to the battle of Armageddon. These will merely hasten the return of Jesus Christ as King of the Jews who will rule over the other nations from the rebuilt Jewish temple on the site of the destroyed Dome of the Rock in Jerusalem. Obstacle or no obstacle, it is certain that the Temple will be rebuilt. Prophecy demands it... With the Jewish nation reborn in the land of Palestine, ancient Jerusalem once again under total Jewish control for the first time in 2600 years, and talk of rebuilding the great Temple, the most important sign of Jesus Christ's soon coming is before us... It is like the key piece of a jigsaw puzzle being found... For all those who trust in Jesus Christ, it is a time of electrifying excitement.

An indication of how seriously Christian Zionists take the military aspect of their apocalyptic scenario can be seen from the content of the itinerary used by Jerry Falwell, in his 'Friendship Tour to Israel'. It includes meetings with top Israeli government and military officials and.....On-site tour of modern Israeli battlefields... Official visit to an Israeli defence installation... strategic military positions, plus experience first hand the battle Israel faces as a nation.

3. Hostility toward the Peace Negotiations

The International Christian Embassy, Jerusalem, as the semi-official voice of Zionist organisations, is frequently cultivated, exploited and quoted by the Israeli Government whenever a sympathetic Christian viewpoint is needed to enhance their own policies, and rebut Western criticism. Every Israeli Prime Minister since 1980 has spoken at their annual

international gatherings in Jerusalem.

In October 1996, Benjamin Netanyahu the Israeli Prime Minister spoke at the Jerusalem 3000 rally organised by the International Christian Embassy, Jerusalem, to support Israel's sovereignty over Jerusalem. Following the provocative opening of an underground tunnel by the Israelis from the Western Wall through the Moslem Quarter, he was cheered when he insisted the tunnel, 'is open. It will stay open. It will always stay open.' The religio-political agenda of the International Christian Embassy is made quite explicit in this declaration. Because of the sovereign purposes of God for the City, Jerusalem must remain undivided, under Israeli sovereignty, open to all peoples, the capital of Israel only, and all nations should so concur and place their embassies here. As a faith bound to love and forgiveness we are appreciative of the attempts by the Government of Israel to work tirelessly for peace. However, the truths of God are sovereign and it is written that the Land which He promised to His People is not to be partitioned... It would be further error for the nations to recognise a Palestinian state in any part of Eretz Israel... The Golan is part of biblical Israel and is a vital strategic asset necessary for the security and defence of the entire country....To this end we commit to work with Israel and to encourage the Diaspora to fulfil the vision and goal of gathering to Israel the greater majority of all Jewish People from throughout the world.

Not surprisingly therefore the Oslo Peace-Accord has been sharply criticised by Christian Zionist groups who see it as a threat to the realisation of Eretz Israel. In particular they have opposed the handing back of the West Bank and the threat to the status of the Jewish settlements. For example, Theodore Temple Beckett, Chairman of the Christian Friends of Israel Community Development Foundation has initiated an 'adopt-a-settlement' program among American Evangelical Churches. The Jewish town of Ariel has already been adopted by Faith Bible Chapel in Denver. By the end of 1995 it was Beckett's expectation that around 70 Jewish settlements would have been adopted by churches,...with larger churches adopting larger settlements and smaller churches adopting smaller settlements and giving all a morale boost to show them they are not alone and are loved by many.

4. Conclusions: A Critique of Christian Zionism

Karen Armstrong is not alone in tracing in *Western Christian Zionism* evidence of the legacy of the Crusades. Fundamentalists have, she claims, 'returned to a classical and extreme religious crusading.' Rosemary Ruether also sees the danger of this kind of Christian Zionism in its, 'dualistic, Manichean view of global politics. America and Israel together against an evil world.' The following quote from Senator Bob Dole is a good example, American-Israeli friendship is no accident. It is a product of our shared values. We are both democracies. We are both pioneer states. We have both opened our doors to the oppressed. We have both shown a passion for freedom and we have gone to war to protect it.

This 'simple dualism' and 'highly dogmatic thinking' is something Bishop Kenneth Cragg, probably the greatest English Christian Islamic scholar alive today, comments on. Satirically, he writes,

It is so; God chose the Jews; the land is theirs by divine gift. These dicta cannot be questioned or resisted. They are final. Such verdicts come infallibly from Christian biblicists for whom Israel can do no wrong-thus fortified. But can such positivism, this unquestioning finality, be compatible with the integrity of the Prophets themselves? It certainly cannot square with the open peoplehood under God which is the crux of New Testament faith. Nor can it well be reconciled with the ethical demands central to law and election alike.

The Middle East Council of Churches (MECC), representing the indigenous and ancient Oriental and Eastern Churches, has been highly critical of the activities of Christian Zionists. They assert Christian Zionists have aggressively imposed an aberrant expression of the Christian faith and an erroneous interpretation of the Bible, which is subservient to the political agenda of the modern State of Israel. Indeed they represent a tendency to,...force the Zionist model of theocratic and ethnocentric nationalism on the Middle East... (rejecting)... the movement of Christian unity and inter-religious understanding which is promoted by the (indigenous) churches in the region. The Christian Zionist programme, with its elevation of modern political Zionism, provides the Christian with a world view where the gospel is identified with the ideology of success and militarism. It places its emphasis on events leading up to the end of history rather than living Christ's love and justice today.

It is therefore perhaps not surprising that among the Middle East churches generally, Christian Zionism is regarded as a devious heresy, an unwelcome and alien intrusion into their culture, which advocates an ethnocentric and nationalist political agenda running counter to their work of seeking justice and reconciliation among both Jews and Muslims.

Essentially, Christian Zionism fails to recognise the deep seated problems that exist between Palestinians and Israelis; **it distorts the Bible and marginalises the universal imperative of the Christian message that God loves all people**; it has grave political ramifications and ultimately ignores the sentiments of the overwhelming majority of indigenous Christians. It is a situation that many believe the Government of Israel exploits to her advantage, cynically welcoming Christian Zionists as long as they remain docile and compliant with Israeli government policy. Kenneth Cragg offers this astute critique of Christian Zionism,

The overriding criteria of Christian perception have to be those of equal grace and common justice. From these there can be no proper exemption, however alleged or presumed. Chosenness cannot properly be either an ethnic exclusivism or a political facility.

Christian Zionism offers an uncritical endorsement of the Israeli political right and at the same time shows an inexcusable lack of compassion for the Palestinian tragedy. In doing so it has legitimised their oppression in the name of God. In the words of Kenneth Leech, Christian Zionism as a form of fundamentalism,

"...represents a narrowing of vision, a closing of doors, a diminishing of human beings, and a backward force in human history..."

Christian Zionism : True Friends of Israel?

To be frank, Israel is a materialistic and apartheid State practising repressive and dehumanising measures against the Palestinians in flagrant disregard of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Christian Zionists who endorse such policies would do well to heed Joshua's final words,

Now I am about to go the way of all the earth. You know with all your heart and soul that not one of all the good promises the LORD your God gave you has failed. Every promise has been fulfilled; not one has failed. But just as every good promise of the LORD your God has come true, so the LORD will bring on you all the evil he has threatened, until he has destroyed you from this good land he has given you. If you violate the covenant of the LORD your God, which he commanded you, and go and serve other gods and bow down to them, the LORD'S anger will burn against you, and you will quickly perish from the good land he has given you (Joshua 23:14-16).

Like Isaac's children Jacob and Esau, it is time to stop fighting over the birthright and start sharing the blessings.

<http://www.preteristcentral.com/articles-preterist-christian_zionism.htm > 2001 Also posted on :
<http://www.monabaker.com/pMachine/more.php?id=2209_o_1_o_M1 >

Stephen Sizer is the author of a remarkable study of the Christian Zionists. He wrote a thesis and later distilled it into a number of books and articles. We warmly recommend our reader to go to Stephen Sizer's homepage and browse around.

Let's quote only one reader:

"Stephen Sizer's work on Christian Zionism is the most important and comprehensive on the subject to date, and should be read by all students of the Middle East and by Christians concerned about a just resolution to the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. Christian Zionism raises vital theological and political challenges that must be addressed head-on by Christians in the West, particularly evangelicals. The impact of this terribly misguided movement is increasingly putting Christians in the Middle East at risk, and it seems a far cry from the witness and message of Jesus Christ."

Professor Don Wagner, Professor of Religion and Middle Eastern Studies & Executive Director: Center for Middle Eastern Studies, North Park University, Chicago (author of Anxious for Armageddon).

<<http://www.christchurch-virginiawater.co.uk/articles/articles.html> >

THE TEACHER IS A MURDERER

The Harvard Law Professor Who Sat On An Israeli Assassination Target Review Panel The Jihad of Alan Dershowitz

Liaquat Ali Khan

If to dispute well is law's chiefest end, Harvard law professor Alan Dershowitz has honed this ability to a stunning craft. In high-profile cases, such as O. J. Simpson, Doctor Dershowitz, a seasoned criminal law jurist, serves as a media-savvy lawyer determined to defend "the guilty." Less well known, however, is that this advocacy Mephistopheles thrives on inventing unpopular, counter-intuitive, and even unjust exceptions to international law--a subject he normally does not teach. These exceptions--mutually folded in each other's orb---allow the torturing of terrorists, the assassinations of their leaders, and the demolition of their family homes. What is most intriguing is the contempt that Dershowitz has for the International Court of Justice (ICJ) and its current President (the Chinese judge) whom he calls a thug, discarding the language of professional courtesy.

Somewhat intrigued by his incendiary views daringly, and sometimes crudely, expressed in books and newspaper columns, I requested to interview Dershowitz, an interview he granted promptly and generously. We both taped the interview, I for no other reason but to save as a souvenir. I came out of the interview with the clear impression that--setting aside the civil liberties concerns that inform his criminal defense rhetoric--Dershowitz concocts these exceptions not merely to embellish his ivory tower but to proactively defend, and sometimes shape, Israeli policies in occupied Palestine.

[...] Dershowitz's exceptional defense of Israel is not confined to academic criticisms of the ICJ (or the International Red Cross or the United Nations). In the interview, Dershowitz, who opposes the death penalty, revealed that **he had sat on the Israeli assassination committee that reviews evidence before terrorists are targeted and killed.** This "due process" hearing is designed to reduce the raw charge that state-sponsored assassinations are blatantly unlawful. **Dershowitz favors targeted assassination** of terrorist leaders "involved in planning or approving on-going murderous activities." Under this protean standard, it is unclear whether spiritual and political leaders who favor terrorist violence but do not materially participate in specific terrorist acts may also be assassinated. These niceties aside, the idea of a Harvard law professor sitting on an occupying state's assassination committee would be, to many in the legal academy, a trifle perplexing.

What rattles his many critics the most, however, is the innovative exception Dershowitz draws for the Convention against Torture (1987). The Convention prohibits all forms of torture and provides for no exception. In fact, the prohibition against torture has attained the status of *jus cogens*--the peremptory norms of international law that cannot be abandoned or altered. Dershowitz confesses to know all this. Yet he makes an empirical argument to carve out an exception. Since torture cannot be eliminated in the real world, he argues: "Ay, think so still, 'til experience change thy mind." Dershowitz proposes that the legal system regulate torture by requiring state officials to obtain a judicial warrant before torturing. Despite Dershowitz's connections and influence, Israel refused to launch the proposed torture warrant, although it embraced the idea of exception to the Convention it had signed. However, when more than 90 percent of the Palestinian security detainees began to be tortured, the Israeli Supreme Court put an end to the fledgling exception.

Undeterred by such judicial rebuffs, Dershowitz continues to manufacture legal exceptions to shore up the universally condemned Israeli practices, such as bulldozing the family homes of terror suspects. Calling it property damage, he apparently dismisses the sanctity, the intimacy, and the memories attached to a family home, anybody's family home. As if demolition of family homes is a minor punishment, Dershowitz is willing to pull down even

the entire "villages of suicide bombers." He thinks perhaps that it takes a village to raise a suicide bomber. It does. When her entire village has been grabbed by the neck and choked, some kid (a "terrorist") is surely going to be mad as hell.

Despite his legalistic jihad for Israel's security and despite his employment of the Harvard Law School stature to propose questionable exceptions to international law, Dershowitz does not completely throw away the sense of limits. For example, he opposes Nathan Lewin, a prominent Washington lawyer and a federal judge hopeful, who blatantly argues, contrary to popular feelings of the Jewish community, that family members of suicide bombers be executed.

By no means is Dershowitz an incorrigible ideologue nor is he morally sightless. His reading of international law is most certainly flawed and he needs "to settle in his studies." His intellectual honesty is nonetheless beyond doubt. He is what he thinks. He does not duck hard questions. And he does all this with an inexhaustible capacity to swallow contradictions. At the end of the play, however, when all arguments have been made, when all exceptions have been put to rest, and when the nation that launched a thousand missiles has been defended, Dershowitz relaxes his grip with a disarming sense of humor expressed through borrowed jokes. In his book *Why Terrorism Works* (2002), for example, he tells readers how he, as a boy, pondered over difficult hypothetical scenarios such as this: "If you were up to your neck in a vat of cat vomit and somebody threw a pile of dog poop on your face, would you duck?"

One may relish Dershowitz's for his wits, but only to wonder at the unlawful things he permits.

Ali Khan is a professor at Washburn University School of Law in Kansas. His book *A Theory of International Terrorism* will be published in 2005. He can be reached at: <ali.khan@washburn.edu> September 30, 2004

Remember this guy, an accomplice to a lot of murders (death penalty is abolished in Israel) still teaches at Harvard !!! What a disgrace !

THEOCRATS AND MISOGYNISTS

You Can't Bomb Beliefs

Naomi Klein

My first run-in with Muqtada al-Sadr's Mahdi Army came on March 31 in Baghdad. The US occupation chief, Paul Bremer, had just sent armed men to shut down the young cleric's newspaper, Al Hawza, claiming that its articles comparing Bremer to Saddam Hussein incited violence against Americans. Sadr responded by calling for his supporters to protest outside the gates of the Green Zone, demanding Al Hawza's reopening.

When I heard about the demo, I wanted to go, but there was a problem: I had been visiting state factories all day, and I wasn't dressed appropriately for a crowd of devout Shiites. Then again, I reasoned, this was a demonstration in defense of journalistic freedom -- could they really object to a journalist in loose pants? I put on a head scarf and headed over.

Demonstrators had printed up English-language banners that said, Let Journalists Work With No Terror and Let Journalists Do Their Work. That sounded good, I thought, and started doing my work. I was soon interrupted, however, by a black-clad member of the Mahdi Army: He wanted to talk to my translator about my fashion choices. A friend and I joked that we were going to make up our own protest sign that said, Let Journalists Wear Their Pants. But the situation quickly got serious: Another Mahdi soldier grabbed my translator and shoved him against a concrete blast wall, badly injuring his back. Meanwhile, an Iraqi friend called to say she was trapped inside the Green Zone and couldn't leave: She had forgotten to bring a head scarf and was afraid of running into a Mahdi patrol.

It was an instructive lesson about who Sadr actually is: not an anti-imperialist liberator, as some on the far left have cast him, but someone who wants the foreigners out so he can shackle and control large portions of Iraq's population himself. But neither is Sadr the one-dimensional villain painted by so many in the media, a portrayal that has allowed many liberals

to stay silent as he is barred from participating in elections and to look the other way while US forces nightly firebomb the civilian population of Sadr City, where the fighting recently knocked out electricity in the midst of a Hepatitis E outbreak.

The situation requires a more principled position. For instance, Muqtada al-Sadr's calls for press freedom may not include the freedom of women journalists to cover him. Yet he still deserves to have his right to publish a political newspaper--not because he believes in freedom but because we supposedly do. Similarly, Sadr's calls for fair elections and an end to occupation demand our unequivocal support--not because we are blind to the threat he would pose if he were actually elected but because believing in self-determination means admitting that the outcome of democracy is not ours to control.

These kinds of nuanced distinctions are commonly made in Iraq: Many people I met in Baghdad strongly condemned the attacks on Sadr as evidence that Washington never intended to bring democracy to their country. They backed the cleric's calls for an end to occupation and for immediate open elections. But when asked if they would vote for him in those elections, most laughed at the prospect.

Yet here in North America, the idea that you can support Sadr's call for elections without endorsing him as Iraq's next prime minister has proved harder to grasp. For arguing this position, I have been accused of making "excuses for the theocrats and misogynists" by Nick Cohen in the London Observer, of having "naively fallen for the al-Mahdi militia" by Frank Smyth in Foreign Policy in Focus and of being a "socialist-feminist offering swooning support to theocratic fascists" by Christopher Hitchens in Slate.

All this manly defense of women's rights is certainly enough to make a girl swoon. Yet before Hitchens rides to the rescue, it's worth remembering how he rationalized his reputation-destroying support for the war: Even if US forces were really after the oil and military bases, he reasoned, the liberation of the Iraqi people would be such a joyous side-effect that progressives everywhere should cheer the cruise missiles. With the prospect of liberation still a cruel joke in Iraq, Hitchens is now claiming that this same anti-woman, anti-gay White House is the Iraqi people's best hope against Sadr's brand of anti-woman, anti-gay religious fundamentalism. Once again we are supposed to hold our noses and cheer the Bradleys--for the greater good, or the lesser evil.

There is no question that Iraqis face a mounting threat from religious fanaticism, but US forces won't protect Iraqi women and minorities from it any more than they have protected Iraqis from being tortured in Abu Ghraib or bombed in Falluja and Sadr City. Liberation will never be a trickle-down effect of this invasion because domination, not liberation, was always its goal. Even under the best scenario, the current choice in Iraq is not between Sadr's dangerous fundamentalism and a secular democratic government made up of trade unionists and feminists. It's between open elections--which risk handing power to fundamentalists but would also allow secular and moderate religious forces to organize--and rigged elections designed to leave the country in the hands of Iyad Allawi and the rest of his CIA/Mukhabarat-trained thugs, fully dependent on Washington for both money and might.

This is why Sadr is being hunted--not because he is a threat to women's rights but because he is the single greatest threat to US military and economic control of Iraq. Even after Grand Ayatollah Ali al-Sistani backed down from his opposition to the handover plans, fearing civil war, Sadr continued to oppose the US-drafted Constitution, continued to call for the withdrawal of foreign troops and continued to oppose US plans to appoint the interim government rather than hold elections. If Sadr's demands are met and the country's fate is truly left in the hands of the majority, US military bases in Iraq will be in serious jeopardy, as will all the privatization-friendly laws pushed through by Bremer.

Progressives should oppose the US attack on Sadr, because it is an attack not on one man but on the possibility of Iraq's democratic future. There is another reason, as well, to defend Sadr's democratic rights: It's the best way to fight the rise of religious fundamentalism in Iraq.

Far from reducing the draw of extremism, the US attack on Sadr has greatly strengthened it. Sadr has deftly positioned himself not as the narrow voice of strict Shiites but as an Iraqi nationalist defending the entire country against foreign invaders. Thus, when he was attacked with the full force of the US military and dared to resist, he earned the respect of millions of Iraqis living under the humiliation and brutality of occupation.

The heavy-handed attempts to silence Sadr have also served to confirm the worst fears of

many Shiites--that they are being betrayed by the Americans once again, the same Americans who supported Saddam during the Iran-Iraq war, which took the lives of more than 100,000 Iraqis; the same Americans who told them to rise up in 1991, only to leave them to be slaughtered. Now, under siege once again, many are seeking refuge in the certainties of fundamentalism, not to mention in the emergency social services provided by the mosques. Some are even concluding that they need a tyrant of their own, a fierce fundamentalist to do battle with the other strongmen trying to control Iraq.

This shift in attitude is evident in all the polling. A Coalition Provisional Authority poll in May, after the first US siege on Najaf, found that opinion of Sadr had improved among 81 percent of Iraqi respondents. An Iraq Center for Research and Strategic Studies poll ranked Sadr--a marginal figure only six months before--as Iraq's second most influential political player after Sistani.

Most alarming, the attacks appear to be boosting support not only for Sadr personally but for theocracy generally. In February, the month before Paul Bremer closed down Sadr's newspaper, an Oxford Research International survey found that a majority of Iraqis wanted a secular government: Only 21 percent of respondents said their favored political system was "an Islamic state" and only 14 percent ranked "religious politicians" as their preferred political actors. Fast-forward to August, with Najaf under siege by US forces: The International Republican Institute reported that a staggering 70 percent of Iraqis want Islam and Shariah as the basis of the state. The poll didn't differentiate between Sadr's unyielding interpretation of Shariah and more moderate versions represented by other religious parties. Yet it's clear that some of the people who told me back in March that they supported Sadr but would never vote for him are beginning to change their minds.

Published in the October 18, 2004 issue of *The Nation*
<<http://www.commondreams.org/views04/1001-05.htm>>

AN OVERVIEW II

Return to the Dark Ages Censorship is on the rise. Is it coming to America?

by Jared Taylor

[Following from previous issue]

Other Countries Until 1995, Spain was a popular refuge for dissidents facing prosecution elsewhere in Europe but in that year it passed new laws putting it firmly in the camp of the censors. The first conviction came in November, 1998, when bookseller Pedro Varela was sentenced to five years in jail for "incitement to racial hatred" and "denying or justifying genocide." His case began in December, 1996, when police raided his Librería Europa bookstore in Barcelona and confiscated 20,000 volumes. Nearly two years went by before he went to trial because many of the books were in English, French, or German, and the court insisted that they be translated into Spanish. In addition to the five-year prison term, the court fined him 720,000 pesetas (\$5,000) and ordered all 20,000 books burned—even though only 30 of some 200 titles were found to violate the law.

In December 1998, Mr. Varela appealed the sentence to the provincial court or *Audencia* of Catalonia, which ruled unanimously in April 1999 that the censorship law violates guarantees of free expression in the Spanish constitution. The case will now go before the Constitutional Tribunal in Madrid. In the meantime, Mr. Varela's 20,000 volumes have not yet been burned, but he has not gotten them back either. He restocked his store and continued to operate, but in January 1999, a mob of "anti-fascists" smashed through the protective metal shutters of his shop, ransacked it, and burned hundreds of books. Police arrived but did nothing. Mr. Varela

rebuilt his store and continues to sell books. In Britain, despite campaign promises from Tony Blair that Labour would ban Holocaust denial, in early 2000 Parliament resisted pressure from Jewish groups to do so. Home Office Minister Mike O'Brien explained that the government was unable to "strike a balance between outlawing such offensive statements while ensuring that freedom of speech is not unduly restricted." Since 1986 the Public Order Act has made incitement to racial hatred an offense, but Jewish groups argued this law was inadequate because prosecutors have been unable to show that Holocaust denial incites hatred. This is not to say that these laws have never been used. Although enforcement is sporadic, a few racial nationalists have been convicted. Originally prosecutors had to prove a defendant intended to stir up hatred, but that was difficult. Later the laws were broadened to permit conviction if hatred was stirred up whatever the intent, but that was also hard to prove. Now, it is sufficient to show a "likelihood" that some act will incite racial hatred, and it was on this basis that *Spearhead* editor John Tyndall and *British Nationalist* editor John Morse were tried together and convicted by a single jury in 1986. The prosecution's tactic was to read page after page of "offensive" material in court and the cumulative effect seems to have convinced the jury what they wrote was "likely" to incite hatred. The judge decided the crime deserved six months in jail. Mr. Tyndall, who after serving his sentence returned to editing *Spearhead*, despises incitement laws but believes they have the beneficial effect of keeping racial nationalists from using intemperate—and ultimately unpersuasive—language. Nick Griffin, now head of the British National Party, received a suspended sentence after a similar conviction in 1998. He also edited a magazine, which discussed Holocaust revisionism and opposed non-white immigration to Britain. In his case as well, there seems to have been no clear line between acceptable and unacceptable opinions; his magazine apparently created an overall atmosphere that was "likely" to incite hatred.

Some British anti-racism measures approach outright insanity. As reported in the July 2000 issue of AR, a recently passed law forbidding "racially threatening or abusive words" was recently invoked against a Cambridge man who got into a whispered argument in a library. A woman overheard Robert Birchall tell Kenyan-born Mugai Mbaya to "go back to your own country," and reported him to police. Mr. Birchall was fined 100 pounds. In the city of Gloucester police officers are reported to have been sent to eat in ethnic restaurants and listen in on the conversations of other patrons so they can charge them with crimes if they say rude things about other races. Perhaps even more than to Europeans, Americans feel kin to Canadians and perhaps Australians—fellow English-speakers who have established themselves far from the homeland. But here, too, traditions of free speech have crumbled under the pressure of special interest groups. In October 2000, the Australian Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission ordered Frederick Toben—back from prison in Germany—to remove Holocaust revisionist material from the web page of the Adelaide Institute. Commissioner Kathleen McEvoy said Mr. Toben violated the 1975 Racial Discrimination Act by "having published materials inciting hatred against the Jewish people." She also ordered Mr. Toben to post a lengthy apology. Mr. Toben refused, saying he would not apologize for material he believed to be factual and that any proceeding against him was immoral if truth was not permitted as a defense. The government-funded commission has no enforcement powers, but could initiate proceedings to have Mr. Toben jailed for contempt. In Tasmania, the commission has also accused an associate of the Adelaide Institute, 58-year-old Olga Scully, of selling anti-Jewish material and putting it in mailboxes. She also refused to apologize, and the commission announced plans to take her to court. The Russian-born grandmother says she is not intimidated and is "quite prepared" to go to prison.

It will be a surprise to many Americans to know that our next-door-neighbor Canada now has a nearly 20-year tradition of censorship. In 1981 a well-liked secondary school teacher and mayor in Lacombe County, Alberta, named Jim Keegstra was reported to be telling his social studies students that Jews run the world. The school board fired him—which it no doubt had the right to do—but Canadian authorities also charged him with violating section 281 of the criminal code, which prohibits spreading hate against an identifiable group. Mr. Keegstra remained unrepentant during a ten-year legal battle that took him to the Canadian Supreme Court, which upheld his conviction. The most famous Canadian thought criminal is undoubtedly Ernst Zundel, a German who immigrated to Canada in 1958 and established himself as a commercial artist. Since the mid-1970s he has published and publicized Holocaust revisionist materials, and

in 1983 he was charged under section 181 of the criminal code, which prohibits spreading “false news” that the purveyor knows to be false.

His case became something of a *cause célèbre*, and the trial dragged on for eight weeks before reaching a conviction. Mr. Zundel filed numerous appeals and in 1992 the Supreme Court ruled the law under which he was convicted unconstitutional because it was “an unjustifiable limit on the right and freedom of expression.”

Mr. Zundel was not out of court for long. At the urging of Jewish groups, he was brought before the Canadian Human Rights Commission in what must be one of the most Kafkaesque censorship proceedings of modern times. There is a section of the Canadian criminal code written to outlaw telephone answering machines with “hate messages.” It makes it illegal “to communicate telephonically” “any matter that is likely to expose a person or persons to hatred [for reasons of race, ethnicity, etc.]” In a tortured interpretation of this law, Mr. Zundel was charged on the basis of a web page that contains Holocaust materials by him and by others. Although the site is commonly known as the Zundel site, it is based in the United States and run by an American.

Ironically, the Human Rights Commission has been asked to find Mr. Zundel guilty because he is associated with a foreign web page that publishes articles that, in print form, *have been found to be legal* in Canada. Indeed, the first and lengthiest of the pamphlets cited in the charge is the very one cited in the previous case that was thrown out by the Canadian Supreme Court! What is more, this case has dragged on for an astonishing five years. At the same time, the chairman of the Human Rights Tribunal has conceded that “the truth is not an issue before us. . . . The sole issue is whether such communications are likely to expose a person or persons to hatred or contempt.” Mr. Zundel, who has spent an estimated \$140,000 on the case, recently gave up even trying to defend himself, saying “I would rather save my money and appeal their grotesque ruling when it comes out.” Amazingly, the case continues to drag on without him, with final arguments expected in late February.

Yet another prominent censorship victim has been Doug Collins and the newspaper that used to publish him, the *North Shore News*. In February 1999, the British Columbia Human Rights Tribunal found Mr. Collins guilty of acts “likely to expose Jews to hatred or contempt.” Found criminal were four columns he wrote in 1994. Interestingly, the tribunal decided that taken individually none of the columns was a criminal act, but taken together they were. The tribunal ordered Mr. Collins and the *North Shore News* to desist from further incitement to hatred, and to pay \$2,000 to a Jewish man who had brought the charges, as compensation for injury to his dignity and self-respect. It also ordered the paper to publish the judgment in full, which was perhaps the first time the government ever forced a Canadian newspaper to print something against its will. Mr. Collins now publishes on the Internet.

Canadian authorities have been very unpredictable in their enforcement of laws against “incitement of hatred.” They have never been bothered by the lyrics of black rap “musicians” who openly urge blacks to kill whites, but it has taken a very close look at academic studies of racial differences. Canadian customs authorities have seized many shipments of books from the United States including *Race, Evolution and Behavior*, by Philippe Rushton (reviewed in AR, Dec. 1994). Prof. Rushton, who teaches psychology at the University of Western Ontario, has been himself investigated for inciting hatred and nearly lost his job because of his carefully-researched studies of racial differences. Other books Canadian customs have held at the border include *Shockley on Eugenics and Race* (reviewed in AR, Jan. 1993), *Race, Intelligence and Bias in Academe* by Roger Pearson, *The Dispossessed Majority* by Wilmot Robertson, and *The Immigration Invasion* by Wayne Lutton and John Tanton.

The United States does not have censorship laws but we are creeping in that direction. Hate crime laws are an ominous step, because they add penalties to crimes based on motive. Until the passage of hate crime laws sentencing did not depend on the motive of a crime but whether it was premeditated or spontaneous. You could punch a man because he was fat, black, insulted you, or seduced your wife, and you were guilty of assault. Now, certain motives—that is to say certain thoughts—bring heavier penalties. In February of this year, a Houston, Texas, judge sentenced 21-year-old Matthew Marshall to no fewer than ten years in jail for burning a cross in front of a black family’s house. People who commit gruesome violent crimes often get less jail time.

We have also had a few cases of censorship almost as absurd as those that have begun to

crop up in England. In August, 1998, Janis Barton was leaving a restaurant in Manistee, Michigan, and walked by another group waiting to be seated. Those in the other group spoke to each other in Spanish, and Mrs. Barton said, out loud, "I wish damn Spics would learn to speak English." One of the Spanish-speakers filed a complaint and Mrs. Barton was charged with the crime of committing "insulting conduct in a public place," on the grounds that what she said were "fighting words" that could provoke violence. A jury bought that argument and the judge sentenced Mrs. Barton to 45 days in jail (she served only a few days). This is an odd case that may not be repeated, but it clearly shows the direction in which hypersensitivity to the feelings of non-whites is taking us.

Another worrying step towards censorship is a law passed just last December 15, which requires all libraries receiving federal money to use content filters on computers connected to the Internet. The idea is to protect people from pornography, violence and "hate speech," but the makers of filtering software invariably give it a leftist slant. The federal government is using the power of the purse to restrict access to certain views and information.

What These Laws Mean The full-blown, unabashed censorship laws in Europe and Canada are a giant step backwards in the history of Western Civilization. It was perhaps one of the most significant conceptual breakthroughs in human thought to recognize that the social cost of suppressing "error" is far greater than the damage unchecked "error" can do when men are free to refute it. It is cause for great sadness that our European brethren have stepped back into the mentality of the witch hunt, forcing their citizens into exile and making them prisoners of conscience. Indeed, it is in the defense of prisoners of conscience that Amnesty International (AI) made a name for itself, and cases like those described here would appear to be tailor-made for them. According to their own publications, prisoners of conscience are "people who are imprisoned, detained or otherwise physically restricted anywhere because of their beliefs, color, sex, ethnic origin, language or religion, provided they have not used or advocated violence." Every person mentioned in this article and thousands more have been charged with crimes because of the non-violent expression of beliefs. AI goes on to say that "all people have the right to express their convictions and the obligation to extend that freedom to others" and that "Amnesty International seeks the immediate and unconditional release of all prisoners of conscience."

A number of people have appealed to AI to intervene on behalf of imprisoned Holocaust revisionists but AI refuses. In 1995 it affirmed "Amnesty International's intention to exclude from prisoner of conscience status those who advocate the denial of the Holocaust . .

. ." They took this step on the grounds that dissent from accepted views on the Holocaust means one has "advocated national, racial, or religious hatred that constitutes incitement to discrimination, hostility or violence." What this means is that AI does not consider someone a prisoner of conscience unless it agrees with him.

It is probably true that some of the people charged under incitement laws really do want to stir up hatred—something that however reprehensible is legal in the United States and should be legal everywhere—but there is no evidence whatever that this is the motive of people like Robert Faurisson, Fredrick Toben, Pedro Varela or Germar Rudolf. It is the people who oppose their work who appear to be driven by hatred. Furthermore, as British prosecutors have found, it is unclear just how disputing the existence of gas chambers or the number of Nazi victims incites hatred against anyone. People are not suddenly going to start hating Jews just because a pamphlet convinces them the Nazis killed only one million rather than six million.

It would be more plausible to say that anyone who harps on slavery, Jim Crow, and segregation is inciting hatred against whites, or that anyone who describes the way Indians mutilated the bodies of Custer's men at Little Big Horn is stirring up hatred against Indians. If you scoff at the miracles in the Bible are you inciting hatred against Christians? If not, why not? After all, neither the truth of the statements nor the intent of the speaker matters. Laws of this kind cry out for abuse and invidious application. Obviously of concern to *American Renaissance* is the possibility that any description of race or sex differences could be considered incitement to hatred. What if the French and the Germans decide discussions of race and IQ are hate-mongering? This is actually more logical than saying skepticism about gas chambers makes people hate Jews. Will AR be banned in Europe? Will people who write for AR be arrested if they go to Europe?

Laws about inciting hatred are really very simple: If you hurt the feelings of certain people

you can be charged with a crime. So far, the people about whose feelings one must be most careful are Jews. Pressure from Jewish organizations has turned what may have been intended as universal prohibitions into prohibition of opinions that upset Jews. Laws of the French, German, and Austrian type that specifically prohibit Holocaust denial likewise reflect the pressure of Jewish organizations. There is only one historical event in all of human history—an event of particular interest to Jews—about which the law forbids dissent. Legally requiring acceptance of a historical event is an absurdity on its face, but why just this one?

In January 2000, the French National Assembly voted officially to recognize the Turkish “genocide” of Armenians during the First World War. There are many people who strongly dispute the number and circumstances of these deaths; Turkey angrily withdrew its ambassador after the vote. No doubt there will be vigorous “genocide denial,” “whitewashing of crimes against humanity,” and “insulting the memory of the dead.” Why will this not be a crime in France? One can only conclude that it is because Armenians have less influence than Jews.

But the real shame is how few people, either in Europe or the United States, are willing to oppose this clampdown on freedom. The left loves to quote lines attributed to Martin Niemöller (1892-1954), the German Lutheran minister interned by the Nazis:

“First they came for the Communists, and I didn’t speak up, because I wasn’t a Communist. Then they came for the Jews, and I didn’t speak up, because I wasn’t a Jew. Then they came for the Catholics, and I didn’t speak up, because I was a Protestant. Then they came for me, and by that time there was no one left to speak up for me.”

The message, of course, is that we must be vigilant against wrongs done even to people with whom we may disagree, because if we do not resist evil we may some day be its victims. European censorship laws are precisely the kind of creeping evil Niemöller warned against, but the left ignores them because it has no principles and the right ignores them because it has no spine. Censorship is therefore on the march in Europe and licking at our own borders. We have entered a new Dark Age.

The Law is an Ass

The laws under which Europeans, Canadians and perhaps now Australians can be prosecuted for thought crimes are of several kinds. The first includes the French Gayssot law, which, though amazing, clearly says what it means: No one is to dispute the genocide or other crimes against humanity for which the Nazi leaders were put on trial at Nuremberg after the war. There is no ambiguity about this. Anyone who says the Nazis did not have an extermination program is a criminal.

Laws that forbid “incitement of hatred” are much more ambiguous. These laws are particularly frightening because there is no way to know what they mean. Presumably, if it is against the law to “incite hatred” there should be no conviction unless it is proven that something caused hatred. The prosecution should produce someone who, having read the offending work or heard the offending speech or seen the offending picture or symbol, became a hater. None of the censorship laws requires this. Courts have decided without the slightest evidence that anyone who takes a position on certain questions—even if all he does is deliver this view to subscribers who have paid to receive it—is “inciting hate.” The other breath-taking aspect of these laws is that intent does not matter either. It makes no difference if someone sincerely believes he is uncovering the truth; if what he says can be construed as likely to incite hate, he can end up in behind bars.

Finally, there are laws that have no clear meaning at all. What does it mean to “glorify National Socialism” or “insult the dead” or “whitewash the crimes of the Nazis”? Crimes that depend on wording as vague as this—and there have been plenty of convictions under them—are close kin to Communist laws that forbade “anti-Soviet behavior” or “parasitism.” These were justly decreed in the West, but there is almost complete silence about anti-Nazi laws. In the United States vague prohibitions of this kind are clearly unconstitutional.

Another astonishing aspect of these laws is that truth is not a defense. Once again, in the United States, the law is clear: Truth is an absolute protection for anyone charged with making hurtful, damaging, or embarrassing statements about anyone or anything. In the American colonies this tradition dates back to the famous John Peter Zenger trial of 1735. Zenger, publisher of the *New York Weekly Journal*, was charged by British authorities with publishing articles “tending to raise seditions and tumults among the people of this province, and to fill

their minds with contempt for his majesty's government." Zenger was arrested, jailed, and tried. Jurors, however, were persuaded that "truth ought to govern the whole affair of libels," and in concluding that what Zenger had written was true, both set Zenger free and, in effect, rewrote the law.

To many people, it seems preposterous that anyone who disputes gassings at Auschwitz or doubts Germany's extermination program could appeal to the truth as a defense. However, in cases of this kind facts are of so little importance that there have been convictions for statements that appear to be almost certainly true. British historian David Irving, who in 2000 lost a celebrated libel case against an anti-revisionist author, was fined \$30,000 by a German court for telling a German audience that the Auschwitz gas chamber is a post-war reconstruction. Even the Polish curator at Auschwitz has conceded it is a fake, but Mr. Irving is a criminal and the curator is not. A different German court is seeking Mr. Irving's extradition for having said the same thing to a different German audience.

James Alexander, one of the lawyers who defended John Peter Zenger, would have been appalled. "Freedom of speech," he wrote after the trial, "is a principal pillar in a free government: when this support is taken away, the constitution is dissolved and tyranny erected on its ruins."

American Renaissance, vol. 12, No. 3, March 2001.

AN INTERVIEW BY DISAPPOINTED BOOT-LICKERS

Interview of Norman Finkelstein

by Giovanni De Martis

Grand Satrap of the <Olokaustos.org> website

De Martis: Professor Finkelstein, your book "The Holocaust Industry" was not yet been translated into Italian, and yet volumes have already been published, written by revisionists who comment on its content. A number of negationist websites refer to your work, and use it in their campaign to deny the Shoah. What do you think of this use of your book on the part of negationists? Does this exploitation of your words make you uncomfortable?

Finkelstein: The main reason Holocaust revisionists embraced my book is that the Holocaust industry immediately pigeon-holed it as Holocaust denial to deflect unanswerable criticism. Had it not been labeled Holocaust denial by the Holocaust industry, I doubt Holocaust revisionists would have supported it. There's not a single word in the book that can be interpreted as Holocaust denial. Rather the contrary, I insist throughout the book that the conventional view of the Nazi holocaust - i.e, an assembly-line, industrialized killing of the Jews - is correct, and that the conventional figures on those killed are (more or less) correct. One main point of the book is that it is the Holocaust industry that has become the main purveyor of Holocaust denial in the world. If there were a single word in the book that in any way supported Holocaust denial, why would the world's leading

authority on the Nazi holocaust, Raul Hilberg, repeatedly endorse the book? Of course I would have preferred if Holocaust revisionists didn't support me - just as I'm sure that many critics of the former Soviet Union would have preferred if right-wing fanatics hadn't supported them.

De Martis: You maintain that there exists a lobby which, in actual fact, has made the Shoah into a business. What is, in your view, the most appropriate way to approach the subject of the Shoah?

Finkelstein: I see no reason to invent new approaches to the Nazi holocaust. The conventional tools of historians seem to me adequate. Perhaps these tools are not adequate to fully apprehend what happened, but there's no reason to suppose that these tools are any more

adequate for apprehending other historical events. The Nazi holocaust raises some new questions, but it

doesn't call into question conventional approaches for answering those questions. The best historiography on the subject - e.g., Raul Hilberg's *The Destruction of the European Jews* - utilizes the most conventional approaches.

De Martis: What is your opinion on the phenomenon of negationism, and what are, in your view, the reasons for its growth?

Finkelstein: In general, negationism is a marginal phenomenon wildly inflated by the Holocaust industry to justify its existence. However, the danger does exist that it will grow due to all the falsifications of the Holocaust industry. Were it not for the fact that my late parents passed through the Nazi holocaust, I myself would probably would be a skeptic by now. Who can any

longer believe a single word coming out of the Holocaust industry? To cite just one example, according to the Holocaust industry, "tens of thousands" of Holocaust survivors will still be alive in 2035. It's become a bad joke.

De Martis: Pehr Ahlmark, the Swedish ex Prime Minister, recently wrote: "Traditional antisemitism wanted a "Judenrein" world; modern antisemitism aims at a "Judenstaatrein" world.

Do you agree with this statement?

Finkelstein: Many anti-Semites support Israel; many orthodox Jews are fanatic anti-Zionists. The real purpose of Ahlmark's unclever epigram is to dismiss all criticism of Israel as anti-Semitic. I just came back yesterday from spending several horrible weeks in the West Bank and Gaza. Is it really anti-Semitic to deplore Israel's murderous repression of the Palestinians? I don't think so.

< <http://www.olokaustos.org/saggi/interviste/finkel-en4.htm> >

SAME AS THAT

Concerning free speach and revisionism in Europe.

A brief record by **Lars Thirslund**

In Europe the problems facing free speach take on a little different dimension from that in the USA. In Germany, Austria, France and Switzerland revisionistic manifestions are simply forbidden by laws, and its defenders are sentenced to prison or heavily fines.

This is not exactly the case in Scandinavia and Great Britain. Here you formally are allowed freely to express your opinion on holocaust and other disputed historical issues, but you are prevented from bring it out trough the media. Papers, radio and TV are in Scandinavia dominated by zionistic powers so strongly, that nothing comes through, that is troublesome to zionism and Israel

The evident cruelties in Palestine can't, of course, be totally ignored, when observed by scores of international reporters, but not even the most famous revisionist books are ever mentioned here and that goes even for distinguished Jewish dissidents as Israel Shahak and Benjamin Friedman.

This situation has caused the appearance of samisdats-publishings, which now even appear on the internet.

It was almost a shock to me, when I six years ago got acquainted witr the IHR and the JHR and after short investigations of my own came to the conclusion that you were disclosing

facts that all my life had been hidden to the public in my own and nearby countries.

I could'nt stay passive to this discovery. It soon proved impossibel to bring the information out in the official media. The censorship was thorough as under the Soviet dictatorship. **So I did as the dissidents were doing in the Soviet Union.** I started together with my wife Marianne Herlufsdatter a small bulletin, which we called "Western Samisdatt". By that time we did not know, that Ernst Zündel long before had started a much more powerful and more western samisdatt-publishing.

Seeing the cruel situation for revisionists south of our own country we soon started, co-operating with other Danish revisionists, actions against the horrible laws produced in the four countries, that makes this possible.

With twentyfive other Danish persons we wrote 17.4.1998 to the chairman of the EU-Parliament urging him to make the Parliament take action against these impossible laws. It now appeared, that the EU had made special precautions, to make it impossible for common citizens to have letters presented for the chairman. A committee for petitions is founded obviously with the purpose of stopping unpleasent proposals to reach the top round the members of the Parliament, who are strongly directed by the media.

The chairman of the committee, Mr. Sandro Fontana declared 13.04.1999, that the Parliament had decided, that certain questions as that of the right to express revisionistic opinions on the holocaust, was to be declared a question solely concerning the individual countries. Therefore the question could not be handled of the EU-Parliament. He added, that all members of the committee were agreed that any attempt to deny or diminish "the historical recognized fact", that holocaust has taken place, can weeken our defence against racism and antisemitism.

I answered at once 16.04.1999 emphasizing, that the EU-Parliament, the Council and the Commission in a solemn common declaration in Rome 05.04.1977 had assured their respect for the basic human rights, specially the European conventions signed in Rome 04.11.1950.

I could not see, that Wilhelm Stäglich, Udo Walendy, Germar Rudolph, Günther Deckert and Robert Faurisson as little as Garaudy and abbé Pierre denied historical facts. On the contrary they denied what had shown to be historical falsities.

We never wanted to exonerate Germans from crimes they did, but we find that everybody must be obliged to liberate them from professed crimes they never committed. I wondered if our letter had been correctly translated. They never did send us copy of their translation, what they of course were obliged to do.

They never answered this letter, and it became clear that there was no way to get through to the top of the EU with this important case.

But now the Parliament had established a "ombudsman", who shall help common people against the authorities. He is Finnish with a Swedish name, Jacob Söderman. He ought to be able to understand a little Danish and the Danish way of thinking. However, he answered that he could or would do nothing about the medieval laws, or about the prisoned persons, or about our fruitless applications to the Parliament. He could do absolutely nothing.

We tried a free EU-telephone number. It passed me to a General Secretariate for Justice. Neither this could nor, I surmise, would help.

So I wrote again to Amnesty International in Denmark. I had done so once earlier. This time my letter resulted in an answer from the central organisation in London. I found the answer offending to the gifted persons I had mentioned. They seemed to be considered either as criminals or as idiots. Maybe the following correspondencs will interest other revisionists :

Foreningen Amnesty International arbejder i en række lande for at hjælpe og støtte uskyldige, der er ofre for politiske overgreb som uretfærdig fængsling, afskedigelse og/eller ruinerende ved bøder. Vi har før skrevet til organisationen om overgrebene mod betydelige europæere. Vi besluttede at skrive igen :....

<<http://www.samisdatt.dk/samisdatt/c.html> >

SAME OLD ENEMIES OF THE FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION

Books Seized from Fair on Jewish Outcry

13 titles not to their liking.

Germany -- Frankfurt police have seized dozens of books at the world's biggest book fair after Jewish complaints that they breached a German ban on "anti-Semitic" writing.

The Frankfurt Book Fair is giving a special showcase this year to Arabic literature.

"The prosecutor's office is checking the accusations," the fair's deputy director, Joachim Kehl, said after the Jewish supremacist Simon Wiesenthal Center protested about numerous books being promoted by Arab publishers.

Mr. Kehl declined to say which books were seized but said organizers acted after the Wiesenthal Center complained about 13 titles.

Among those were three volumes it said called for the "destruction of Israel" and one that paid tribute to the late spiritual leader of Palestinian militant group Hamas, Sheikh Ahmed Yassin, assassinated by Israeli forces in March. (The Israeli airstrike that killed the quadriplegic, wheelchair-bound old man also killed many innocent bystanders, blown to bits by the 'blockbuster type' bomb used in the attack. Seventeen people were horribly wounded.)

The Simon Wiesenthal Center's international liaison director, Shimon Samuels, said some of the books contravened **German laws, which ban criticism of Jews and Israel.**

9 Oct. 2004

DRIVE IN SHOAH

France to distribute copies of 'Shoah' film in anti-hate drive

Paris - France's Education Ministry is distributing DVDs with excerpts of the classic Holocaust film "Shoah" to its 5,500 lycees this week, in another step Paris is taking to fight growing anti-Semitism.

Director Claude Lanzmann, whose nine-hour opus features interviews with Holocaust survivors and death camp guards, watched parts of the 1985 film with pupils and Education Minister Francois Fillon at a central Paris lycee on Tuesday.

The copies of "Shoah" - the word is Hebrew for Holocaust - will be accompanied by anthologies of texts pupils will be asked to read to better understand the problems of racism and anti-Semitism, Fillon said at the secondary school.

Lanzmann said Paris had to stress long-term education against hatred if it wanted to roll back a new wave of anti-Semitic attacks, which official statistics say have doubled to tripled over the past year.

"We've seen all too often that, when an anti-Semitic act is committed somewhere, the government immediately calls a meeting of the ministries involved, like a Pavlovian reaction, and everybody asks 'what should we do?'," he said.

"This needs a much longer-term approach," he told France-Info radio.

On a visit to Paris last week, the American Jewish Congress praised the government for taking a firm stand against anti-Semitism, but acknowledged there was no sure-fire method to stamp it out quickly.

Haaretz

<<http://www.haaretzdaily.com/hasen/spages/478439.html>>

LITTLE KILLINGS FOR FUN

Sy Hersh: U.S. Soldiers Massacre Non-Combatant Iraqis

Seymour Hersh spoke at Berkeley last Friday, October 8th. He told a story about recently receiving a call from an American lieutenant in Iraq who'd just witnessed other American soldiers killing non-combatant Iraqis.

HERSH: I got a call last week from a soldier -- it's different now, a lot of communication, 800 numbers. He's an American officer and he was in a unit halfway between Baghdad and the Syrian border. It's a place where we claim we've done great work at cleaning out the insurgency. He was a platoon commander. First lieutenant, ROTC guy.

It was a call about this. He had been bivouacing outside of town with his platoon. It was near, it was an agricultural area, and there was a granary around. And the guys that owned the granary, the Iraqis that owned the granary... It was an area that the insurgency had some control, but it was very quiet, it was not Fallujah. It was a town that was off the mainstream. Not much violence there. And his guys, the guys that owned the granary, had hired, my guess is from his language, I wasn't explicit -- we're talking not more than three dozen, thirty or so guards. Any kind of work people were dying to do. So Iraqis were guarding the granary. His troops were bivouaced, they were stationed there, they got to know everybody...

They were a couple weeks together, they knew each other. So orders came down from the generals in Baghdad, we want to clear the village, like in Samarra. And as he told the story, another platoon from his company came and executed all the guards, as his people were screaming, stop. And he said they just shot them one by one. He went nuts, and his soldiers went nuts. And he's hysterical. He's totally hysterical. And he went to the captain. He was a lieutenant, he went to the company captain. And the company captain said, "No, you don't understand. That's a kill. We got thirty-six insurgents."

You read those stories where the Americans, we take a city, we had a combat, a hundred and fifteen insurgents are killed. You read those stories. It's shades of Vietnam again, folks, body counts...

You know what I told him? I said, fella, I said: you've complained to the captain. He knows you think they committed murder. Your troops know their fellow soldiers committed murder. Shut up. Just shut up. Get through your tour and just shut up. You're going to get a bullet in the back. You don't need that. And that's where we are with this war.

<<http://portland.indymedia.org/en/2004/10/299837.shtml>

You may download a video of the conference. Quite exciting. Remember Hersh was the first one to dig up the story of My Lai. Remember My Lai ? Nam, heard of ? Somewhere in Asia, a lot of grunts KIA there... Bad times...

UNSPEAKABLE TRUTHS

Professor Bruno Gollnisch in Lyon (France)

1) France mulls ways to sanction Holocaust doubter

Paris - France is checking whether it can take legal action against a leading far-right politician who has questioned whether the Nazis used gas chambers in the Holocaust, Justice Minister Dominique Perben said on Thursday. The University of Lyon has urged education officials to suspend Bruno Gollnisch, a professor of Japanese there, for questioning how the gas chambers were used in the wartime slaughter of the Jews and querying the death toll.

The president of the European Parliament, Josep Borrell, also called for legal action against Gollnisch, a European deputy who is also the number two man in the National Front party of extreme-right leader Jean-Marie Le Pen. "Mr Gollnisch's comments are absolutely unacceptable," Perben told France Info radio in announcing the probe. "In an affair like this, I think the response should not only be penal ... but it should be political and possibly also professional."

France anti-racism laws have made denying the Holocaust a crime, punishable by fines and even prison. Gollnisch, who is known as the intellectual of the controversial party, said on Monday he recognized that the gas chambers had existed but thought historians still had to decide whether they were actually used to kill Jews. He called for an open debate about whether the total number of Jews killed in the Holocaust was actually 6 million as stated.

He also questioned the objectivity of leading historian Henry Rousso, who is investigating charges that certain Lyon lecturers were denying the Holocaust, by calling him "a Jewish personality". The CRIF umbrella group of French Jewish organizations publicly condemned Gollnisch's comments at a news conference about Rousso's report on Holocaust denial at Lyon University. European Parliament head Borrell said: "I would like to say clearly to public opinion in Europe and to all those who suffered from Nazi ethnic cleansing that the European Parliament will not tolerate this kind of statement."

At his Monday news conference, Gollnisch also said that serious historians no longer accepted that all the judgements of the post-war Nuremberg Trials of leading Nazis were fair. "I don't know if I will lose my chair as professor of Japanese or even be put in prison for saying that, but I stand by it," he added. Gollnisch, who studied law and political science at Kyoto University in Japan, holds a chair for Japanese language and civilization at the Lyon university named after Jean Moulin - the hero of the French Resistance murdered by the Nazis in 1943.

2) Outrage as Le Pen aide casts doubt on existence of Holocaust Susan Bell in Paris

FOR two years, the National Front in France has tried to present itself as a moderate, socially acceptable, right-wing party - a strategy guided by Jean-Marie Le Pen's youngest daughter, Marine. But Mr Le Pen's deputy, Bruno Gollnisch, has blown a hole through that public relations effort by casting doubt on the existence of the Holocaust, provoking outrage. "There is not a serious historian alive today who adheres completely to the conclusions of the Nuremberg trials," Mr Gollnisch, a Euro MP and Mr Le Pen's designated successor, said at a press conference in Lyons on Monday [October 11, 2004].

"I do not call into question the existence of the concentration camps, but as to the number of dead, historians can still have something to argue about. As to the existence of the gas chambers, that is up to the historians to determine," he added. A leading anti-racist organisation, LICRA, said it had asked the president of the European Parliament to sanction the National Front deputy. And demands were made for Mr Gollnisch to be suspended from his professorship at a university in Lyons.

His comments also infuriated senior members of the National Front, who have been striving to present a socially acceptable image of the anti-immigrant party. "At his next appearance, he should just put on a hood and a Ku Klux Klan outfit and he will have got the total look," one exasperated executive said. Until this latest controversy, Marine Le Pen had been trying hard to transform the party's image and tone down her father's frequently offensive rhetoric in a bid to attract more women and young people. Her movement, Generations Le Pen, offered a softer, more palatable version of the National Front. Members of Ms Le Pen's camp were reported to be furious with Mr Gollnisch over his comments.

"It's unbelievable," one aide to Ms Le Pen said. "It really does not follow the line of credibility and the culture of government which we have fixed for ourselves." "He let himself go," said another disgruntled senior figure in the party. "This is hardly going to make us more popular, or him either, while he looks like the next leader the party will be putting up for president." This is not the first time Mr Gollnisch has made such statements. In 1996, he sung the praises of French soldiers who served under the Nazis on the eastern front during the Second World War.

This is a sensitive issue for the brilliant but colourless Mr Gollnisch. After long being

promised the party leadership upon the retirement of the ageing Mr Le Pen, he is faced with a formidable rival in the form of the boss's daughter. Dubbed "the clone" by party insiders, the square-jawed, green-eyed blonde with the gravelly voice is the spitting image of her pugnacious father and is increasingly powerful within the National Front. Many believe she is positioning herself to take on her father's mantle upon his retirement, rumoured to be in 2006. That led observers to say yesterday they believed Mr Gollnisch's comments were far from being a slip but instead were a carefully calculated rallying call to the ultra right-wing core of the party, which feels betrayed by Ms Le Pen's softly-softly approach.

Although the party's golden girl is clearly a chip off the old block, offering few variations on her father's anti-immigration, law-and-order message, the twice-married mother of three has riled many party militants by supporting abortion. Mr Gollnisch, a professor of languages and Japanese civilisation, made his comments as he was reacting to the published findings of an investigation into alleged extreme right-wing activities at the University of Lyons III, where he teaches. A report by the investigating commission, headed by the Jewish historian Henry Rousso, found "it was incontestable that the founders of Lyons III have more than just tolerated the _expression of extreme- right ideas".

Yesterday, the president of Lyons III, Guy Lavoire, said he had asked the education minister, François Fillon, to suspend Mr Gollnisch from his post following his comments. Mr Le Pen is no stranger to controversial statements about the Holocaust. Some 17 years ago, he shocked France, and the rest of the world, by describing the Nazi gas chambers used to murder an estimated 3.5 million Jews as a "mere detail of history" while speaking in Munich in the company of a former Nazi SS officer. "In a book which contains 1,000 lines, the concentration camps take up about ten to 15 lines. That is what is called a detail," Mr Le Pen said. Speaking on the French radio station Europe 1 in 1987, Mr Le Pen declared: "I am not saying that the gas chambers did not exist. I did not have the possibility to see them personally. I haven't especially studied the question. But I believe it is a detail in the history of the Second World War." That comment led to him being stripped of his seat in the European Parliament.

Reuters, October 14, 2004

=====

Christian Zionism and Palestine: Internet Sources

<<http://www.christchurch-virginiawater.co.uk/bibwebsites.html> >

In Defence of the Boycott of Israeli Academic Institutions

<<http://www.monabaker.com/InDefenceoftheBoycottofIsraeliAcademicInstitutions.htm>>

+++++

This site contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available in our efforts to advance understanding of environmental, political, human rights, economic, democracy, scientific, and social justice issues, etc. We believe this constitutes a 'fair use' of any such copyrighted material as provided for in section 107 of the US Copyright Law. In accordance with Title 17 U.S.C. Section 107, the material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving the included information for research and educational purposes. For more information go to: <<http://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/17/107.shtml>>. If you wish to use copyrighted material from this site for purposes of your own that go beyond 'fair use', you must obtain permission from the copyright owner.

OTHER AAARGH MONTHLY PUBLICATIONS

El Paso del Ebro

<<http://www.geocities.com/ilrestodelsiclo> >

Das kausale Nexusblatt

<<http://www.geocities.com/ilrestodelsiclo> >

Il Resto del Siculo

<<http://www.geocities.com/ilrestodelsiclo/resto> >

La Gazette du Golfe et des banlieues (multilingual)

<<http://ggb.0catch.com> >

Conseils de Révision