

THE REVISIONIST CLARION

oo

MONTHLY NEWSLETTER ABOUT HISTORICAL REVISIONISM AND THE CRISIS OF IMPERIAL POWERS

oo

Issue Nr. 2 - February 2004

oooooooooooooooooooooooooooo

[<aaargh-international.org/engl/engl.html>](http://aaargh-international.org/engl/engl.html)

oo

Contents

An Interview with **Benny MORRIS**

Bob FITRAKIS, Why Bush must be captured and tried alongside Saddam Hussein

Dr. Rosemary Radford RUETHER, Was the Bush Administration Complicit in 9/11?

Paul GRUBACH, letter to the editor to the "Forward" magazine.

Lasse WILHELMSON, Zionism - more than traditional colonialism and apartheid.

Joh DOMINGO, White Nationalists - a possible ally ?

NIZKOR and **Mark WEBER**, The Enduring Live of the War Mythology.

Germar RUDOLF, Photos.

Robert FAURISSON, Presentation of The Hoax of the Twentieth Century (French Edition, 2002).

NUTS AND BOLTS

TOWARDS A FREE-KILL ZONE IN PALESTINE ?

TALK OF A BLOODTHIRSTY

January 16, 2004

Survival of the Fittest?

An Interview with Benny Morris

By **ARI SHAVIT**

Note: Benny Morris is the dean of Israeli 'new historians', who have done so much to create a critical vision of Zionism--its expulsion and continuing oppression of the Palestinians, its pressing need for moral and political atonement. His 1987 book, The Birth of the Palestinian Refugee Problem, chronicled the Zionist murders, terrorism, and ethnic cleansing that drove 600,000-750,000 Palestinians from their homes in 1948, thus refuting the myth that they fled under the orders of Arab leaders. A second edition of this book is due out

this month, chronicling even more massacres, and a previously unsuspected number of rapes and murders of Palestinian women. Thus Morris continues to provide crucial documentation for Palestinians fighting the heritage of Al-Nakba, "The Catastrophe."

But in an astonishing recent Ha'aretz interview, after summarizing his new research, Morris proceeds to argue for the necessity of ethnic cleansing in 1948. He faults David Ben-Gurion for failing to expel all Arab Israelis, and hints that it may be necessary to finish the job in the future. Though he calls himself a left-wing Zionist, he invokes and praises the fascist Vladimir Jabotinsky in calling for an "iron wall" solution to the current crisis. Referring to Sharon's Security Wall, he says, "Something like a cage has to be built for them. I know that sounds terrible. It is really cruel. But there is no choice. There is a wild animal there that has to be locked up in one way or another." He calls the conflict between Israelis and Arabs a struggle between civilization and barbarism, and suggests an analogy frequently drawn by Palestinians, though from the other side of the Winchester: "Even the great American democracy could not have been created without the annihilation of the Indians."

That's nice and clear. Now one can find fault with the analogy, as did one outraged reader of Ha'aretz, who suggested that the annihilation of the Indians was the prototype for American imperialism, not the precondition for American democracy. But such arguments are almost beside the point. Morris's chilling candor effectively removes him from the realm of rational argument, and hauls Sharon's fascist vision of a Greater Israel out into the light of day. There's no point in saying, "You're talking about ethnic cleansing!" for Morris says bluntly, "There are circumstances in history that justify ethnic cleansing." There's no point in saying, "You're denying Palestinian suffering!" for after chronicling that suffering in scrupulous detail, he observes brightly, "You can't make an omelet without breaking eggs. You have to dirty your hands." There's no point in saying, "This is racist!" for Morris has abandoned humanist ethical universalism, invoking the pied-noir Camus to do so: "He was considered a left-winger and a person of high morals, but when he referred to the Algerian problem he placed his mother ahead of morality. Preserving my people is more important than universal moral concepts."

When momma makes it into a political analogy, somebody's about to bleed: never get between a colon and his motherland, particularly if his motherland used to be your motherland. Here, **Morris leaves Enlightenment universalism for a volkische ethics of blood and bone** that has haunted world history from Herder to Milosevic. But another French-Algerian, Jules Roy, answered Camus (and Benny Morris): "It is not a matter of choosing one's mother over justice. It is a matter of loving justice as much as one's mother."

Jim Holstun

Jim Holstun is professor of English at University at Buffalo.

(This interview originally in
<<http://www.haaretz.com/hasen/spages/380986.html>> Ha'aretz)

Benny Morris says he was always a Zionist. People were mistaken when they labeled him a post-Zionist, when they thought that his historical study on the birth of the Palestinian refugee problem was intended to undercut the Zionist enterprise. Nonsense, Morris says, that's completely unfounded. Some readers simply misread the book. They didn't read it with the same detachment, the same moral neutrality, with which it was written. So they came to the mistaken conclusion that when Morris describes the cruelest deeds that the Zionist movement perpetrated in 1948 he is actually being condemnatory, that when he describes the large-scale expulsion operations he is being denunciatory. They did not conceive that the great documenter of the sins of Zionism in fact identifies with those sins. That he thinks some of them, at least, were unavoidable.

Two years ago, different voices began to be heard. The historian who was considered a radical leftist suddenly maintained that Israel had no one to talk to. The researcher who was accused of being an Israel hater (and was boycotted by the Israeli academic establishment) began to publish articles in favor of Israel in the British paper The Guardian.

Whereas citizen Morris turned out to be a not completely snow-white dove, historian Morris continued to work on the Hebrew translation of his massive work "Righteous Victims: A History of the Zionist-Arab Conflict, 1881-2001," which was written in the old, peace-pursuing style. And at the same time historian Morris completed the new version of his book on the refugee problem, which is going to strengthen the hands of those who abominate Israel. So that in the past two years citizen Morris and historian Morris worked as though there is no connection between them, as though one was trying to save what the other insists on eradicating.

Both books will appear in the coming month. The book on the history of the Zionist-Arab conflict will be published in Hebrew by Am Oved in Tel Aviv, while the Cambridge University Press will publish "The Birth of the Palestinian Refugee Problem Revisited" (it originally appeared, under the CUP imprint, in 1987). That book describes in chilling detail the atrocities of the Nakba. Isn't Morris ever frightened at the present-day political implications of his historical study? Isn't he fearful that he has contributed to Israel becoming almost a pariah state? After a few moments of evasion, Morris admits that he is. Sometimes he really is frightened. Sometimes he asks himself what he has wrought.

He is short, plump, and very intense. The son of immigrants from England, he was born in Kibbutz Ein Hahores and was a member of the left-wing Hashomer Hatzair youth movement. In the past, he was a reporter for the Jerusalem Post and refused to do military service in the territories. He is now a professor of history at Ben-Gurion University of the Negev in Be'er Sheva. But sitting in his armchair in his Jerusalem apartment, he does not don the mantle of the cautious academic. Far from it: Morris spews out his words, rapidly and energetically, sometimes spilling over into English. He doesn't think twice before firing off the sharpest, most shocking statements, which are anything but politically correct. He describes horrific war crimes offhandedly, paints apocalyptic visions with a smile on his lips. He gives the observer the feeling that this agitated individual, who with his own hands opened the Zionist Pandora's box, is still having difficulty coping with what he found in it, still finding it hard to deal with the internal contradictions that are his lot and the lot of us all.

Rape, massacre, transfer

Benny Morris, in the month ahead the new version of your book on the birth of the Palestinian refugee problem is due to be published. Who will be less pleased with the book - the Israelis or the Palestinians?

"The revised book is a double-edged sword. It is based on many documents that were not available to me when I wrote the original book, most of them from the Israel Defense Forces Archives. What the new material shows is that there were far more Israeli acts of massacre than I had previously thought. To my surprise, there were also many cases of rape. In the months of April-May 1948, units of the Haganah [the pre-state defense force that was the precursor of the IDF] were given operational orders that stated explicitly that they were to uproot the villagers, expel them and destroy the villages themselves.

"At the same time, it turns out that there was a series of orders issued by the Arab Higher Committee and by the Palestinian intermediate levels to remove children, women and the elderly from the villages. So that on the one hand, the book reinforces the accusation against the Zionist side, but on the other hand it also proves that many of those who left the villages did so with the encouragement of the Palestinian leadership itself."

According to your new findings, how many cases of Israeli rape were there in 1948?

"About a dozen. In Acre four soldiers raped a girl and murdered her and her father. In Jaffa, soldiers of the Kiryati Brigade raped one girl and tried to rape several more. At Hunin, which is in the Galilee, two girls were raped and then murdered. There were one or two cases of rape at Tantura, south of Haifa. There was one case of rape at Qula, in the center of the country. At the village of Abu Shusha, near Kibbutz Gezer [in the Ramle area] there were four female prisoners, one of whom was raped a number of times. And there were other cases. Usually more than one soldier was involved. Usually there were one or two Palestinian girls. In a large proportion of the cases the event ended with murder. Because neither the victims nor the rapists liked to report these events, we have to assume that the dozen cases of rape that were reported, which I found, are not the whole story. They are just the tip of the iceberg."

According to your findings, how many acts of Israeli massacre were perpetrated in 1948?

"Twenty-four. In some cases four or five people were executed, in others the numbers were 70, 80, 100. There was also a great deal of arbitrary killing. Two old men are spotted walking in a field - they are shot. A woman is found in an abandoned village - she is shot. There are cases such as the village of Dawayima [in the Hebron region], in which a column entered the village with all guns blazing and killed anything that moved.

"The worst cases were Saliha (70-80 killed), Deir Yassin (100-110), Lod (250), Dawayima (hundreds) and perhaps Abu Shusha (70). There is no unequivocal proof of a large-scale massacre at Tantura, but war crimes were perpetrated there. At Jaffa there was a massacre about which nothing had been known until now. The same at Arab al Muwassi, in the north. About half of the acts of massacre were part of Operation Hiram [in the north, in October 1948]: at Safsaf, Saliha, Jish, Eilaboun, Arab al Muwasi, Deir al Asad, Majdal Krum, Sasa. In Operation Hiram there was a unusually high concentration of executions of people against a wall or next to a well in an orderly fashion.

"That can't be chance. It's a pattern. Apparently, various officers who took part in the operation understood that the expulsion order they received permitted them to do these deeds in order to encourage the population to take to the roads. The fact is that no one was punished for these acts of murder. Ben-Gurion silenced the matter. He covered up for the officers who did the massacres."

What you are telling me here, as though by the way, is that in Operation Hiram there was a comprehensive and explicit expulsion order. Is that right?

"Yes. One of the revelations in the book is that on October 31, 1948, the commander of the Northern Front, Moshe Carmel, issued an order in writing to his units to expedite the removal of the Arab population. Carmel took this action immediately after a visit by Ben-Gurion to the Northern Command in Nazareth. There is no doubt in my mind that this order originated with Ben-Gurion. Just as the expulsion order for the city of Lod, which was signed by Yitzhak Rabin, was issued immediately after Ben-Gurion visited the headquarters of Operation Dani [July 1948]."

Are you saying that Ben-Gurion was personally responsible for a deliberate and systematic policy of mass expulsion?

"From April 1948, Ben-Gurion is projecting a message of transfer. There is no explicit order of his in writing, there is no orderly comprehensive policy, but there is an atmosphere of [population] transfer. The transfer idea is in the air. The entire leadership understands that

this is the idea. The officer corps understands what is required of them. Under Ben-Gurion, a consensus of transfer is created."

Ben-Gurion was a "transferist"?

"Of course. Ben-Gurion was a transferist. He understood that there could be no Jewish state with a large and hostile Arab minority in its midst. There would be no such state. It would not be able to exist."

I don't hear you condemning him.

"Ben-Gurion was right. If he had not done what he did, a state would not have come into being. That has to be clear. It is impossible to evade it. Without the uprooting of the Palestinians, a Jewish state would not have arisen here."

When ethnic cleansing is justified

Benny Morris, for decades you have been researching the dark side of Zionism. You are an expert on the atrocities of 1948. In the end, do you in effect justify all this? Are you an advocate of the transfer of 1948?

"There is no justification for acts of rape. There is no justification for acts of massacre. Those are war crimes. But in certain conditions, expulsion is not a war crime. I don't think that the expulsions of 1948 were war crimes. You can't make an omelet without breaking eggs. You have to dirty your hands."

We are talking about the killing of thousands of people, the destruction of an entire society.

"A society that aims to kill you forces you to destroy it. When the choice is between destroying or being destroyed, it's better to destroy."

There is something chilling about the quiet way in which you say that.

"If you expected me to burst into tears, I'm sorry to disappoint you. I will not do that."

So when the commanders of Operation Dani are standing there and observing the long and terrible column of the 50,000 people expelled from Lod walking eastward, you stand there with them? You justify them?

"I definitely understand them. I understand their motives. I don't think they felt any pangs of conscience, and in their place I wouldn't have felt pangs of conscience. Without that act, they would not have won the war and the state would not have come into being."

You do not condemn them morally?

"No."

They perpetrated ethnic cleansing.

"**There are circumstances in history that justify ethnic cleansing.** I know that this term is completely negative in the discourse of the 21st century, but when the choice is between ethnic cleansing and genocide - the annihilation of your people - I prefer ethnic cleansing."

And that was the situation in 1948?

"That was the situation. That is what Zionism faced. A Jewish state would not have come into being without the uprooting of 700,000 Palestinians. Therefore it was necessary to uproot them. There was no choice but to expel that population. It was necessary to cleanse the hinterland and cleanse the border areas and cleanse the main roads. It was necessary to cleanse the villages from which our convoys and our settlements were fired on."

The term 'to cleanse' is terrible.

"I know it doesn't sound nice but that's the term they used at the time. I adopted it from all the 1948 documents in which I am immersed."

What you are saying is hard to listen to and hard to digest. You sound hard-hearted.

"I feel sympathy for the Palestinian people, which truly underwent a hard tragedy. I feel sympathy for the refugees themselves. But if the desire to establish a Jewish state here is legitimate, there was no other choice. It was impossible to leave a large fifth column in the country. >From the moment the Yishuv [pre-1948 Jewish community in Palestine] was attacked by the Palestinians and afterward by the Arab states, there was no choice but to expel the Palestinian population. To uproot it in the course of war.

"Remember another thing: the Arab people gained a large slice of the planet. Not thanks to its skills or its great virtues, but because it conquered and murdered and forced those it conquered to convert during many generations. But in the end the Arabs have 22 states. The Jewish people did not have even one state. There was no reason in the world why it should not have one state. Therefore, from my point of view, the need to establish this state in this place overcame the injustice that was done to the Palestinians by uprooting them."

And morally speaking, you have no problem with that deed?

"That is correct. Even the great American democracy could not have been created without the annihilation of the Indians. There are cases in which the overall, final good justifies harsh and cruel acts that are committed in the course of history."

And in our case it effectively justifies a population transfer.

"That's what emerges."

And you take that in stride? War crimes? Massacres? The burning fields and the devastated villages of the Nakba?

"You have to put things in proportion. These are small war crimes. All told, if we take all the massacres and all the executions of 1948, we come to about 800 who were killed. In comparison to the massacres that were perpetrated in Bosnia, that's peanuts. In comparison to the massacres the Russians perpetrated against the Germans at Stalingrad, that's chicken feed. When you take into account that there was a bloody civil war here and that we lost an entire 1 percent of the population, you find that we behaved very well."

The next transfer

You went through an interesting process. You went to research Ben-Gurion and the Zionist establishment critically, but in the end you actually identify with them. You are as tough in your words as they were in their deeds.

"You may be right. Because I investigated the conflict in depth, I was forced to cope with the in-depth questions that those people coped with. I understood the problematic character of the situation they faced and maybe I adopted part of their universe of concepts.

But I do not identify with Ben-Gurion. I think he made a serious historical mistake in 1948. Even though he understood the demographic issue and the need to establish a Jewish state without a large Arab minority, he got cold feet during the war. In the end, he faltered."

I'm not sure I understand. Are you saying that Ben-Gurion erred in expelling too few Arabs?

"If he was already engaged in expulsion, maybe he should have done a complete job. I know that this stuns the Arabs and the liberals and the politically correct types. But my feeling is that this place would be quieter and know less suffering if the matter had been resolved once and for all. If Ben-Gurion had carried out a large expulsion and cleansed the whole country - the whole Land of Israel, as far as the Jordan River. It may yet turn out that this was his fatal mistake. If he had carried out a full expulsion - rather than a partial one - he would have stabilized the State of Israel for generations."

I find it hard to believe what I am hearing.

"If the end of the story turns out to be a gloomy one for the Jews, it will be because Ben-Gurion did not complete the transfer in 1948. Because he left a large and volatile demographic reserve in the West Bank and Gaza and within Israel itself."

In his place, would you have expelled them all? All the Arabs in the country?

"But I am not a statesman. I do not put myself in his place. But as an historian, I assert that a mistake was made here. Yes. The non-completion of the transfer was a mistake."

And today? Do you advocate a transfer today?

"If you are asking me whether I support the transfer and expulsion of the Arabs from the West Bank, Gaza and perhaps even from Galilee and the Triangle, I say not at this moment. I am not willing to be a partner to that act. In the present circumstances it is neither moral nor realistic. The world would not allow it, the Arab world would not allow it, it would destroy the Jewish society from within. But I am ready to tell you that in other circumstances, apocalyptic ones, which are liable to be realized in five or ten years, I can see expulsions. If we find ourselves with atomic weapons around us, or if there is a general Arab attack on us and a situation of warfare on the front with Arabs in the rear shooting at convoys on their way to the front, acts of expulsion will be entirely reasonable. They may even be essential."

Including the expulsion of Israeli Arabs?

"The Israeli Arabs are a time bomb. Their slide into complete Palestinization has made them an emissary of the enemy that is among us. They are a potential fifth column. In both demographic and security terms they are liable to undermine the state. So that if Israel again finds itself in a situation of existential threat, as in 1948, it may be forced to act as it did then. If we are attacked by Egypt (after an Islamist revolution in Cairo) and by Syria, and chemical and biological missiles slam into our cities, and at the same time Israeli Palestinians attack us from behind, I can see an expulsion situation. It could happen. If the threat to Israel is existential, expulsion will be justified."

Cultural dementia

Besides being tough, you are also very gloomy. You weren't always like that, were you?

"My turning point began after 2000. I wasn't a great optimist even before that. True, I always voted Labor or Meretz or Sheli [a dovish party of the late 1970s], and in 1988 I refused to serve in the territories and was jailed for it, but I always doubted the intentions of the

Palestinians. The events of Camp David and what followed in their wake turned the doubt into certainty. When the Palestinians rejected the proposal of [prime minister Ehud] Barak in July 2000 and the Clinton proposal in December 2000, I understood that they are unwilling to accept the two-state solution. They want it all. Lod and Acre and Jaffa."

If that's so, then the whole Oslo process was mistaken and there is a basic flaw in the entire worldview of the Israeli peace movement.

"Oslo had to be tried. But today it has to be clear that from the Palestinian point of view, Oslo was a deception. [Palestinian leader Yasser] Arafat did not change for the worse, Arafat simply defrauded us. He was never sincere in his readiness for compromise and conciliation."

Do you really believe Arafat wants to throw us into the sea?

"He wants to send us back to Europe, to the sea we came from. He truly sees us as a Crusader state and he thinks about the Crusader precedent and wishes us a Crusader end. I'm certain that Israeli intelligence has unequivocal information proving that in internal conversations Arafat talks seriously about the phased plan [which would eliminate Israel in stages]. But the problem is not just Arafat. The entire Palestinian national elite is prone to see us as Crusaders and is driven by the phased plan. That's why the Palestinians are not honestly ready to forgo the right of return. They are preserving it as an instrument with which they will destroy the Jewish state when the time comes. They can't tolerate the existence of a Jewish state - not in 80 percent of the country and not in 30 percent. From their point of view, the Palestinian state must cover the whole Land of Israel."

If so, the two-state solution is not viable; even if a peace treaty is signed, it will soon collapse.

"Ideologically, I support the two-state solution. It's the only alternative to the expulsion of the Jews or the expulsion of the Palestinians or total destruction. But in practice, in this generation, a settlement of that kind will not hold water. At least 30 to 40 percent of the Palestinian public and at least 30 to 40 percent of the heart of every Palestinian will not accept it. After a short break, terrorism will erupt again and the war will resume."

Your prognosis doesn't leave much room for hope, does it?

"It's hard for me, too. There is not going to be peace in the present generation. There will not be a solution. We are doomed to live by the sword. I'm already fairly old, but for my children that is especially bleak. I don't know if they will want to go on living in a place where there is no hope. Even if Israel is not destroyed, we won't see a good, normal life here in the decades ahead."

Aren't your harsh words an over-reaction to three hard years of terrorism?

"The bombing of the buses and restaurants really shook me. They made me understand the depth of the hatred for us. They made me understand that the Palestinian, Arab and Muslim hostility toward Jewish existence here is taking us to the brink of destruction. I don't see the suicide bombings as isolated acts. They express the deep will of the Palestinian people. That is what the majority of the Palestinians want. They want what happened to the bus to happen to all of us."

Yet we, too, bear responsibility for the violence and the hatred: the occupation, the roadblocks, the closures, maybe even the Nakba itself.

"You don't have to tell me that. I have researched Palestinian history. I understand the reasons for the hatred very well. The Palestinians are retaliating now not only for yesterday's closure but for the Nakba as well. But that is not a sufficient explanation. The peoples of Africa were oppressed by the European powers no less than the Palestinians were oppressed by us, but nevertheless I don't see African terrorism in London, Paris or Brussels. The Germans killed far more of us than we killed the Palestinians, but we aren't blowing up buses in Munich and Nuremberg. So there is something else here, something deeper, that has to do with Islam and Arab culture."

Are you trying to argue that Palestinian terrorism derives from some sort of deep cultural problem?

"There is a deep problem in Islam. It's a world whose values are different. A world in which human life doesn't have the same value as it does in the West, in which freedom, democracy, openness and creativity are alien. A world that makes those who are not part of the camp of Islam fair game. Revenge is also important here. Revenge plays a central part in the Arab tribal culture. Therefore, the people we are fighting and the society that sends them have no moral inhibitions. If it obtains chemical or biological or atomic weapons, it will use them. If it is able, it will also commit genocide."

I want to insist on my point: A large part of the responsibility for the hatred of the Palestinians rests with us. After all, you yourself showed us that the Palestinians experienced a historical catastrophe.

"True. But when one has to deal with a serial killer, it's not so important to discover why he became a serial killer. What's important is to imprison the murderer or to execute him."

Explain the image: Who is the serial killer in the analogy?

"The barbarians who want to take our lives. The people the Palestinian society sends to carry out the terrorist attacks, and in some way the Palestinian society itself as well. At the moment, that society is in the state of being a serial killer. It is a very sick society. It should be treated the way we treat individuals who are serial killers."

What does that mean? What should we do tomorrow morning?

"We have to try to heal the Palestinians. Maybe over the years the establishment of a Palestinian state will help in the healing process. But in the meantime, until the medicine is found, they have to be contained so that they will not succeed in murdering us."

To fence them in? To place them under closure?

"Something like a cage has to be built for them. I know that sounds terrible. It is really cruel. But there is no choice. There is a wild animal there that has to be locked up in one way or another."

War of barbarians

Benny Morris, have you joined the right wing?

"No, no. I still think of myself as left-wing. I still support in principle two states for two peoples."

But you don't believe that this solution will last. You don't believe in peace.

"In my opinion, we will not have peace, no."

Then what is your solution?

"In this generation there is apparently no solution. To be vigilant, to defend the country as far as is possible."

The iron wall approach?

"Yes. An iron wall is a good image. An iron wall is the most reasonable policy for the coming generation. My colleague Avi Shlein described this well: What Jabotinsky proposed is what Ben-Gurion adopted. In the 1950s, there was a dispute between Ben-Gurion and Moshe Sharett. Ben-Gurion argued that the Arabs understand only force and that ultimate force is the one thing that will persuade them to accept our presence here. He was right. That's not to say that we don't need diplomacy. Both toward the West and for our own conscience, it's important that we strive for a political solution. But in the end, what will decide their readiness to accept us will be force alone. Only the recognition that they are not capable of defeating us."

For a left-winger, you sound very much like a right-winger, wouldn't you say?

"I'm trying to be realistic. I know it doesn't always sound politically correct, but I think that political correctness poisons history in any case. It impedes our ability to see the truth. And I also identify with Albert Camus. He was considered a left-winger and a person of high morals, but when he referred to the Algerian problem he placed his mother ahead of morality. Preserving my people is more important than universal moral concepts."

Are you a neo-conservative? Do you read the current historical reality in the terms of Samuel Huntington?

"I think there is a clash between civilizations here [as Huntington argues]. I think the West today resembles the Roman Empire of the fourth, fifth and sixth centuries: The barbarians are attacking it and they may also destroy it."

The Muslims are barbarians, then?

"I think the values I mentioned earlier are values of barbarians - the attitude toward democracy, freedom, openness; the attitude toward human life. In that sense they are barbarians. The Arab world as it is today is barbarian."

And in your view these new barbarians are truly threatening the Rome of our time?

"Yes. The West is stronger but it's not clear whether it knows how to repulse this wave of hatred. The phenomenon of the mass Muslim penetration into the West and their settlement there is creating a dangerous internal threat. A similar process took place in Rome. They let the barbarians in and they toppled the empire from within."

Is it really all that dramatic? Is the West truly in danger?

"Yes. I think that the war between the civilizations is the main characteristic of the 21st century. I think President Bush is wrong when he denies the very existence of that war. It's not only a matter of bin Laden. This is a struggle against a whole world that espouses different values. And we are on the front line. Exactly like the Crusaders, we are the vulnerable branch of Europe in this place."

The situation as you describe it is extremely harsh. You are not entirely convinced that we can survive here, are you?

"The possibility of annihilation exists."

Would you describe yourself as an apocalyptic person?

"The whole Zionist project is apocalyptic. It exists within hostile surroundings and in a certain sense its existence is unreasonable. It wasn't reasonable for it to succeed in 1881 and it wasn't reasonable for it to succeed in 1948 and it's not reasonable that it will succeed now. Nevertheless, it has come this far. In a certain way it is miraculous. I live the events of 1948, and 1948 projects itself on what could happen here. Yes, I think of Armageddon. It's possible. Within the next 20 years there could be an atomic war here."

If Zionism is so dangerous for the Jews and if Zionism makes the Arabs so wretched, maybe it's a mistake?

"No, Zionism was not a mistake. The desire to establish a Jewish state here was a legitimate one, a positive one. But given the character of Islam and given the character of the Arab nation, it was a mistake to think that it would be possible to establish a tranquil state here that lives in harmony with its surroundings."

Which leaves us, nevertheless, with two possibilities: either a cruel, tragic Zionism, or the forgoing of Zionism.

"Yes. That's so. You have pared it down, but that's correct."

Would you agree that this historical reality is intolerable, that there is something inhuman about it?

"Yes. But that's so for the Jewish people, not the Palestinians. A people that suffered for 2,000 years, that went through the Holocaust, arrives at its patrimony but is thrust into a renewed round of bloodshed, that is perhaps the road to annihilation. In terms of cosmic justice, that's terrible. It's far more shocking than what happened in 1948 to a small part of the Arab nation that was then in Palestine."

So what you are telling me is that you live the Palestinian Nakba of the past less than you live the possible Jewish Nakba of the future?

"Yes. Destruction could be the end of this process. It could be the end of the Zionist experiment. And that's what really depresses and scares me."

The title of the book you are now publishing in Hebrew is "Victims." In the end, then, your argument is that of the two victims of this conflict, we are the bigger one.

"Yes. Exactly. We are the greater victims in the course of history and we are also the greater potential victim. Even though we are oppressing the Palestinians, we are the weaker side here. We are a small minority in a large sea of hostile Arabs who want to eliminate us. So it's possible than when their desire is realized, everyone will understand what I am saying to you now. Everyone will understand we are the true victims. But by then it will be too late."

Ha'aretz, 9 janvier 2004

<<http://www.haaretz.com/hasen/spages/380986.html>>

A French translation has been provided at

<<http://aaargh-international.org/fran/livres4/morrisfr.pdf>>

=====>

Why Bush must be captured and tried alongside Saddam Hussein

Bob Fittrakis

December 31, 2003: (FreePress.org) As the new year unfolds, one unmistakable fact remains unreported in America's submissive mainstream media: our President George W. Bush is a war criminal. Any attempt to state this obvious fact is ignored and any Democratic Presidential hopeful who suggests we repudiate the new Bush doctrine of American imperialism and instead, work for world peace, is dismissed as a "vanity" candidate and told to drop out of the race.

The case against President Bush is overwhelming. The nonprofit American Society of International Law, consisting mainly of scholars, has laid out the case against the President in article after article in a dispassionate fashion. Following the September 11, 2001 attack on the United States by the Al Qaeda terrorist organization, both the United States and Britain attempted to comply with international law. When Operation Enduring Freedom, the massive military assault on Afghanistan, began on October 7, 2001, both countries adhered to the United Nations Charter Article 51 by notifying the Security Council that they were attacking Afghanistan under the doctrine of individual and collective self-defense. Most international law scholars accepted the United States' right to self-defense against terrorist bases in Afghanistan.

From legitimate self-defense, the Bush administration suddenly resurrected the discredited Nazi doctrine of "preventive war" with Bush and his collaborators arguing that in the battle of "good" versus "evil" the United States had the right to attack any country that might pose a future threat to our nation.

The Bush administration is using the recent capture of Saddam Hussein for propaganda purposes to justify its illegal and criminal war against Iraq. Some newspapers have gone so far to question the practicality of the "Bush doctrine" without pointing out its illegal and criminal nature. For example, Matthew Hay Brown of the Orlando Sentinel wrote in a news analysis piece the day Saddam was captured, that: "By striking at a country that was not threatening to attack the United States and without hard evidence of weapons of mass destruction or links to al-Qaeda officials hope to show the length to which the United States would go to protect itself."

The Columbus Dispatch ran Brown's analysis on its front page. Still there was no mention of the universal repudiation of the Bush doctrine.

Let's start with the obvious. Any law scholar will tell you that pre-emptive self-defense is unlawful under international law – from Article VI of the Nuremberg Charter to the UN Charter. In fact, the United States was the guiding force behind both the Nuremberg trials and the establishment of the United Nations. At the end of the second world war, with the Nazis defeated and discredited, the United Nations Charter, a treaty binding on the U.S., prohibited nations using preventive force in Article II, Section 4. Only the Security Council has the authority to take measures against "threats to the peace, breaches of the peace, and acts of aggression."

The only exception to this is the right of individual and collective self-defense that the U.S. and Britain invoked under Article 51. The key, of course, is that you has to be attacked or that an enemy must be in the process of attacking you. Under the UN Charter, you cannot simply say here's a list of "rogue nations" who may at some undefined time in the near future pose a threat to you because they may harbor weapons of mass destruction, which we have in abundance, and they are not allowed to have. Nor is there anything under international law that says simply developing a weapons program amounts to an armed

threat or attack. If this were true, every country on Earth would be justified in attacking the U.S., the country with the greatest number of WMD's, at any time.

A few voices in the Democratic Presidential primary have attempted to raise substantial issues concerning U.S. foreign policy but the mainstream media is obsessed with its "politics as horse race" mentality focusing mostly on who is in the lead. So, while the talking heads analyze the post-Saddam capture "Bush bounce" and predict that no President with a favorable rating over 60% going into a presidential election year has ever lost, they miss the point that if they actually reported that world consensus holds their president to be a war criminal, then maybe his rating wouldn't be so high.

Perhaps the most egregious example of a journalist trying to silence debate on the Bush doctrine was ABC debate moderator Ted Koppel who suggested that peace candidates Dennis Kucinich, Ambassador Carol Mosley-Braun and Rev. Al Sharpton should drop out of the debate. When Kucinich directly challenged Koppel suggesting that it wasn't the media's role to define who should be in or out of a presidential race prior to the people casting votes, ABC retaliated by pulling the fulltime reporter covering the Kucinich campaign.

Recently the Pope reminded the world that the war against Iraq is illegal. Perhaps ABC could take the fulltime reporter they pulled from Kucinich and put him on fulltime research on the illegality of the Bush doctrine and its eerie parallels to Nazi Germany and its attack on Poland.

And they might want to look into the story Popular Mechanics broke in its December 2003 issue showing a satellite photo of a pipeline through Kuwait looting Iraqi oil from the Ramalah oil field.

Dr. Bob Fittrakis is Senior Editor of The Free Press (<http://freepress.org>), a political science professor, and author of numerous articles and books.
<<http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article5467.htm>>

=====>

Book Review: The New Pearl Harbor

Was the Bush Administration Complicit in 9/11?

by Dr. Rosemary Radford Ruether

Until recently I dismissed the suggestions that the Bush administration might have been complicit in allowing 9/11 to happen as groundless "conspiracy theory." I regarded the federal investigative bureaucracies as suffering from a "lock the barn door after the horse has escaped" syndrome. American government agencies seemed to me to be full of repressive energy and exaggerated overreach after some atrocity had occurred, but remarkably incompetent when it came to preventing something in advance. There is no question that the Bush administration has profited greatly from the 9/11 attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, but I did not imagine that they could have actually known they were being planned and deliberately allowed them to happen.

Thus it was with some skepticism that I agreed to read the new book written by David Ray Griffin, a process theologian from the Claremont School of Theology (Claremont, California), that argues the case for just such complicity. This book, *The New Pearl Harbor: Disturbing Questions about the Bush Administration and 9/11*, is due for release in January, 2004. Griffin admits that he too was skeptical toward such suggestions until he began to actually read the evidence that has been accumulated by a number of researchers, both in the United States and Europe. As he became increasingly convinced that there was a case for complicity, he planned to write an article, but this quickly grew into a book.

The first startling piece of evidence that Griffin puts forward is establishing the motive among leaders in the Bush administration for allowing such an attack. Already in 2000 the right-wing authors of the "Project for the New American Century: Rebuilding

America's Defenses," opined that the military expansion they desired would be difficult unless a "new Pearl Harbor" occurred. They had outlined plans for a major imperial expansion of American power that included a greatly increased military budget and invasions of Afghanistan and Iraq, primarily to secure oil supplies, but also to control the region generally. But they believed that the American people would not have the will for such actions without some devastating attack from outside that would galvanize them through fear and anger to support it. In short, they had already envisioned facilitating a major attack on the United States in order to gain the public support for their policy goals.

Griffin then shows the considerable evidence that the Bush administration knew in advance that such an attack was being planned, despite claims by the administration that such an attack was completely unanticipated. As early as 1995 the Philippine police conveyed to the U.S. information found on an Al-Qaeda computer that detailed "Project Bojinka" that envisioned hijacking planes and flying them into targets, such as the World Trade Center, the White House and the Pentagon. By July of 2001 the CIA and the FBI had intercepted considerable information that such an attack was planned for the Fall. Leaders of several different countries, including the Taliban in Afghanistan, as well as leaders of Russia, Britain, Jordan, Egypt and Israel, conveyed information to the United States that such an attack was being planned. It appears not only that all these warnings were disregarded, but that investigations into them were obstructed.

The actual events of September 11 leave many puzzling questions. Standard procedures for intervention when a plane goes off course were not followed in the case of all four airplanes. Within ten minutes of evidence that a plane has been hijacked standard procedures call for fighter jets to intervene and demand that the plane follow it to an airport. If the plane fails to obey, it should be shot down. There was time for this to happen before the plane was over New York City in the case of the first jet and more than ample time in the case of the second. Moreover when the order was finally given to intervene, it was not to McGuire Air Force Base in New Jersey, seventy miles from New York City, but from Otis Air National Guard in Cape Cod.

Griffin also examines unexplained issues about the other two planes. Eye witnesses and on-site evidence suggests that a missile or guided fighter aircraft, not a large commercial plane, crashed into the Pentagon. Moreover the part of the Pentagon that was hit was not where high ranking generals were working, but an area under repair with few military officials. Flight #93 was the only plane shot down, although only after it appeared passengers were on the verge of taking control. Griffin also examines the conduct of President Bush on that day, giving considerable evidence that he knew of the first crash immediately after it happened, but delayed his response for some half a hour, nonchalantly continuing with a photo op with elementary school children.

These are only a few details of the myriad data that Griffin assembles to show that, not only did the Bush administration have detailed information that such attacks were going to occur on September 11 and failed to carry through protective responses in advance, but that they also obstructed the standard procedures to intervene in these events on the actual day it happened.

Griffin concludes the book with some considerable evidence of the way the Bush Administration has obstructed any independent investigation of 9/11 since it occurred, both withholding key documents and insisting that the official investigation, when it was set up, limit itself to recommendations about how to avoid such an event in the future, and not focus on how it actually was able to happen. Griffin writes in a precise and careful fashion, avoiding inflammatory rhetoric. He argues for a high probability for the Bush Administration's complicity in allowing and facilitating the attacks, based not on any one conclusive piece of evidence, but the sheer accumulation of all of the data. He concludes by calling for a genuinely independent investigative effort that would examine all this evidence. He himself plans to send the book to the Kean Commission presently charged with that task, even though he has doubts about its real independence.

I personally found Griffin's book both convincing and chilling. If the complicity of the Bush Administration to which he points is true, then Americans have a far greater problem

on their hands than even the more ardent anti-war critics have imagined. If the administration would do this, what else would they do to maintain and expand their power?

=====>

Revisionist Paul Grubach sends a letter to the editor to the "Forward" magazine:

In the recent, 11/14/03 issue of the Forward (p.9), one of the most important Jewish newspapers in the United States, I came across the following statement made by Rabbi Eric Yoffe, president of the Union for Reform Judaism. He stated: "And in Europe, which bears the mark of Cain for its complicity in the Holocaust, the Arab-Israeli conflict has become a means of absolving guilt. In turning Israelis from victims into Nazis, they [non-Jewish Europeans] seek to cleanse their consciences by casting their sins upon us [Jews]."

This comment is interesting for two reasons. First, it shows that the Holocaust doctrine is indeed used by certain groups of powerful Jews as an ideological battering ram against all non-Jewish Europeans. Notice that Rabbi Yoffe labels all of Europe with the "mark of Cain." Just as it is socially and morally acceptable for Jewish groups like the ADL to proclaim as its mission the ending of the defamation of the Jewish people, so it should also be with non-Jewish Europeans. What is good for the goose is good for the gander. It should be socially and morally acceptable for non-Jewish Europeans to work to expose the lies and exaggerations in the Holocaust ideology, which in turn are used to defame all non-Jewish Europeans. This is one of the reasons why the mission of Walter Mueller's Patriot Letter is so vitally important. By exposing Holocaust lies and exaggerations, the online journal is helping to end the defamation of all of European peoples.

The quote from Rabbi Yoffe is important for another reason. It displays the hypocritical double standard that is so deeply ingrained in modern day society. It is a fact of history that people of Jewish descent were a major force behind the rise of totalitarian Communism, which in turn brought misery and death to millions of non-Jewish people. It is also a historical fact that there was a large amount of sympathy and support within the Jewish community for Communism. Now, suppose for the sake of argument a major European or American politician were to say something similar to what Rabbi Yoffe said: "And in the Jewish Community, which bears the mark of Cain for its complicity in the crimes of Communism, the Nazi Holocaust has become a means of absolving guilt. In turning all non-Jewish Europeans into Holocaust perpetrators, the Jews seek to cleanse their consciences by casting their sins upon non-Jews."

Any European or American leader that made a statement like this would immediately be branded an "evil anti-Semite." Indeed, in certain European nations he may even be put on trial for "hate crimes." Contemporary Western society "allows" Jews to use the Holocaust as an ideological battering ram against non-Jews. But non-Jews are absolutely forbidden to use the crimes of Communism as a battering reproach against Jews. Hypocrisy abounds.

Paul Grubach

Patriot Letter, 7 January 2004

=====>

Today we introduce a new author: Lasse Wilhelmson from Sweden, who spent a few years in Israeli kibbutz before becoming disenchanted with Zionism. His line presented in the article below runs against contradistinction of good Socialist Zionism (of Ben Gurion, Rabin, Barak) vs. bad Revisionist Zionism of Jabotinsky, Begin and Sharon. Lasse goes far beyond

usual condemnation of Zionism and asserts that Socialist Zionism is but Jewish National Socialism, and notes extreme similarity of left-wing and right-wing Zionism. He finds a common root of Jewish and German National Socialism in teachings of 'the Red Rabbi' Moses Hess, who allegedly influenced Marx, Herzl and Hitler. Somewhat mysterious personality, Hess is credited with being a source of the Jewish Question by Karl Marx, who however repudiated him in strong terms. Hess rejected the Class war concept of Marx and offered the Race war and Class peace idea, later utilised by Adolf Hitler. Herzl thought Hess was the true founder of Zionism and his Forerunner.

Lasse Wilhelmson calls for a single democratic state in the whole of Palestine, and for boycott of Israel until its racist laws are repealed. Following Israel Shahak, he finds Judaism an extremely problematic doctrine and an origin of Israeli racism. He calls for creation of a Palestinian version of ANC, a joint movement for all native and adoptive Palestinians.

Israel Adam Shamir

=====>

Zionism - more than traditional colonialism and apartheid

by Lasse Wilhelmson

The Jewish colonisation of Palestine under the Zionist slogan "the land without people to the people without a land" started almost a hundred years ago and reached its first climax with the proclamation of The Jewish State of Israel in 1948. A second climax is now in the offing through the ongoing colonisation of the West Bank and Gaza.

A Jewish state needs a substantial majority of Jews in the population. This has been insured by means of immigration, terror and expulsion of the native Palestine population. Jewish hegemony in Israel today is secured through a system of apartheid inherent in all aspects of Society, be it law, administration or religion. Israel lacks a constitution and fixed borders, which is fully consistent with Zionism's call for continual expansion.

Israel - not even a democracy for Jews

There is a law in Israel, passed in 1985, which forbids political parties to openly oppose the principle of a Jewish state. Neither are they allowed to work for a change of this principle through democratic means. A party so doing will be banned from elections to the Knesset. Democracy is thus denied to those citizens – even Jews – who wish to work within the parliamentary system towards replacing the Jewish state with a secular state which represents all its citizens' equal rights regardless of religion or ethnic origin. This law alone prevents Israel from being seen as a liberal democracy of Western type.

All Jews living outside Israel are entitled by law to immigrate and become citizens immediately, while the Palestinian refugees who were expelled from their homes are prohibited from returning. This is a violation of international law. Israel is the only country in the world that defines its land as belonging to just one group of its citizens, namely Jews. This law works as a fundamental national apartheid law and turns all Jews into potential enemies of the Palestinians.

Israel is an apartheid state

Other laws and administrative regulations emphasize Israel as a Jewish apartheid state. Israeli ID cards indicate whether the holder is Jewish or not and Jews in Israel may not marry non-Jews. Non-Jewish Israelis cannot purchase government-owned land. Many Arab villages in Israel are not zoned as residential areas, as a result of which they have no access to public services such as electricity and water. The disqualification of most Arab Israelis

from military service reinforces discrimination as regards social benefits, education and the like.

In Israel/Palestine today, there are three apartheid classes of people.

1. Jews are fully qualified citizens of Israel, the West Bank, Gaza and the whole world.
2. Non-Jews in Israel, mainly Palestinians (20 percent) are secondclass citizens
3. Palestinians are stateless non-citizens on the West Bank, in Gaza or in refugee camps in neighbouring countries.

Israel continues to violate international law and commit crimes against humanity. They have conducted genocide against the Palestinians for a hundred years. When Israel became a member of the UN in 1949 an objection was raised regarding a previous UN demand that the refugees be allowed to return home at the earliest possible date and that they should receive full compensation for property, according to international law and practice. For 55 years, Israel has completely ignored this demand. On these grounds alone Israel could be expelled from the UN. No other state, saving Israel, has so completely ignored so many UN resolutions.

Israel is a military superpower with nuclear weapons and took active part in the US and England's war against Iraq. Without any provocation, Israel recently bombed targets in Syria and armed its fleet with nuclear weapons. Previously they attacked Egypt and Lebanon amongst others.

How could this evolve? What is the ideology behind this very special project of colonialism, the only one that has survived two turns of a century? What sort of ideology is Zionism?

More than a hundred years of colonialism

Colonising Palestine continues today on the West Bank and in Gaza according to the practical plan presented by Theodor Herzl in his book "The Jewish State"(1896) The book is mainly about how the project could be financed and how land in Palestine could be transferred to Jewish ownership. The plan was affirmed by the first Zionist Congress 1897.

Herzl had some important starting points for the Zionist Project.

- . Antisemitism cannot be remedied by the assimilation of Jews.
- . Jews are a race of people with a right to their own state.
- . Palestine (or Zion) is the home of the Jewish State
- . The goal is a socialist Utopia - a model state

The term Zionism was, however, conceived by Nathan Birnbaum in 1885. Together with Herzl he made up the leadership of the Zionist World Organisation. Later on he became a spokesman for Judaism in the Diaspora - outside Israel/Palestine.

Moses Hess - the Communist Rabbi

The fundamental ideology of Zionism however evolved much earlier with Moses Hess. He was one of Germany's earliest renowned Socialists. He was a Utopian, a Hegelian and a good friend of Karl Marx. Hess also wrote a contribution to The Communist Manifesto (1848) on the question of Religion as opium to the masses. He is considered by Zionists as the first Zionist. As he grew older he dissociated himself from Marx and "returned" to his People, that is to say Judaism. Marx shunned Hess' chauvinistic ideas. "Communist Rabbi Moses" as he was also called, wrote Zionism's Magnum Opus which Herzl later referred to as the book which says everything there is worth saying about Zionism.

This book, "Rome and Jerusalem" was published by Hess in 1862. He was inspired, amongst others, by Spinoza. He defines the Jewish Nation by the following components:

- . The Jewish race - superior and chosen
- . Palestine - the homeland of the Jewish people

- . The Jewish religion - the best guarantee for Jewish nationality.

The importance of Blood in defining racial purity was common at that time and was also part of Hess' conception. He saw the German race as antagonistic to the Jewish race. He worried about the antisemitism apparent in Germany at that time and this was his main reason for "returning" to Judaism. For him, Socialism, apart from developing equality of the classes must also develop a moral dimension. The Jewish State should have the makings of a Socialist State.

Hess predicted both the foundation of the State of Israel and the Holocaust 80 -85 years in advance of these occurrences. Hess considered France to be the foremost ally of the Jews. This was before the Dreyfus trial in France which came to be the one event that convinced Theodor Herzl that Zionism was the only solution to antisemitism.

Marxist Zionism and Zionist Revisionism

After the first Zionist Congress, the renowned Marxist Ber Borochov developed the rigorous policies of the Zionist Project. He argued territorial concentration as a solution to, among other things, the Jewish question. He founded Poalei Zion, the Marxist Zionist Party which supported the Russian Revolution in 1917. David Ben Gurion, one of the Party members and Israel's founder, came to Palestine at the beginning of the twentieth century. He considered himself a Bolshevik and was in favour of the dictatorship of the proletariat in all countries, except Palestine where he favoured the dictatorship of Zionism. Ben Gurion considered Jewish national interests superior to class interests in Palestine: a clear case of unmitigated National Socialist leanings.

When the Poalei Zion split up, Ben Gurion became the leader of the Social Democrat wing and was influential in Zionism for years to come. The colonisation took place in the name of Socialism and the enlightened culture of the Western World. Under the forceful leadership of Ben Gurion the colonisation proceeded in stages while upholding negotiations with the Palestinians. The foundation of the Jewish state could wait. The first issue was the building of a strong army (Hagana), which could drive the Palestinians out and create and defend a substantial Jewish majority on as large a part of Palestine as possible. The strategy was very successful. Israel was proclaimed in 1948 on land which geographically comprised almost 80% of the whole of Palestine: a considerable increase to the UN Partition plan which offered Jews 55%. Today Israel has seized all of the original Palestine, while the Palestinian villages are now surrounded by The Wall, cut through by motorways - only for Jews - and interspersed with hundreds of check points and fortified Jewish settlements.

A minority within Zionism, represented by Zeév Jabotinsky wanted immediate action. In 1925 he founded a Zionist revisionist movement. In the article "The Iron Wall" (1937), he stated, among other things, that all native people are against colonisation, even the Palestinians. Colonisers must therefore use the utmost determination to show that opposition does not pay off.

"We hold that Zionism is moral and just. And since it is moral and just, justice must be done, no matter whether Joseph or Simon or Ivan or Achmet agree with it or not. There is no other morality." (ibid.) The above mentioned are the two main standpoints within Zionism which have also, during different periods of time, served as the official ideology in Israel. Interwoven in these and of varying importance, are other movements such as practical Zionism, radical messianic Zionism, religious Zionism, spiritual/cultural Zionism and more.

Zionism, National Socialism and Fascism

While Ben Gurion sympathised with Marxism and later on with Social Democracy, Jabotinsky sympathised with Fascism. He admired Mussolini who supported him. Jabotinsky died in 1940 before the proclamation of The State Of Israel. He founded the Jewish terror organisation Irgun which committed its most horrible deeds during the expulsion of the Palestinians. The Lehi, a splinter group headed by Stern, murdered Folke Bernadotte who was the UN representative and mediator. The man who pulled the trigger became Ben Gurion's good friend and security guard when he retired to the kibbutz Sde Bocker. The

leaders of both organisations Menachem Begin and Yitzhak Shamir later became Prime Ministers of Israel.

It is remarkable how similar the two Zionist standpoints are in practical politics. The Iron-Wall policy is now being completed by Israel's present Prime Minister, Ariel Sharon, with greater military force than ever before. Sharon belongs to the same right-wing group as Begin and Shamir (Likud). However it was the governments lead by the Social Democrats that started and completed most of the considerable expansion of Jewish settlements on the West Bank and Gaza.

The Eastern European Jews, who were Marxists, stamped their mark on the colonisation of Palestine during the first half of the twentieth century. Collective farms - the kibbutz - were the main instrument in bringing it about. They were democratic, socialist, experimental units, often secular. No money was in use and the collective upbringing of children was common for a long time. Only Jews were allowed to be members. The seemingly racist kibbutz played an important part in the capture and military defence of occupied territory. The settlements of today on the West Bank and in Gaza serve a similar purpose, though they are religiously orthodox.

A Zionist leftist ideology dominated in the beginning. As shown above this can also be seen as Jewish National Socialism, upheld by Ben Gurion. After the occupation of the West Bank and Gaza in 1967 a Zionist right-wing ideology, like Jabotinsky's has dominated. The Israeli "left" of today is predominately left-wing Zionism. Within Zionism's two main standpoints there has been interaction. Thus left-wing Zionism has targeted policies for the settlements, while the right-wing has been responsible for terrorism and ethnic cleansing. After 1967, the religious influence on Israel's politics has grown. However, religion has always been important in Zionism. Nowadays in Israel, religion and politics have merged.

Zionism and Jewish Religion

Classic Judaism (and orthodox of today) has its roots in the Jewish societies in Europe of the Middle Ages. Zionism has given it a boost. Its antagonism towards non-Jews and the opinion that Jews are God's Chosen People has great impact on Israel's policies towards the rest of the world.

According to Halachah, classic Judaism's laws and customs, for example "compassion towards others" extends to Jews only. Murder or manslaughter is judged mildly when the perpetrator is Jewish and the victim a non-Jew. Also according to Halachah, it is accepted for a Jew to kill a non-Jew if he is laying claim to "eternal Jewish land". This is what the settlers' religious organisations are alleging. There is no corresponding law in Israel's judicial system but in effect it influences the system as punishment of such crimes is very mild.

Israel's state terrorism, theft of land and occupation, demolition of houses, the building of the Wall etc including the so called 'extra-judicial killings' (assassinations), are seen by Zionists as legitimate defence of the Nation and therefore fall under international law - which Israel ignores.

Israel Shahak discusses the influence classic Judaism has on Israel's policies in his book "Jewish History, Jewish Religion" (1996). For a long period of time Shahak was chairman of Israel's Society for Human and Civil Rights. He is especially critical of the double moral standards kept by prominent left wing intellectual Jews, particularly Martin Buber, the well known philosopher. Buber criticised Nazism while commending the Jewish Religion (Hassidism) but keeping quiet about its dehumanising of non-Jews (goyim). These double standards act to increase Israel's chauvinism and hatred of all non-Jews. Israel's Peace Movement has been accused of harbouring similar sentiments.

Many countries which think of themselves as modern, attempt to do away with religious thinking from the Middle Ages, mainly by the separation of Church from State and laws against racism. The opposite has occurred in Israel. The revival of classic Judaism in Israel's politics can be seen as an expression of Zionist expansion, thus increasing opposition to the Palestinian Arabs.

Had the Jews, some 75 years ago, chosen a bi-national democracy for their national sovereignty, there could have been peaceful development of the English Mandate for Palestine. The Mandate was partitioned by the UN in 1947 even though this meant the

further extension of land already colonised. Judah Magnes, head of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, advocated bi-nationalism, as did Folke Bernadotte, the UN mediator. A Jewish nationalism which acknowledges the Palestinians right to national sovereignty is more in keeping with Judaism's long tradition of humanity and "Jewish Enlightenment". But the Zionists under their leader Ben Gurion demanded a Jewish State in no less than the whole of Palestine.

The next opportunity Israel had to achieve a peaceful development was the Oslo Agreement. The Palestinians accepted a Jewish State on 78% of land that was the original Palestine in return for the development of their own State on the remaining 22%. But the Zionists turned down this generous offer. Israel has thus repeatedly rejected solutions which could have insured Jewish national interests and given them international recognition. Instead of this, Israel has chosen a policy which runs the risk of shattering The Jewish state. The logic of this can not be understood without taking into consideration classic Judaism's close connection with Zionism.

Zionism and Nazism

Moses Hess put together the fundamental components Race, People, Nation and "the Chosen" to make a National Socialist version of colonialism. It was later to be known as Zionism. Hitler, 60 years on, put together the same components in Mein Kampf and formed his National Socialist Party. Hess' opinions about the "purity of the Jewish race" correspond to Hitler's belief in "the pure Aryan race".

This is extreme chauvinism based on the theory of the connection between "Blood and Soil". Despite the similarity of ideological structure, there are differences in constitutional and organisational structures. The same goes for similarities to the former apartheid State of South Africa. Family ties (Blood ties) are however still basic to Jews all over the world and in the Jewish state of Israel. A person with a Jewish mother is defined for religious purposes as a Jew, according to the Jewish Community in Stockholm, even if he considers himself an atheist. Jewish religion and family ties today are interwoven at a personal level, like religion and politics are in Society as a whole, as shown above.

"I too, like Hitler, believe in the power of the blood idea", Chaim Nachman Bialik writes this in "The Present Hour" (1934) Bialik is Israel's most acclaimed poet. Had it been 10 years later he would probably have chosen to refer to Moses Hess, or kept quiet on the matter. Bialik's sentiments on the enigma of the Blood can also be found in the above mentioned Martin Buber's book "On Judaism" (1967).

Summary

Israel is not only a traditional colonial State with apartheid and racism, but also a Western imperialist fortress in The Orient. Zionism also means expansion and ethnic cleansing. Furthermore, it is an elitist ideology. It grows politically and religiously amongst the broad masses of people and is thereby strengthened. Religious totalitarianism is its ideological base with strong links to National Socialism and Fascism. The brutal violence, the intransigence and the dehumanisation of the Palestinians can only be understood against this background. Against this background, the genocide of the Palestinians is possible and consistent. It is the background against which Israel is a "time bomb" in the Middle East policies of the US. It is high time Zionism and its Jewish State was replaced by a secular parliamentary democracy with equal rights for all citizens regardless of ethnic or religious beliefs. The grounds for a system of apartheid and the occupation of the West Bank and Gaza would thereby disappear. This is a necessary, if not conclusive, requirement if there is to be lasting peace between Israeli Jews and Palestinian Arabs. Whether it results in one or two secular democracies is of secondary importance. A feasible strategy for achieving democracy in Israel/Palestine would be the start of a liberation movement where Jews and Palestinians could pull together similar to the ANC movement in South Africa. Those Jews and Palestinians who are already fighting Zionism should therefore be given support first.

It is also high time Jews - both in Israel and elsewhere - started reforming the Jewish religion. The concept of Blood ties should be replaced by religious conviction, the idea of Jews as "The Chosen People" should be rejected and Jews looked upon as people like everyone else.

The current genocide must stop. First of all for the sake of the Palestinians but also for the Jews. It fires a growing hatred of Jews in large parts of the World. United Nations forces are needed to protect the Palestinians and worldwide sanctions of Israel should be maintained.

Lasse Wilhelmson, Stockholm
<wilhelmson@gmx.net>

Bibliography

Moses **Hess**, *The Revival of Israel – Rome and Jerusalem, The Last Nationalist Question*. Bison Book, 1995
Theodor **Herzl**, *The Jewish State*, 1896. Web edition
Shabtai **Teveth**, *Ben-Gurion and the Palestinian Arabs, From Peace to War*, Oxford University Press, 1985
Zeév (Vladimir) **Jabotinsky**, *The Iron Wall*. Article in *The Jerusalem Herald* 26th November 1937, Web edition
<<http://aaargh-international.org/fran/actu/actu03/doc2003/jabot.html>>
Israel **Shahak**, *Jewish History, Jewish Religion*, Pluto Publishers, 1996
Martin **Buber**, *On Judaism*, Schocken Books, New York 1967
Avi **Shlaim**, *The iron wall, Israel and the Arab World*, Penguin Books, 2001
Adolf **Hitler**, *Mein Kampf, Parts One and Two*. Högglunds 2002
Marx och Engels, *Kommunistiska manifestet*, Arbetarkultur, Stockholm 1947.
Gilad **Atzmon**, *Israeli People's Most Common Mistakes*. Article in *Counter Punch*, Web edition, August 28th 2003
Lasse **Wilhelmson**, *Demokrati eller folk mord?* Article in *SVD/Brännpunkt* June 3rd 2003
Lasse **Wilhelmson**, *Israel Must Choose The Path of Democracy*. Article in *The Palestine Chronicle*, Web edition, 17th September 2003
Jabotinsky Institute in Israel, on the Web
Ber Borochoy Internet Archive
Jewish Virtual Library, on the Web
The Jewish Agency for Israel, on the Web

=====>

White Nationalists - a possible ally ?

By Joh Domingo

Today we talk about things unthinkable a few years ago. Tomorrow we will do things unthinkable today. Struggle is theatre, and the Palestinian struggle has become the Broadway of the liberation movement. This struggle has moved from the seedy halls to become a smash hit because they have the benefit of the greatest publicity machine of all time, the Jewish dominated Mass Media of the United States. All that remains is the final act, with its incredible finale.

Commonwisdom has it that Israel was conceived as a response to Racism, and has morphed into the Racist monster we see today. For many liberals, to oppose Zionism is to oppose Racism; is to oppose anti-Semitism. But they fail to see the intricate relationship between Nationalism and Racism. While Nationalism can be both a positive and negative natural force, Racism is a totally negative construct feeding on negative ethnocentric sentiments and involves acts of dispossession and the subjugation of others. Racism is a denial of the valid opposing claims of others and requires the absence of a nationalist consciousness in opposition to it. It can survive for centuries, providing those oppressed by Racism accept the frame of reference provided by the Racist. Absent this condition, Racism falters against the resistance provided by a countervailing nationalist consciousness. For this reason; true Racist always has to ensure that the distinction between Racism and Nationalism is obscured. An individual asserting that he as good as any is piddling compared to a homogeneous group

asserting their PRIDE in their cultural heritage. Asserting your pride in your cultural heritage does not carry with it a need that others be ashamed of theirs.

Antisemitism can mean many things: from acute hatred of Jews, to objection to Jewish cultural domination, to mild mockery of Jewish values. But what is nationalism, if not the mocking of those that mock you, thereby building up the antibodies to protect you from the scourge of Racism? Examined in this light, the cry of "antisemitism" can be seen to be the ultimate racist tool, designed to ensure the domination of a racist discourse.

Why Zionism is Racism but antisemitism is not.

Because of the deliberate skewing of the discourse as cover for Racist domination, we are led to believe that someone championing the virtues of his ethnic background is the same as someone promoting the idea of the racial domination of others. Hence, anyone providing context that presents his race in a positive light, as opposed to a competing culture, is equated with the worst Racist Supremacist doctrines of the Apartheid and Nazi regimes. At the same time, a Racist Oppressor can be presented as an enlightened humanist if he hides his nationalism while denouncing the thoughts of competing nationalists. Yitzhak Rabin, a racist supremacist if there ever was one, who presided over the deaths and torture of tens of thousands, is presented as a saint next to David Duke, the ex-Grand Wizard of the Ku Klux Klan, who struggles to maintain his livelihood and culture in his own land. While it is true that the KKK are rogues, and have proven that they are capable of sliding into Racist atrocities of a Rabin given the opportunity; a comparison fails the equivalency test. Rabin is lauded and presented as champion of enlightenment, while the ex-Grand Wizard struggles to even find voice amongst his own kind and is completely marginalized in his own country.

Even the worse Racist in South Africa never tried to squeeze the life out of African Society. Apartheid was monstrous, but it was never Ethnocide. It is a triumph of Zionist propaganda that they have managed to convince us that they are merely as bad as Jim Crows America. It is a triumph that they have managed to limit us to comparing Zionism with Apartheid. Such a comparison is an insult - to Apartheid. I don't make this statement lightly, Desmond Tutu and Mandela; Alistair Sparks and Ronnie Kasrils have said similar things.

<<http://www.inminds.co.uk/boycott-news-0416.html>>

The dominant Racist Supremacists always speak of "self-determination" and "preserving the culture" of their opponents. They speak of "peace" and "living side by side in harmony", but their multiculturalism is nothing but cover for the suppression of a competing force. Subconsciously accepting that their own nationalism was a powerful force in subjugating their opponents, they seek to deprive them of the same weapon by appealing to the outrage of the oppressed. They champion the rights of the oppressed in words, while remaining ever vigilant against the expression of a competing nationalism. Such expressions of opposition, is "bad" nationalism, while their openly Racist supremacy is considered "accidental", "inevitable" and "self-preservation". Always, the dominant supremacist maintains that his nationalism is a product of historical circumstance while the nationalism of the dominated is the product of wrong thinking and evidence of their backwardness, bigotry and hatred.

Such is the dialectic enforced by the strong. Having achieved their position by virtue of their nationalism, they relegate it to its basest level and deny access to it to their opponents. Having misused it to their own ends, they now denounce their strongest converts, and proclaim it an evil, to be opposed by all right thinking people, and especially to be denied its utilization by their opponents.

But resistance is at its core the application of pressure. We know that when the bleating gets loudest, the pressure is being applied correctly. Nationalism has time and time again proven itself to be a particularly effective form of pressure on a dominant Racist Regime.

Zionism is dispossession; dispossession is an integral part of Racism. Nationalism without dispossession is a legitimate countervailing force against other competing nationalism. Antisemitism of White Nationalists (called White Supremacy by their adversaries) is a reaction to Jewish racist assertion in White societies. As such, it is a mild

form of nationalism. From a White-Nationalist point of view, it can be seen to be a moral imperative and necessary to combat the Jewish war against their values and heritage. They do, after all, compete to occupy the same space.

Let me tell you how frustrating it was dealing with White liberals in South Africa who championed racial equality but denied their own racism. In the end, it was better to ignore white liberals altogether and adopt racist attitudes toward them. Only then was the struggle able to escalate, proving clearly that they had been a ballast all along. White Afrikaner supremacists were indispensable allies once they decided to cross over. They had no qualms about smuggling weapons, stealing weapons from Military armory's and generally engaging in sabotage. Today, these Afrikaners still live in South Africa and support a vibrant opposition party. In the end, the liberals left South Africa once privilege ended, the Afrikaners remained. As a Black Man who has resisted White Supremacy for most of my life, I am now sympathetic to White Nationalists. It was a White Nationalist who in the end handed Mandela the keys to the Presidential suite, without conditions.

It is valid for Palestine, too. It is not necessary that the Palestinian struggle be conducted on a lily-white sheet. David Duke was the grand Wizard of the Ku Klux Klan. They hanged black people from tree trunks. What they did was however small change compared to what the Ku Klux Knesset does on a daily basis. Today the White Nationalists are downtrodden and discriminated-against people in America. Yet, their ideas have a resonance with many Americans, especially on the Palestine issue. Don't underestimate the ideological pull of these hillbillies with library cards. They can make a big difference where it counts the most ^ with the average WASP. From what I remember, WASP's are still a majority in the States.

What does not have a place in the Palestinian struggle, is an ideological agenda. Zionists are not particular about who supports them, so why should Palestinians be reliant on a bogus ideological cleanliness? It makes little difference whether the Palestinians enjoy the support of ADL-affected communities. These communities provide nothing of value to the Palestinian struggle. In fact they provide material assistance to the enemy. Yet the friends of Palestine pretend to cringe at the mere thought of occupying political space with deluded nationalists. They may be even supremacists, but they provide another avenue by which the enemy can be engaged. Engaging the enemy on every conceivable front is what struggle is all about. Ideology is secondary.

The White groups on the right are not all the same, and they not all subscribe to the same philosophies. I am convinced that the brush is applied far too widely and liberally. I have corresponded with a few, and I find them to be courteous and intelligent. Quite the opposite of the rabid racist bigot. They always concede a point well made and are content to rest on genuine differences of opinion. Joe Sobran is a great guy and always takes the time and effort to respond comprehensively and interestingly. I also find some of their prose about the Middle East and Palestine, to be the most passionate around. Most genuinely admire the Palestinians for doing what they failed to do - resist, adapt and survive against a vile and vicious hate campaign. There is a genuine solidarity with the Palestinians amongst disaffected white people. As genuine as yours or mine is. It does not serve any purpose to question their motives, they are quite clear about them: they support the Palestinians because the Palestinians are engaged in direct action against a common enemy. The fact that you or I are opposed to White Supremacy is quite irrelevant. It is not White Racist Supremacist oppressing Palestinians. If I were a Palestinian, the White Nationalists would be my legitimate ally. After all, those White Nationalists write great prose and have the ability to influence far more people where it counts.

On the other hand, I have found anti-Zionist Jewish people (with some notable exclusions) on my correspondence list to be extremely annoying because of their penchant to obscure obvious circumstances while compiling dirges in a vain attempt to throw people off the scent. Instead of acknowledging patent realities regarding Jewish individuals at the heart of influence in the US administration, and then putting your views regarding it, a ridiculous attempt is made to smear the content of an article like that of Mr. Shamir,s as latent Nazism. Whether we are incorrect and flirt with an anti-Semite canard is a tenth order issue for both Israeli Jews and Palestinians. I have taken the trouble to read Shamir,s

body of work and can vouch that they are inspirational. He is an extremely talented writer and uses words to great effect. His vision of a future Palestine/Israel is a refreshing departure from the rutted, stilted and ideologically driven drivel that passes for discourse on this issue. I would even go so far as to defend his use of anti-Semitic imagery, it is a valid posture buster and certainly more effective than an AK47. Like all of us, his ideas can be considerably cleansed of incorrect thoughts. But that is his greatest gift - his ability to communicate at every level and bust through - despite incorrect thoughts. Cleansing is not always desirable and would place his writing beyond the reach of all but the most pure amongst us. Purists always fail when they ultimately discover what Shamir instinctively knows, that none of us are pure. But we can at least be honest with ourselves. You cannot help the Palestinians until you can free Israeli Jews from the stultifying Boot of Diaspora Jewry. You cannot lead from behind. Shamir might just be the vanguard of an Israeli liberation movement, its liberation from racist Jewry.

Explaining its political Application.

All people have strange and wonderful traditions. It is the therapy of the times to subsume oneself and experience a diversity of cultural traditions. Nationalism, properly defined, is the celebration of one's own kind and the mocking of another. It is a common human characteristic and is hardwired to our DNA. One does not acquire nationalism, it comes with the package and it was vital to the early survival of human communities. We would not have been here if it were not for nationalism. In some situations, it still has a valid and vital function.

However it is chemically triggered, it is clear that its occurrence is proportional to the level of threat to our own culture and identity. Remove that threat and over time the ethnocentric trigger is deactivated and replaced by other "in-group" triggers. Any historical analysis of Jewish nationalism, whatever slant one wished to put on it, reveals a steady flow of the activation of triggers and counter-triggers as Jewish communities wrestled with the twin demons of Supremacy and antisemitism. That one feeds off the other has been the observation of many historians. If Jews think that they were superior, chosen by God, many people also think that they are superior. For many, the only defence to such an attitude is to mock those that think this way, and to celebrate their own superiority. It is primordial; it is instinctive; and it works.

In organized political terms, it is called Group Consciousness. Stokely Carmichael was one of the first proponents of this approach. He developed it as a result of observing the sorry state Black people had been reduced to by centuries of slavery, dispossession and ridicule. It came to be known as "Black Consciousness" and was a culmination and synthesis of the ideas of many earlier Black thinkers in Africa, the United States and The West Indies. It was given an expression by Malcolm X who, in an earlier his trip to Africa began to urge that the Black struggle be conducted using any means necessary. The most practical demonstration of its effectiveness was in the early 1970,s when a young Black Medical Student called Steven Biko, then a black representative on the executive of the mostly White National Union of South African Students, unreservedly adopted its principles. In a sudden turnaround, he led the Black Student caucus in a walkout of NUSAS to found the South African Students Organization (SASO) and the corresponding Black Peoples Convention (BPC). He unilaterally cut off ALL political contact with White South Africans from the Liberation Struggle, arguing that White activists carried too much political baggage and were hindering, rather than advancing, the liberation of the Black People in South Africa. By holding up positive white cultural attributes as a desirable yardstick for Black People to emulate, they were in fact emasculating legitimate Black anti-Racist expression. He began to mock White people generally and agitate for a defiant Black anti-Racist discourse. The results were astonishing. Within 14 months, (after 90 years of failing to achieve any significant uprising by the Black indigenous population), South Africa was in flames and ungovernable. By 1976, Biko was dead, murdered by the South African Regime, but South Africa was never to be the same again. There were no "ISMS" in his campaign. It was pure affirmation. The goal was to make it possible to decide the future, not to create a utopian

society. Dark was no longer "evil", and white "good". In fact, the opposite was the case. White people were devils.

Naturally, Steve did not really believe this, but it is what he taught. There were no complicated speeches given and philosophical treatise written. The medium of communication was song, and dance, and poetry. It electrified the people. They sang the songs on the trains, at work, everywhere. The white man did not understand the words that said "watch out, I am going to kill you." The "Toyoi Toyoi" (the enduring image of Black South African protest marches) terrified the young White conscripts and they wet their pants. It was a national joke. They laughed even amidst the tragedy of slain friends and comrades. Young White friends were asked to leave public meetings. It was pure nationalism. Black Activists were roundly condemned for their Racism, even by other Blacks: "is this the way to fight Racism" it was asked; "by being racist yourself?"

But it was not Racism; it was nationalism. The most effective weapon there is against Racism; which is the dispossession of your property, your liberty and your identity. When Apartheid crumbled, the trigger lapsed as suddenly as it had appeared. The need to destroy another's identity to regain yours vanished. You already had it.

There is definitely a problem when you can celebrate your cultural particularity only in the absence of other cultural identities. When affirmation can only come at the expense of forcing another to disavow theirs or the parts you take offence to. Mocking another culture is the essence of Nationalism. Cultural hegemony is the essence of colonialism. Calling an Individual a "Nazi" for his instinctive reaction to a nationalist trigger is ignorance about the true nature of Racism, and the cure for it, which is cultural affirmation, "consciousness" or "nationalism".

Joh Domingo is a South African born Muslim with roots in the full spectrum of the varied racial mix that makes up the South African milieu. His background traverses the divide between his traditional African tribal kin and the rich cultural influences of colonial East Asia. His maternal grandfather was the sibling of a Methodist Scottish priest, and was a Methodist priest himself. His paternal grandfather was an indentured Indian sugar cane worker from Madras, India who provides him his religious background. He married a South African born Chinese/African Christian and has two adult Daughters and a teenaged son.

Joh cut his political teeth during the upheaval of 1970,s South African revolution. He was the inaugural President of the Black Students Society at the University of the Witwatersrand, in 1974 and held that post until 1977. During this period he also served as editor in chief of the society,s magazine "By Ministerial Consent" (a reference to the Government permission required for a Black Person to attend a White University in Apartheid South Africa.). He was a member of both the South African Students Organisation and the Black Peoples Convention. His studies were cut short in 1977 after his consent to attend university and his Scholarship were withdrawn. In 1980 he married his childhood sweetheart and in 1985 they left South Africa after being granted permission to migrate to Australia. Joh is a Building Contractor in Brisbane, Australia. He still believes that the "Black Consciousness" Soweto Uprising of 1976 was the defining moment in the demise of the Apartheid System, paving the way for the broader based African National Congress, which had been rendered moribund by ideological battles, to re-energize itself and exert its more experienced political leadership. There is little doubt in his mind that political change begins at the grassroots level. His email <johd7894@hotmail.com>

=====>

THE ENDURING LIVE OF THE WAR MYTHOLOGY

LEST WE FORGET: Mazur's Soap Machine

E-mail: kmcvay@oneb.almanac.bc.ca

The issue of whether or not the Nazis produced soap from human fat is addressed by Konnilyn Feig, in the book "Hitler's Death Camps." It is a contentious issue, **sadly clouded by the Holocaust deniers** who often cite legal summations by attorneys as "evidence." If "evidence" exists that Mazur has been discredited, I would welcome the opportunity to examine it. Until then, I will accept the evidence offered:

It seems that Stutthof manufactured soap. Some historians claim that the Nazi manufacture of soap from human fat is just a grim rumor. However, cakes are on display; and witnesses have testified that soap was made at Stutthof from the fat of dead Jews.

At the War Crime Trials Sigmund Mazur, laboratory assistant at the Danzig Anatomic Institute, testified that the institute conducted experiments in producing soap from human bodies. The professors collected bodies, bones, and human fat in a building called "a laboratory for the fabrication of skeletons, the burning of meat and unnecessary bones." the chief, Professor Spanner, gave Mazur the soap recipe:

5 kilos of human fat are mixed with 10 liters of water and 500 or 1,000 grams of caustic soda. All this is boiled 2 or 3 hours and then cooled. The soap floats to the surface while the water and other sediment remain at the bottom. A bit of salt and soda is added to this mixture. Then fresh water is added, and the mixture again boiled 2 or 3 hours. After having cooled the soap is poured into molds.

The prosecutor presented Mazur's description of the process:

I boiled the soap out of the bodies of women and men. The process of boiling alone took several days -- from 3 to 7. During two manufacturing processes, in which I directly participated, more than 25 kilograms of soap were produced. The amount of human fat necessary for these two processes was 70 to 80 kilograms collected from some 40 bodies. The finished soap then went to Professor Spanner, who kept it personally. The work for the production of soap from human bodies has, as far as I know, also interested Hitler's Government. The Anatomic Institute was visited by the Minister of Education, Rust; the Reichsgesundheitsfuhrer, Doctor Conti; the Gauleiter of Danzig, Albert Forster; as well as professors from other medical institutes.

I used this human soap for my personal needs, for toilet and for laundering. For myself I took 4 kilograms of this soap.

Two British POWs gave the prosecution staff testimony on the soap experiments:

Owing to the preservative mixture in which they were stored, this tissue came away from the bones very easily. The tissue was then put into a boiler about the size of a small kitchen table... After boiling the liquid it was put into white trays about twice the size of a sheet of foolscap and about 3 centimeters deep... Approximately 3 to 4 trayfuls per day were obtained from the machine.

A machine for the manufacture of soap was completed some time in March or April 1944. The British prisoners of war had constructed the building in which it was housed in June 1942. The machine itself was installed by a civilian from Danzig by the name of AJRD. It consisted, as far as I remember, of an electrically heated tank in which bones of the corpses were mixed with some acid and melted down.

This process of melting down took about 24 hours. The fatty portions of the corpses and particularly those of females were put into a crude enamel tank, heated by a couple of bunsen burners. Some acid was also used in this process. I think it was caustic soda. When boiling had been completed, the mixture was allowed to cool and then cut into blocks for microscopic examination.

The prosecutor showed the court soap samples.[19]

[19] The soap stories appear to excite enormous controversy. Early scholars said the stories were untrue, that the Nazis did not make soap from human fat, that those bars of soap marked with an "RJF" were not made from humans (letter in author's possession from Herbert Rosenkranz to Lonny Darwin, September 20, 1979). Most East European camp scholars, however, validate the soap stories, and other kinds of bars made from humans are displayed in Eastern Europe -- I have seen many over the years. I accept without further question that

the Nazis did use every part of the human body, for the evidence now is irrefutable. The Stutthof soap do not have "RJF" stamped on them. Testimony from IMT 7:598-601. See also Shirer, 971.

[It seems this text is extracted from <<http://www.nizkor.org>>, a poor and confused attempt to refute revisionist arguments. Next is a revisionist point of view.]

'Jewish soap'

by Mark Weber

One of the most lurid and slanderous Holocaust claims is the story that the Germans manufactured soap from the bodies of their victims. Although a similar charge during the First World War was exposed as a hoax almost immediately afterwards, it was nevertheless revived and widely believed during the Second. More important, this accusation was "proved" at the main Nuremberg trial of 1945-1946, and has been authoritatively endorsed by numerous historians in the decades since. In recent years, though, as part of a broad retreat from the most obviously untenable aspects of the "orthodox" extermination story, Holocaust historians have grudgingly conceded that the human soap tale is a wartime propaganda lie. In their retreat, though, these historians have tried to dismiss the soap story as a mere wartime "rumor," neglecting to mention that international Jewish organizations and then Allied governments endorsed and sanctioned this libelous canard.

Wartime rumors that the Germans were manufacturing soap from the corpses of slaughtered Jews were based in part on the fact that soap bars distributed by German authorities in Jewish ghettos and camps bore the impressed initials "RIF," which many took to stand for "Rein juedisches Fett" or "Pure Jewish Fat." (It did not seem to matter that the letters were "RIF" and not "RJF.") These rumors spread so widely in 1941 and 1942 that by late 1942 German authorities in Poland and Slovakia were expressing official concern about their impact.

According to a Polish source quoted in a secret wartime U.S. Army military intelligence report, for example, the Germans were operating a "human soap factory" in 1941 at Turek, Poland. "The Germans had brought thousands of Polish teachers, priests and Jews there and after extracting the blood serum from their bodies, had thrown them on large pots and melted off grease to make soap," the intelligence report added.

Macabre "Jewish soap" jokes became popular in the ghettos and camps, and many non-Jews on the outside came to believe the story. When trains loaded with Jewish deportees stopped temporarily at rail stations, Poles reportedly would gleefully shout at them: "Jews to soap!" Even British prisoners of war interned at Auschwitz in 1944 testified later about the wartime rumors that corpses of gassing victims were being turned into soap there.

In spite of its inherently incredible character, the soap story became an important feature of Jewish and Allied war propaganda. Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, wartime head of both the World Jewish Congress and the American Jewish Congress, publicly charged in November 1942 that Jewish corpses were being "processed into such war-vital commodities as soap, fats and fertilizer" by the Germans. He further announced that the Germans were "even exhuming the dead for the value of the corpses," and were paying fifty marks for each body.

In late 1942, the Congress Weekly, published by the American Jewish Congress, editorialized that the Germans were turning Jews "by scientific methods of dissolution into fertilizer, soap and glue." An article in the same issue reported that Jewish deportees from France and Holland were being processed into "soap, glue and train oil" in at least two special factories in Germany. Typical of many other American periodicals, the influential New Republic reported in early 1943 that the Germans were "using the bodies of their Jewish victims to make soap and fertilizer in a factory at Siedlce."

During June and July 1943, two prominent representatives of the Moscow-based "Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee" toured the United States and raised more than two million dollars for the Soviet war effort at a series of mass meetings. At each of these rallies, Soviet Jewish

leader Solomon Mikhoels showed the crowd a bar of soap that he said was made from Jewish corpses.

After the war the soap story was given important legitimacy at the main Nuremberg trial. L. N. Smirnov, Chief Counsellor of Justice for the USSR, declared to the Tribunal:

.. The same base, rationalized SS technical minds which created gas chambers and murder vans, began devising such methods of complete annihilation of human bodies, which would not only conceal the traces of their crimes, but also to serve in the manufacturing of certain products. In the Danzig Anatomical Institute, semi-industrial experiments in the production of soap from human bodies and the tanning of human skin for industrial purposes were carried out.

Smirnov quoted at length from an affidavit by Sigmund Mazur, an Institute employee, which was accepted as Nuremberg exhibit USSR-197. It alleged that Dr. Rudolf Spanner, the head of the Danzig Institute, had ordered the production of soap from corpses in 1943. According to Mazur's affidavit, Dr. Spanner's operation was of interest to high-ranking German officials. Education Minister Bernhard Rust and Health Leader Dr. Leonardo Conti, as well as professors from other medical institutes, came to witness Spanner's efforts. Mazur also claimed to have used the "human soap" to wash himself and his laundry.

A human soap "recipe," allegedly prepared by Dr. Spanner (Nuremberg document USSR-196), was also presented. Finally, a sample of what was supposed to be a piece of "human soap" was submitted to the Nuremberg Tribunal as exhibit USSR-393.

In his closing address to the Tribunal, chief British prosecutor Sir Hartley Shawcross echoed his Soviet colleague: "On occasion, even the bodies of their victims were used to make good the wartime shortage of soap." And in their final judgment, the Nuremberg Tribunal judges found that "attempts were made to utilize the fat from the bodies of the victims in the commercial manufacture of soap."

It is worth emphasizing here that the "evidence" presented at the Nuremberg Tribunal for the bogus soap story was no less substantial than the "evidence" presented for the claims of mass extermination in "gas chambers." At least in the former case, an actual sample of soap supposedly made from corpses was submitted in evidence.

After the war, supposed Holocaust victims were solemnly buried, in the form of soap bars, in Jewish cemeteries. In 1948, for example, four such bars wrapped in a funeral shroud were ceremoniously buried according to Jewish religious ritual at the Haifa cemetery in Israel. Other bars of "Jewish soap" have been displayed as grim Holocaust relics at the Jewish Historical Institute in Warsaw, the Stutthof Museum near Gdansk (Danzig), the Yivo Institute in New York, the Holocaust Museum in Philadelphia, the Jewish Holocaust Centre in Melbourne (Australia), and at various locations in Israel.

Numerous Jews who lived in German ghettos and camps during the war helped keep the soap story alive many years later. Ben Edelbaum, for example, wrote in his 1980 memoir *Growing Up in the Holocaust*:

"Often with our rations in the ghettos, the Germans had included a bar of soap branded with initials R.J.F. which came to be known as "RIF" soap. It wasn't until the war had ended that we learned the horrible truth about the bar of soap. Had we known in the ghetto, every bar of "RIF" soap would have been accorded a sacred Jewish funeral in the cemetery at Marysin. As it was, we were completely oblivious to its origin and used the bones and flesh of our murdered loved ones to wash our bodies."

Nesse Godin was transferred from a ghetto in Lithuania to the Stutthof concentration camp in the spring of 1944. In a 1983 interview, she recalled her arrival there:

"That day they gave us a shower and a piece of soap. After the war we found out the soap was made out of pure Jew fat, Rein Juden Fett, marked in the initials on the soap that I washed with. For all I know sometimes maybe there was a little bit of my

father's fat in that soap that I washed with. How do you think I feel when I think about that?"

Mel Mermelstein, the former Auschwitz inmate who was featured in the sensationalized April 1991 cable television movie "Never Forget" (and who sued the Institute for Historical Review and three other defendants for \$11 million), declared in a 1981 sworn deposition that he and other camp inmates used soap bars made from human fat. It was an "established fact," he insisted, that the soap he washed with was made from Jewish bodies.

Renowned "Nazi hunter" Simon Wiesenthal repeated the soap tale in a series of articles published in 1946 in the Austrian Jewish community paper *Der Neue Weg*. In the first of these he wrote:

"During the last weeks of March the Romanian press reported an unusual piece of news: In the small Romanian city of Folticeni twenty boxes of soap were buried in the Jewish cemetery with full ceremony and complete funeral rites. This soap had been found recently in a former German army depot. On the boxes were the initials RIF, "Pure Jewish Fat." These boxes were destined for the *Waffen-SS*. The wrapping paper revealed with completely cynical objectivity that this soap was manufactured from Jewish bodies. Surprisingly, the thorough Germans forgot to describe whether the soap was produced from children, girls, men or elderly persons."

Wiesenthal went on:

"After 1942 people in the General Government [Poland] knew quite well what the RIF soap meant. The civilized world may not believe the joy with which the Nazis and their women in the General Government thought of this soap. In each piece of soap they saw a Jew who had been magically put there, and had thus been prevented from growing into a second Freud, Ehrlich or Einstein."

In another article he observed: "The production of soap from human fat is so unbelievable that even some who were in concentration camps find it difficult to comprehend."

Over the years, numerous supposedly reputable historians have promoted the durable soap story. Journalist-historian William L. Shirer, for example, repeated it in his best-selling work, *The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich*.

Leading Soviet war propagandist Ilya Ehrenburg wrote in his postwar memoir:

"I have held in my hand a cake of soap stamped with the legend 'pure Jewish soap', prepared from the corpses of people who had been destroyed. But there is no need to speak of these things: thousands of books have been written about them."

A standard history studies textbook used in Canadian secondary schools, Canada: *The Twentieth Century*, told students that the Germans "boiled" the corpses of their Jewish victims "to make soap." *The Anatomy of Nazism*, a booklet published and distributed by the Zionist "Anti-Defamation League" of B'nai B'rith, stated:

"The process of brutalization did not end with the mass murders themselves. Large quantities of soap were manufactured from the corpses of those murdered."

A detailed 1981 work, *Hitler's Death Camps*, repeated the soap story in lurid detail. While noting that "some historians claim that the Nazi manufacture of soap from human fat is just a grim rumor," author Konnilyn Feig nevertheless accepted the story because "most East European camp scholars ... validate the soap stories, and other kinds of bars made from humans are displayed in Eastern Europe -- I have seen many over the years."

New York Rabbi Arthur Schneier repeated the tale at the opening ceremony of the largest Holocaust meeting in history. In his invocation to the "American Gathering of Jewish

Holocaust Survivors," held in Washington in April 1983, the Rabbi solemnly declared: "We remember the bars of soap with the initials RJF -- Rein jdisches Fett, Pure Jewish Fat -- made from the bodies of our loved ones."

In spite of all the apparently impressive evidence, the charge that the Germans manufactured soap from human beings is a falsehood, as Holocaust historians are now belatedly acknowledging. The "RIF" soap bar initials that supposedly stood for "Pure Jewish Fat" actually indicated nothing more sinister than "Reich Center for Industrial Fat Provisioning" ("Reichsstelle fr Industrielle Fettversorgung"), a German agency responsible for wartime production and distribution of soap and washing products. RIF soap was a poor quality substitute that contained no fat at all, human or otherwise.

Shortly after the war the public prosecutor's office of Flensburg, Germany, began legal proceedings against Dr. Rudolf Spanner for his alleged role in producing human soap at the Danzig Institute. But after an investigation the charge was quietly dropped. In a January 1968 letter, the office stated that its inquiry had determined that no soap from human corpses was made at the Danzig Institute during the war.

More recently, Jewish historian Walter Laqueur "denied established history" by acknowledging in his 1980 book, *The Terrible Secret*, that the human soap story has no basis in reality. Gitta Sereny, another Jewish historian, noted in her book *Into That Darkness*: "The universally accepted story that the corpses were used to make soap and fertilizer is finally refuted by the generally very reliable Ludwigsburg Central Authority for Investigation into Nazi Crimes."

Deborah Lipstadt, a professor of modern Jewish history, similarly "rewrote history" when she confirmed in 1981: "The fact is that the Nazis never used the bodies of Jews, or for that matter anyone else, for the production of soap."

In April 1990, professor Yehuda Bauer of Israel's Hebrew University, regarded as a leading Holocaust historian, as well as Shmuel Krakowski, archives director of Israel's Yad Vashem Holocaust center, confirmed that the human soap story is not true. Camp inmates "were prepared to believe any horror stories about their persecutors," Bauer said. At the same time, though, he had the chutzpah to blame the legend on "the Nazis."

In fact, blame for the soap story lies rather with individuals such as Simon Wiesenthal and Stephen Wise, organizations like the World Jewish Congress, and the victorious Allied powers, none of whom has ever apologized for promoting this vile falsehood.

Why did Bauer and Krakowski decide that this was the appropriate time to officially abandon the soap story? Krakowski himself hints that a large part of the motivation for this "tactical retreat" has been to save what's left of the sinking Holocaust ship by throwing overboard the most obvious falsehoods. In the face of the growing Revisionist challenge, easily demonstrable falsehoods like the soap story have become dangerous embarrassments because they raise doubts about the entire Holocaust legend. As Krakowski put it: "Historians have concluded that soap was not made from human fat. When so many people deny the Holocaust ever happened, why give them something to use against the truth?" The bad faith of those making this calculated and belated concession to truth is shown by their failure to note that the soap myth was authoritatively "confirmed" at Nuremberg, and by their unwillingness to deal with the implications of that confirmation for the credibility of the Tribunal and other supposedly trustworthy authorities in establishing other, more fundamental aspects of the Holocaust story.

The striking contrast between the prompt postwar disavowal by the British government of the infamous "human soap" lie of the First World War, and the way in which a similarly baseless propaganda story from the Second World War was officially endorsed by the victorious Allied powers and then authoritatively maintained for so many years not only points up the dispiriting lack of integrity on the part of so many Western historians, but underscores the general decline in Western ethical standards during this century.

The "human soap" story demonstrates anew the tremendous impact that a wartime rumor, no matter how fantastic, can have once it has taken hold, particularly when it is disseminated as a propaganda lie by influential individuals and powerful organizations. That so many intelligent and otherwise thoughtful people could ever have seriously believed

that the Germans distributed bars of soap brazenly labeled with letters indicating that they were manufactured from Jewish corpses shows how readily even the most absurd Holocaust fables can be -- and are -- accepted as fact.

<<http://ihr.org/leaflets/jewishsoap.html>>

=====>

PHOTOS

I think it was in the late nineties that a small news item in England mentioned that many million air photos of WWII taken by the Royal British Air Force (and also some photos by the German Luftwaffe confiscated after the war by the British) were hidden in an Archive of Keele University. Nobody else seemed to pay a lot of attention to this news item. At that time I lived in England, and at one of my meetings with my revisionist friend Jeff Roberts, we discussed this topic. (Roberts is the creator of Carlos W. Porter's website <<http://www.cwporter.com>>). We agreed that it was necessary to get access to this archive in the hope of finding more air photo evidence regarding alleged crime locations of the Holocaust.

Jeff subsequently traveled many times to Keele University. He found the air photos in total disorder, its archive threatened to be dissolved due to lack of funds. After many visits, many hours of talking to the people in charge, he finally managed to get a project started to organize these air photos, in which he selflessly assisted, and he even indicated to me some two years ago that he appears to have success in convincing Keele University to make those photos publicly accessible by offering them on the internet.

Last week, the international media have announce that Keele University has now indeed opened a website offering access to some of its air photos, accessible at <<http://www.evidenceincamera.co.uk/>>. Due to the massive public attention, however, requests have been so huge that the bandwidth used exceeded the allotted amount, resulting in the site being taken down temporarily.

As usual, the media hype generated around this "discovery" -- **a discovery made possible because of the selfless efforts of just one almost unknown revisionist** -- is filled with the usual lies. The German news magazine "Spiegel", for example, headlined on Jan 19, 2004: "Five Million Pictures of Horror" and quoted the British news Agency Reuters:

"Burning Corpses in the concentration camp [...] concentration camp Auschwitz on August 23, 1944: white clouds of smoke from burning corpses. [...] One of the photos shows the concentration camp of Auschwitz at the climax of extermination madness. On this pictures, a white cloud rolls over the country. According to the National Archive, it stems from a mass grave and not from the chimney of a crematorium. In 1943 and 1944, some 430,000 Hungarian Jews were murdered in Auschwitz -- too many to be cremated in the cremation ovens of the extermination camp. [...] "The pictures moved my very much", says Allan Williams of the British Aerial Reconnaissance Archives at Keele University. "To my knowledge no other reconnaissance photos of Auschwitz of that time exist."

That is of course wrong, since the U.S. published some of the photos of that camp, taken by U.S. and Canadian air planes, back in 1979, and John C. Ball published his analysis of many air photos of the U.S. National Archives relating to alleged Holocaust crimes scenes back in 1992.

From this series of newly released British photos, one copy found particular attention: a photo of the Auschwitz-Birkenau camp of Aug. 23,1944 (see below and the mentioned "Spiegel" article). It shows smoke coming from an small area north of crematorium V, that is,

from the same area where a little smoke is also seen on a photo of May 31, 1944, as it was published and analyzed by Ball.

But before claiming "This is the proof for the gas chambers, for the extermination, for mass murder, for the Holocaust!", I may remind the reader that this picture shows smoke coming from an area measuring perhaps some 100 square meters or less. According to witness claims and to the established version of the 'Holocaust', however, the pits in which ten thousand of Jews were allegedly incinerated were located outside of the camp immediate perimeter, close to the so-called Bunkers, and they would have covered an area of many ten thousand square meters, if the really would have been able to incinerate that many bodies. In addition to this, we would have to expect not only to see smoke in this pictures, but also other obvious traces of: pits, mounds of excavated earth, piles of woods as fuel, a wide area around these items marked by massive human activity (i.e., transporting of corpses, fuel, ashes, etc.), leading to the destruction of the vegetation in this area.

Nothing of this can be seen on this or other photos taken between May and September 1944.

Though this one photo of the Royal Air Force shows that a moderate size fire burned north of crematorium V on August 23, 1944, it does not show exactly what burned in this fire. **But this photo clearly refutes claims of mass extermination with subsequent mass incineration in huge pits.**

Germar Rudolf
25 January 2004

=====>

Presentation of *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century* (French Edition)

by **Robert Faurisson**

For Arthur Butz, the author of *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, the alleged physical extermination of Europe's Jews during the Second World War constitutes one might justly call a historical lie, a myth, an imposture or, as he puts it, a hoax. In France and in quite a few other countries this hoax has become an official truth, protected by the police, the judicial system and, above all, by the omnipotent mass media. It has taken on the character of a religious belief, a social prohibition, a taboo. "The kosher account of the Second World War," as it may also be called, is the only version allowed in schools, universities, the book trade, law courts, the press, the cinema or on television. The "Holocaust" or "Shoah" has become a religion, a business, an industry.

The writers and scholars who are known as revisionists contend that the Germans, in fact, never exterminated, or sought to exterminate, the Jews. They further contend that the Germans neither built nor used gas chambers or gas vans to kill Jews. Based on their research, the revisionists conclude that the number of European Jews who actually perished between 1939 and 1945 as a consequence of the war, together with those who died of hunger or disease, – notably in outbreaks of typhus (which was nearly endemic in eastern Europe) – certainly did not reach the extravagant figure of six million but, more likely, about one million, all in the course of a conflict that claimed tens of millions of lives. As in any modern war, civilians were as severely affected as soldiers. Children paid a heavy toll. Many Jewish children died, while at the same time many German and Japanese children were atrociously killed in flames of phosphorous or nuclear explosion. It has become commonplace to mention that entirely innocent Jewish children were deported *because they were Jewish*. On this score, and using the

same turn of phrase, it should be noted that entirely innocent German and Japanese children were killed *because they were German or Japanese*.

During the 1950s and 1960s, the most prominent revisionist was the Frenchman Paul Rassinier. (He died in 1967.) Although he studied certain aspects of the Great Lie, he lacked either the will or the time to present a comprehensive analysis of this subject. All the same, his works and his struggle are worthy of admiration.

* * *

It was in 1976 that the American Arthur Robert Butz published the awaited comprehensive analysis. This work is so powerful that still today it deters other revisionists from attempting to produce a comprehensive study of his own that might compare with the "masterstroke" of *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*. Let us add, for good measure, that the first successor of Arthur R. Butz is Arthur R. Butz himself. In effect, the texts that he has since published on certain particular aspects of the question complement, piece by piece, his masterwork. Perhaps the best proof that *The Hoax* has been, since 1976, a durable overall evaluation is the fact that each of the author's later essays naturally fit with the basic construction; none of the additions compels a modification of the general structure, either of the argument or of the book.

It took an exceptional mind and character to confront and fell the monstrous taboo.

Arthur Butz has, all at the same time, the mind of a scientist, of an analyst of texts and of a historian. By training he is a scientist; his specialty is advanced information technology. In the analysis of texts, he is not really a specialist, although an information scientist will often have to analyze texts or documents. Finally, he is not a professional historian – as he makes a point of underscoring – but experience has proven that, on the perilous ground that he has chosen, he can put to shame or bring envy to all those persons, academics or not, who happen to be professional historians and who, for the most part, have kept quiet and let the historical imposture proliferate.

As for Butz's character: it is, rather distinctively, that of a man able to set out on the most daunting of missions with moderation, prudence and wisdom.

The sum of knowledge that he acquired in about five years in order to accomplish his work is, in itself, impressive. He succeeded in putting this rich mass of data in order. He has a talent for demonstration. He knows the art of persuasion. Not for nothing has Pierre Vidal-Naquet dubbed Butz "the foremost and cleverest revisionist," adding:

[...] if a prize for mendacity were to be given, I would say that Butz's tome, *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, represents, at times, a rather hair-raising success: the reader is persuasively led by the hand and brought little by little to the idea that Auschwitz is a tendentious rumor that skillful propagandists have gradually transformed into a truth. Such are the "good tidings" whose clumsy evangelist Faurisson has become. It is Butz and not he who might be defined in Zola's terms as the "diabolical craftsman of the judicial error." Ought one to refute Butz? It would be possible, of course, and even easy, assuming one knew the archives, but it would be long and tedious [...] When a fictitious account is well prepared, it does not contain elements allowing one to destroy it on strictly internal grounds. 1

One is tempted to compare Butz to the best of all possible guides for a journey of exploration into a particularly hostile world. He knows the territory. Even so he advances only with caution, with measured steps, as if, progressively, he were discovering this territory along with us. Often he halts his advance and takes stock. Before starting off anew, he once again consults map and compass. Yet again he examines the surroundings, foreseeing the pitfalls, anticipating our apprehensions, never eluding our questions or objections, which, moreover, he had obviously foreseen. To these his response is either immediate or deferred; in

1 P. Vidal-Naquet, *Assassins of Memory: Essays on the Denial of the Holocaust*, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1992), p. 51.

the latter case, he promises to answer later on and, in effect, the answer comes in due course. At the end of each leg of the journey — of each page or set of pages — we seem to hear his voice murmuring in our ear: “I believe we’re making headway. Turn again towards the obstacle that looked threatening. We’ve overcome it. You thought you were lost in the darkness and fog; look! The fog is lifting and the horizon is coming into sight!” At the end, when the adventure — or the reading — is over this guide, wise and prudent, soberly takes leave of us. In a few sentences the summary is made, and we can then note that the promise has been kept. In a brief statement at the start of the adventure, he had unaffectedly announced what we were setting out to discover; at journey’s end, he gives us a short reminder of that introduction and is content to add just a word or two. And that is all. But let us take a closer look.

The title and, in later editions, the subheading of his book (*The Case Against the Presumed Extermination of European Jewry*), have the same American frankness as a sentence in chapter III: “The thesis of this book is that the story of Jewish extermination in World War II is a propaganda hoax”. In chapter I, in a tone just as blunt, he had written “The simplest valid reason for being skeptical about the extermination claim is also the simplest conceivable reason: at the end of the war they were still there.”

At the very start, in the first lines, the author had made his bid and, at the end of the book, he is there to remind us of it. In a way, it’s like he were declaring: “This version, so widespread, of the Second World War is a tissue of lies. It is nothing but a variation on the outlandish Jewish stories that make up the Talmud.” Those who promote the rabbinical version of Second World War history dare to present the fate of the Jews as that of an exceptional people whose god, incredibly perverse, had chosen to subject them to exceptional suffering; to do so, this perverse god allegedly decided to hand over his “chosen people” to satanic forces, those of German National Socialism. These Talmudisms are but phantasms. They are not history: they are mere stories. More precisely, they are stories like those that were already to be found in abundance in the Old Testament. And with such fabrications, even in the absence of any foul intent, it is seldom that money and publicity are not made.

On the final page Butz mentions the 1952 “Treaty of Luxembourg,” by which the Bonn government made colossal financial “reparations” to the Jews because of the “unspeakable criminal acts” supposedly committed by the Third Reich against the children of Israel; these “reparations,” it may be noted, are set to continue until the year 2030, and constitute but a fraction of what German taxpayers and German businesses disburse to Shylock. Butz concludes that his book has shown those alleged crimes to be “largely a hoax and, specifically, a Zionist hoax.” He is not one to think “Jewish” and write “Zionist”. If he means to call “the Jews” into question, he will say “the Jews”, and if he means “the Zionists”, he will write “the Zionists”. But — and this is one of his most clear-cut demonstrations — he proves to the reader that the “Holocaust” myth was chiefly forged and launched by specifically Zionist circles. He demonstrates as well that the judicial masquerade of the Nuremberg trial was rather less a creation of the United States government or of prosecutor Jackson than of influential personalities who were Zionists and not simply Jews. Our American draws the logical conclusion that, since there was a Zionist hoax followed by a swindle, the State of Israel “owes Germany a lot of money,” as he, a man of understatement, puts it.

One may imagine that a Frenchman or a European will find this American frankness a bit curt but, in Butz’s case, that tone is perceptible only at the beginning and at the end of his discourse. Nearly the whole of the rest of the book bears, on the contrary, the features of a slow and serene exposition.

The work of this revisionist of ours is an undertaking of demolition and construction.

Butz kills the “Holocaust” myth and even, to borrow a word from cold-war parlance, “overkills” it. He razes to its foundations an edifice of lies, each of which is more absurd and dangerous than the rest. Furthermore, he sketches in broad outline the real wartime experience and suffering of Europe’s Jews. He recalls the measures taken by the Germans with respect to a minority whom, often rightly, they deemed hostile, at times even considering them as a belligerent, and whose resources on a global level boded ill for Germany. He portrays the reality of a policy aiming at a “territorial final solution” (*territoriale Endlösung*) of the eternal “Jewish question” (*Judenfrage*). This solution meant finding a

territory (other than Palestine) for the Jews of the entire world: the island of Madagascar had been seriously considered before the outbreak of war. It was foreseen that this relocation would allow for a "Jewish renewal" after the inevitable hardships endured, but the project was rendered impossible by the new world war's progressively tragic development. The author evokes the reality of the "provisional" solutions, which involved the confinement of Jews in ghettos or, sometimes, in concentration camps, transit centers or forced labor camps. He constantly keeps in mind a truth so elementary that it tends to be forgotten: "There was a war going on during World War II." This turn of phrase, intentionally tautological, is rich in meaning. It is by effectively disregarding the war and its necessities that the Reitlingers, Hilbergs and Dawidowicz have succeeded in giving a completely false portrayal of the Germans' treatment of the Jews from 1939 to 1945. Those Shoatic writers have not noticed, or have not cared to notice, that the first and foremost preoccupation of Germany's wartime decision makers was with winning the economic and military war, and not with assailing the Jews. The principal measures adopted concerning the Jews were based primarily on the need to ensure the safety of German soldiers and civilians during a time of "total war," and by the vital need to procure as abundant a workforce as possible. Subsequently, if the authorities in charge of the camps that lodged those Jews, together with non-Jews, built crematoria there, it was because of the epidemics that had struck both Germans and members of their workforce, whether Jewish or non-Jewish. It is incredible that those orthodox authors do not even mention the epidemics as the reason for the construction of the crematoria. Finally, to speak of war is to speak of "the horrors of war." In that war, in that crusade, which so many of them had wanted, the Jews suffered their share of its horrors. As they were not the only ones to suffer from the effects of the Second World War, it is absurd, for a historian of the "Holocaust," to fail to fully refer to that war, which claimed the lives of so many others, including the many who, in the defeated nations, fell victim well after their defeat. "Auschwitz" cannot be judged equitably by isolating that camp as if it were located on Mars, but rather by locating it within the history of the war as well as within the history of all concentration camps — German, British, French, American, Soviet or others — before, during and since the period 1939-1945. A judeocentric and fixated vision of the history of the Jews will never allow us to understand this part of human history.

Arthur Butz's analytical capacities are, of course, obvious — but what is most striking is his global approach: he never fails to see the forest for the trees. The meaning of the word "context," unfortunately so overused, has become so extended that today it too often covers particularly vague considerations, quite removed from the word or subject being studied. By "context" our author, for his part, that word means before anything else that which is closest to the object of his analysis. In the first place, it is for him a question of the immediate context (for instance the terms that flank the word being studied); then, step-by-step, it is also a question of the facts, persons and period under consideration, with a full inventory thereof. One may, by way of example, read the staggering Appendix E on "The role of the Vatican." A stream of studies have been published devoted to the controversy of what is called "the silence of Pius XII" on the "Holocaust." Let us invite the authors of such studies to read this chapter. In doing so they will realize that they have lacked the analytical acumen or the global approach that has allowed Butz, a non-professional historian, to solve the false enigma of that silence. For if Pius XII kept quiet, during and even after the war, about the extermination of the Jews and the gas chambers, it is because the latter did not exist and because, at the very least, the Pope had doubts about their existence, a fact that suffices to make him a "revisionist" in his own fashion. It is normal to keep quiet about what has not existed, and even about what *cannot* have existed. If a crime appears to belong, either with certainty or probably, to the realm of fiction, one does not come out and denounce it as though it had really occurred, for to accuse someone of a crime that has not occurred is to lie and to slander, and, when the accused has just been defeated in a war, it is to dishonor oneself. In this matter, Pius XII wanted neither to lie, nor to slander anyone, nor to dishonor himself.

In the same manner by which he sometimes steers his reasoning, Butz progresses with such scholarly deliberation as to leave some readers disconcerted. "Where is he taking us?" they may ask themselves. "What is the meaning of this passage that has all the appearances of a pure digression? When will we get back to the main thread of the

argument?" The American reader will grumble, if his habitual reading is in the comfortable pages of the "digests." The French reader, who likes things lively, will moan. Both will be wrong. Our man, for his part, knows that "he who goes slowly goes surely." Besides, Butz is armed with the potent Anglo-Saxon sense of humor that can well stand a certain plodding unbearable to the Latin temperament.

Let us take one example of this long and slow reasoning that, in 1975-1976, led the author to a particularly bold conclusion, and see in what providential form an event that occurred a few years later, in 1979, came to provide a spectacular confirmation of Butz's dialectical genius.

A section toward the end of chapter II is devoted to the industrial role of Auschwitz, in which the author holds forth at some length on technical considerations of synthetic oil and rubber. When he does not speak of "polymerization" or "vulcanization", he instructs us on "butadiene" and "sodium." The reader may begin to worry and ask himself whether this Butz is not a stuffed shirt, whether he has not gotten hold of a volume full of that supreme brand of foolishness: academic or polytechnic twaddle, more asinine than an ass. Has he just come face to face with one of those pedants who master a subject so poorly that they have to make a display of their borrowed wisdom? Not the case at all, as we shall be seeing.

The start of the following chapter deals with the United States rubber crisis of 1942. On December 7, 1941, most of the American Pacific fleet at Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, was suddenly destroyed. As a result, the Pacific Ocean became a Japanese sea. Overnight the Americans thus saw their rubber route from Malaya and the East Indies cut off. It was an emergency that called for immediate research into the making of synthetic rubber. But which country was, at the time, the most advanced in the world in this field? The answer: Germany. And, the author asks himself, at which spot in Germany had such research been most extensively pursued? The answer, this time, is Auschwitz. It was at Auschwitz, a town in Upper Silesia (annexed by Poland after the war), that a large industrial complex was located at which the Germans were producing synthetic gasoline, and trying to set up similar production of a synthetic rubber substance called "buna" (a compound word derived from "butadiene" and "Na", the chemical symbol for the element sodium).

It is then that Butz has the daring to conclude that the Americans certainly must have paid the fullest attention to Auschwitz both for the manufacture of synthetic gasoline and for the efforts to make synthetic rubber. Going still further in his daring, he provides a lengthy exposé on aerial photography for surveillance or espionage. He ventures that, given the quality of aerial photographs at the time, the American intelligence agencies, in their desire to know what in fact was going on at Auschwitz, logically must have resorted to this source of information in addition to all the other intelligence-gathering means at their disposal. He adds that, up to now (1975), those photographs have not yet been made public. He concludes that, if, in that camp, in 1942, there had really been set in motion an abomination exceeding all standards of horror, and if such an extraordinary scheme as an industrial program of physical extermination of the Jews of Europe were really being carried out, then the American army's intelligence branch would not have failed to learn of it. To complete the author's thought at the time, let us mention that what he says here of 1942 applies, even more, to the years 1943 and 1944. If, during the war, the aerial photographs had corroborated the rumor of the existence and operation of enormous "death factories", they would inevitably have been published. If, 30 years after the war they were still being kept secret, it was because they did not corroborate the rumor.

In February 1979, almost three years after the publication of his book (which had prompted major consternation, notably within America's Jewish community), Butz had the satisfaction of seeing the CIA finally bring out... aerial photographs of Auschwitz 2! Those photographs proved that Auschwitz had never been anything but a complex of concentration camps near which the Germans developed a vast industrial complex. There was nothing at all special about the crematoria buildings. They were surrounded by lawns in good condition, neatly laid out and showing no sign of the trampling by those crowds of people who, it is

2 Dino A. Brugioni and Robert G. Poirier, *The Holocaust Revisited: Analysis of the Auschwitz-Birkenau Extermination Complex* (Washington, DC: Central Intelligence Agency), 1979, 19 pages.

claimed, regularly waited there before entering the structures in order to be gassed, and then incinerated. No waiting queues were to be seen in the vicinity. Nor was there the least trace of the great heaps of coal or coke that would have been needed to cremate, we are told, thousands of victims per day. In particular, two of those structures, far from being concealed, were situated just near the internees' soccer field. The photographs showed when and how the vast industrial zone had been bombed by Allied aircraft, and why the camps themselves had not been targeted. If the latter had been intentionally bombed, the inmates would have been killed in great numbers precisely because they were "concentrated" there, and the survivors would no longer have had dormitories, latrines, showers, laundries, cookhouses, infirmaries or shelter. With the crematoria destroyed, the corpses would have stayed lying on the ground in an area where, the water table being very high, burial was impracticable. Typhus would then have doubled its toll. (It was to be discovered, in the end, that the Allies carried out a total of 32 aerial reconnaissance missions over Auschwitz between December 27, 1943, and January 14, 1945.)

This release of the aerial photographs confirmed Butz's thesis, and all the more as in 1979 the two authors of the publication bearing the images adorned them with arrows pointing to the location of the "undressing room[s]" (*sic*) and the "gas chamber[s]" (*sic*). Any reader endowed with a minimum of analytical sense could only laugh aloud at the naiveté or deviousness of those two CIA men. In the end, Butz had been so right that his adversaries were reduced to retorting, as we see, with pure childish tricks.

The author has shown the same clear-sightedness on a good number of other subjects. At a conference in 1982 he presented a paper whose text is given in the present volume 3, a detailed exposé in which he enumerates a series of simple observations that happen to fortify his thesis. But, in a preamble, he has the judicious idea to bring up, as a precedent in the history of great hoaxes, the text of the "Donation of Constantine," purportedly discovered in the Ninth century. He does so to describe how an enormous historical fraud, one of capital importance for the papacy, was finally exposed in 1456 by the humanist Lorenzo della Valle (*Contra donationis, quae Constantini dicitur, privilegium ut falso creditum est et ementitum, declamatio*). The emperor Constantine, promulgator, in 313 AD, of the edict of Milan, had, in reality, never donated the Roman Empire to the papacy. The text of the donation was merely a fake, and, for that matter, a thoroughly crude one. No sensible person should be taken in by historical lies of this kind, but nonetheless they endure because society or the powers that be need them; once that need is no longer felt, they may disappear. Moreover, Butz reminds us, the man who endeavors to expose such a lie often accumulates a mass of arguments of disparate value even though a few precise arguments would suffice. After this lengthy introduction, he returns to the heart of the matter. He lists the simple reasons – there are eight – why the alleged extermination of the Jews cannot have happened. To sum up: if, in the middle of Europe, in the space of three years, the Germans had killed so many millions of Jews, such an extraordinary phenomenon could not have gone unnoticed. But the Vatican did not perceive this awesome occurrence. The International Committee of the Red Cross did not see it. The German underground opposition did not mention it. The European Jews had no information on the subject and did not truly believe the vague, absurd and cacophonous rumors circulating here and there of a physical extermination of industrial proportions. Jews overseas (United States, Palestine, international Jewish organizations) did not behave as if they themselves lent credence to the alarming accounts that they were disseminating, and nor did the Allied governments. It is here that Butz inserts what may be called his parable of the miraculous elephant, which deserves to be quoted:

It is demanded that we believe that these "events continental in geographical scope, of three years in temporal scope, and of several million in scope of victims," all transpired without one relevant party being cognizant of them. It is like telling me that, while I saw no elephant when I looked in my basement, he was there anyway. Also while I was sitting in my living room I did not notice that the elephant managed to come upstairs and romp about a while, relevant stairways,

door openings, and floors having suddenly miraculously become compatible with such activities. Then the elephant dashed outside into a busy mid-day shopping district, and then walked several miles back to the zoo, but nobody noticed.

In conclusion, if the genocide of the Jews had happened, at least eight authorities or agencies would not have failed to notice it; none of them noticed it; therefore that genocide cannot have happened. To persist in believing in its reality would be like lending credence to the eight enormities contained in the tale of that elephant. A brief tale that says more than a long speech!

* * *

The Hoax has suffered from imperfections. To begin with, the first edition was presented in an unprepossessing layout. For want of money, low quality paper had to be used, the composition had to be too compact and the type too small. The mass of text appeared all the harder to take in as there were too few subheadings. There was nothing in the way of signs or markers to guide the reader and make easier his progress through the exposition. The style was lacking in polish and the vocabulary lacked finesse; the author, for his part, agrees, as will be seen in his preface to this French edition, which, incidentally, is the first to carry subheadings in sufficient number.

Butz terms his analysis “horizontal” as opposed to the “vertical” analysis conducted by other revisionists. He means, rightly, that he has held the whole of the subject under his gaze whilst others have taken into consideration only certain aspects of it. As concerns, for example, the alleged Nazi gas chamber, he admits that, in his book, that aspect of the “Holocaust” has not got much attention. He goes so far as to say that those who are interested in that question could skip his book. At the same time, he does not imagine that a serious person can venture into the controversy of the gas chambers without having first taken, through his book, a general view of the revisionist interpretation of the “Holocaust”.

This distinction between “horizontal” analysis and “vertical” analysis is a bit too abstract. When he analyzed the type of synthetic rubber that the Germans were trying to produce, when he taught us about polymerization and vulcanization, when he explained the combination of the butadiene and sodium in buna, was the author of that distinction then not in the “vertical” rather than the “horizontal”? Would it not be right to say that, in the whole scope of his book, which constitutes a global attack without equal, the author nonetheless conducts a series of particular inspections that may be characterized as “vertical”? Conversely, is the researcher who decides to approach the vast subject of the “Holocaust” from the angle of the gas chamber alone, before anything else, really working only in the “vertical”? Will he be merely the analyst of a particular aspect? Can he not too, in his own way, have a “horizontal” and comprehensive view of the “Holocaust”? If I judge by my own case, I became acquainted with our American’s global approach (1976) only after having read Rassinier in the early sixties and having decided, considering the huge mass of the Great Lie, that I should attack it from its most vulnerable angle: that of the magical gas chamber. For me, *The Hoax* has not performed the role of an initiation; it has had but the value of a providential confirmation. In observing the colossus that is the Great Lie, I quickly noted that it had feet of clay and it was therefore on this weak point that I decided to concentrate my assaults. Assuredly, the spectator to this struggle who, for his part, has not seen the feet of clay will be surprised at my relentless landing of all my blows, as it were, at ground level. He will find me short-sighted. Nothing of the sort. I had indeed taken complete measure of the monster. Besides, how could its formidable dimensions have escaped me? In truth, discerning what I took to be its weak spot (those hazy gas chambers), it was for that spot, to begin, that I saved my blows. He who confronts Achilles must, like Paris, aim for the heel.

But enough of these images and comparisons! Butz wanted to prove that “the unprecedented *crime*” (the genocide) imputed to the vanquished by the victor had not happened whereas other revisionists, choosing a different path, wanted to demonstrate that “the unprecedented *crime weapon*” (the gas chamber) had not existed. If that crime is

imaginary, it follows that one need no longer even add that the *weapon* is imaginary as well. Conversely, if *that weapon* is imaginary, then so is *the crime*. The result is identical and only the methods used to attain it have been different.

Butz's mighty intelligence is perhaps too abstract. The only concentration camp he has ever visited is that of Dachau. On the subject of the alleged homicidal gas chamber there, he has written nearly nothing than that, in the opinion even of the accusers, that structure, "disguised as a 'shower room' ", had not been completed and, consequently, had not been used.

This actual indifference towards certain material contingencies (not all!) was to be noted elsewhere. Among the essential arguments that may be brought forth to show that the Nazi gas chambers cannot have existed outside of the imagination, there is, it seems to me, the argument dealing with the existence – a quite real one – of the execution gas chambers in some American penitentiaries. It is enough to see an American gas chamber and to study how it works in order to realize that the supposed Nazi gas chambers and the way in which they supposedly worked are mere imagination. And Butz is American. How is it that he did not use this argument? As if it were not enough to refrain from examining any alleged "Nazi" gas chamber, why did he not inform himself about any of the gas chambers in his own country's prisons? Had he done so, he would immediately have realized how daunting a task it is to execute one prisoner with hydrogen cyanide gas (the active ingredient in the pesticide Zyklon B) without gassing oneself. He would have grasped that nothing is more dangerous than to enter an American gas chamber after an execution, and he would have seen that it is impossible to handle the gassed corpse without drastic precautions. He would have noted that only a sophisticated mechanism can prevent the worst from befalling the physician and his two aides, who, in rubber gloves and boots, and wearing masks fitted with special filters, will have to penetrate the gas chamber and handle the still dangerous corpse. He would have realized that the accounts telling of Sonderkommando members walking into the "Nazi" gas chambers to handle casually, without gas masks, hundreds or thousands of cyanide-infused corpses were grotesque. By the same token, Rudolf Höss' "confessions" to his warders would have collapsed and, along with them, a fair number of other "confessions," "testimonies," "memoirs," "items of evidence," and "trials": in short, the whole base of the Great Lie edifice would have disappeared.

Returning to the "Donation of Constantine", the "revisionists" in the style of Lorenzo Valla had thought it necessary to put forth a hundred arguments in order to expose the fraud. But one single argument would have sufficed, although so modest, so laughable, so basely material that one barely dares mention it: in effect, one little Roman coin was enough to prove that after Constantine the Roman Empire continued to have at its head other emperors and no Popes. In reality, heaps of coinage in the effigy of Constantine's true successors proved that the text of the famous donation, "discovered" in the Ninth century, could only be a fraud. The humblest coin collector held in his hands the proof, material and irrefutable, exposing the entire fraud. None of these coins bore the effigy of a Pope; all bore the effigy of an emperor. Similarly, nowadays, two eyes and a minimum of practical knowledge are enough to see that the alleged gas chamber to which, at Auschwitz, capital of the "Holocaust", tourists and pilgrims are led in droves, is nothing but a Potemkin gas chamber. As for the other alleged "Nazi" gas chambers, either they are no longer shown to visitors, or we are told that since they were left unfinished they were never used. No historian dares any longer produce a drawing, a model or any other representation of this diabolical weapon. Sometimes, Voltaire's *Candide* imagines that he sees, off in the distance, the nowhere-to-be-found gas chamber in question; he draws near; it disappears from view: it was only a mirage. The alleged "Nazi" gas chamber is, in a way, the constant no-show of Jewish historiography. I shall say then, to conclude, that Butz, not noticing the precious argument within arm's reach, makes me think in this case of a Lorenzo Valla who failed to see the Roman coin that he held in his hand, even though that coin enabled him to kill and even "overkill" the historical lie that he was seeking to combat.

* * *

The reader will know that these reservations do not in the least diminish my esteem for the work and for the man. Built as solid as a rock, the work will unquestionably outlive its author. Will it be what Thucydides called "an acquisition for ever" (*ktêma es aei*)? It would deserve to be such. In more than a quarter of a century no historian has ventured to refute it. In the endless flood of anti-revisionist publications, not one book, not one article offers a parry to the exceptional reference work that *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century* has proved to be for the study of historical revisionism.

Unhappily, the hoax that the revisionists have tackled still has some fine and wicked days ahead of it in the 21st century. It is difficult to see how a powerful brain, be it even that of the American Arthur R. Butz, could have done with so colossal an imposture as the alleged "Holocaust" of the Jews. Neither the will of scholars nor the quality of their work can prescribe the events that alone will determine the moment of this imposture's demise.

One may even wonder whether a belief of this kind will ever end. Its character is increasingly religious. The religion of the "Holocaust" or "Shoah" tends, amongst the Jews of today, to take over from the Torah and Talmud. It is holy. It serves God, Mammon and the Golden Calf, as well as, at the same time, the Jews' eternal anger and unquenchable thirst for vengeance. The consumer society and its quest for profit are ideally adapted to it. Neither that society nor that religion shows, for the time being, the least sign of weakening.

Twenty-six years. It will have taken twenty-six years (1976-2002) for *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century* to appear in French. And not for want of trying, over a quarter of a century, to make available to the French-reading public the masterly work of the American Arthur Robert Butz. Every time, a lack of money and of material means, to say nothing of the whims of the prevailing repression, frustrated those efforts. Today, at last, the work has come out for us in French, even though it still had to be published abroad. The new inquisition is here, peering from the battlements. "An unbearable Jewish thought police" (as the late Jewish intellectual Annie Kriegel called it) is on guard. Each year, with the appearance of new revisionist writings, it lengthens the lists of its *Index Librorum Prohibitorum*.

Historical revisionism is decidedly the great intellectual adventure of our time.

Robert Faurisson, October 2002.

NUTS AND BOLTS

See **Lubomyr Prytulak's critique** of The Dwork and Pelt book on Auschwitz

The book, winner of the National Jewish Book Award in 1996, is: Debórah Dwork and Robert Jan van Pelt, *Auschwitz: 1270 to the Present*, Norton, New York and London, 1996, ISBN 0-393-03933-1.

<<http://www.ukar.org/98020007.html>>

«The account of Auschwitz Crematorium IV given by Dwork and Pelt makes no sense, and the authors show limited capacity for critical thought - specifically, Auschwitz Crematorium IV could not have been designed, as Dwork and Pelt claim, to be a "killing machine." It does not take an architect to see that Crematorium IV is not a "killing machine." It does not take an engineer. It takes someone with a modicum of common sense.»

+++++

Sudeten German Inferno

The hushed-up tragedy of the ethnic Germans in Czechoslovakia:

<<http://www.wintersonnenwende.com/scriptorium/english/archives/sginferno/sgi18.html>>

+++++

Shamir's book in Swedish is available in Swedish bookshops and from publisher <www.alhambra.se>

Shamir's writings in many languages on

<<http://www.israelshamir.net>>

In Russian on <<http://leftisrael.narod.ru>>

+++++

Re-visiting Revisionism

Siegfried E. Tischler, Visiting Professor, Riau University, Pekanbaru, Indonesia, setex01@yahoo.com

We agree on about half of what Prof. Tischler says, and disagree with the rest. Ask him for his text, if you wish.

+++++

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.

+++++

<<http://aaargh-international.org/eng/eng/html>>