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FASCISM, JEWISH CHAUVINISM AND THE HOLOCAUST REVIVAL

INTRODUCTION

Some Accepted Truisms Which Aren't True

Heretical and unacceptable as it may appear, a considerable number of common beliefs about fascism and the Holocaust are untrue, or at least markedly different from the accounts usually presented. The import of this present view is that many current charges of anti-Semitism are often simple ploys to advance the political power of those who make them. In some ways the demands and actions of the current Holocaust campaign are reminiscent of the charges made and the support engendered by Joe McCarthy's crusade a half century ago.

For some, inconvenient facts are an illegitimate hindrance while ethnic chauvinism has its own internal logic which no factual account can successfully challenge. This is particularly true when careers and political influence are based upon the acceptance of some totally or partially false set of propositions.

Much of this account deals with what were once generally known facts and it is a measure of the amnesiac quality of this knowledge that much of it will now seem unbelievable or unthinkable. Let us consider some general points which should be understood before we progress. They are rather different from the generally held understandings.

1. Fascism and Nazism were not ideologies unique to Central European nations nor necessarily contradictory with views prevalent elsewhere in Europe and North America at the time. Fascistic attitudes towards working people, as well as other racial, political and philosophical features of fascism, found considerable acceptance within the parliamentary democracies of Europe and America from the late 19th and throughout the early 20th centuries. Its supporters included some Jews.

"Fascism" and "democracy" although different were, in some respects, not fundamentally distinct kinds of regimes. Fascism is a form of capitalism created by a ruling and middle class which feels itself threatened by the left. Its initial purpose is to crush any internal threat from the left before turning outwards or against some particular social group.

2. Fascism is not primarily the inexplicable outgrowth of some unique national character or culture - as is the claim of some media historians. Nor is fascism the product of insane, degenerate, or otherwise morally depraved groups in society. Its followers were recruited from exactly the kinds of people who comprise the Holocaust revivalists today. It was predominantly a movement of the middle classes, both those on the verge of becoming declasse and others who felt threatened by the left. Records of party membership in the Nazi party in 1933 bear this out beyond debate. It had a vastly disproportionate number of preachers, lawyers, teachers, large farmers, small businessmen and other respectable burghers. Also involved were right-wing veterans of world war 1. Very few industrial or urban workers were in its ranks.

3. Fascism does not inherently involve any degree of anti-Semitism. Fascist Italy until the late 1930s was not anti-Semitic and was sustained by the support of
many Jews. Significant numbers of Jews in countries where it was possible, showed themselves ready to participate in fascist repression of others.

4. Concentration camps were not an invention of Nazi Germany but first appeared under that name at the beginning of the century as part of the Boer war and the British occupation of South Africa. The death rates of those British concentration camps were roughly comparable to some Nazi concentration camps. Between 1918 and 1933 a number of East European states, usually as a concomitant of some counter-revolutionary triumph, also established such camps. For those incarcerated in them, for those who suffered and died in them, they were every bit as horrendous as those in which Jewish victims later died.

   German concentration camps were established in the first months of the Nazi regime in 1933 and lasted until the final defeat of Germany twelve years later. For the first seven of those years Jews were not the main prisoners in concentration camps - the main victims were anti-Nazi Germans, especially Communists. By the time the Jewish Holocaust began in 1941 some Germans had been in the concentration camps for seven or eight years.

5. The nations which during world war 2 are considered to have been 'fighting to preserve freedom from the fascist menace' sometimes were quite racist themselves; America for instance was as thoroughly segregated as any fascist society might wish. Fascism's repression of its own working class and its oppression of others in occupied territories was not inherently different from the way in which imperial nations, including 'democratic' ones, dealt with subject colonial people outside Europe. Many such democracies were ready to support oppressively dictatorial regimes which served their own national interests. To a considerable extent the 'fight against fascism' was a conflict between the interests of established and aspirant imperial powers.

6. Mass murder and war crimes are, unfortunately, not the exclusive prerogatives of fascist regimes but were committed by almost every side during world war 2. Such acts by the winning side are hidden or simply dismissed by most commentators.

   The death and misery caused by wars carried out by non-fascist states, both in the past and today, have been quite horrendous. Such wars probably have now caused as many deaths as fascism did during world war 2. It is true that few other regimes in the world developed a program for the extermination of an entire people as the Nazis did. Although the losses suffered by the Jewish people through the Nazi genocide are unique in scale, it should be remembered that 30 to 45 million non-Jews also died during world war 2. The majority of the dead were civilians - women, children, and old people. To dismiss those causalities is to trivialize their deaths.

7. Despite the thrust of Jewish claims, there is no clear evidence that over the longer run Jews have suffered or been the victims of oppression more than any number of other people. Current claims inflate past Jewish suffering while passing over the sufferings of all other peoples. It is not a question of 'Could the holocaust happen again?' It has happened, all be it on a somewhat smaller scale, and with non-Jewish victims.

8. The alleged 'lessons' about the rise of fascism and Nazism and its defeat, as conveyed by the mass media and high school lessons, are one of the most recurrent themes in North American propaganda during the last 60 years. It has become a collective and repetitive morality play in which alleged lessons from the past are to inform actions in the present and future. Basically, what passes for an
account of the conflict between fascism and democracy is a vehicle for national and ethnic self-adulation which beclouds what the real forces involved were.

The alleged 'lesson' is that fascism or comparable threats must be nipped in the bud, preferably by joint military action. This serves mainly as a cover for current imperial intervention into other states.

9. The Holocaust revival campaigns over the past 30-40 years have resurrected and utilized past war propaganda 'history'. This has been deployed mainly to serve particular ethnic chauvinist ends. It has little to do with understanding the historical facts or with preventing their reoccurrence.

The Holocaust revival does not fundamentally revolve around events of some 60 or more years ago in Europe but rather stems from the current ideology of right-wing Jewish and allied interests. They are basically about the policies of Israel and those of its supporters in the U.S. Far from being an attempt to bring some delayed justice to victims of a past period, the Holocaust revival is basically a means to (a) convince non-Jews of the legitimacy of Jewish power and (b) to demonstrate the power of the Jewish lobby to punish whosoever it wishes. It also intends to 'educate' adults and children on the special rights, claims, and morality of Jews at home and abroad.

Those allied with this program are motivated by a multiplicity of different goals and desires, including their vision of America as the savior of the world and themselves as the moral leaders of America. Supporting the Holocaust revival sixty years after the events is a way of obscuring the murderous militarism which both America and Israel have succumbed to.

The above views could be expanded and presented more felicitously but I hope that they will cause some reconsiderations by the readers.

This manuscript contains comparatively few excerpts from progressive Jewish commentators, primarily because it is about the way in which charges of anti-Semitism have been used by Jewish chauvinists. However there does seem to be a marked decline in progressive Jewish attitudes over the last half century. The reasons for this are many. (a) There may just be fewer progressive Jews around, the majority may have been captured by Jewish organizations which support an evermore right-wing Israel and America. (b) Jews who do not hold with these sentiments may have simply kept quiet or been silenced. Some may have withdrawn in disgust. This may give the appearance of a greater support for right-wing chauvinism than actually exists. It may be that some have simply left the concerns of Jewish identity behind them and do not involve themselves in such concerns at all. (c) It may also be that one just does not hear the voices of progressive Jews in the press or on the electronic media. Their voices may have been usurped by reactionary forces.

Whatever the case, the views presented here now seem to be a prominent component of Jewish opinion in North America. They are supported in general by right-wing elements within the broader society. If one were to forage about in the internal newsletters, documents, and 'journals' of their organizations I would expect one would find considerably more raucous opinions being bruited about than those cited here. Where does all this lead? To an overwhelming support for American imperialism and to a contempt for most peoples of the world.
PART ONE
Chapter 1. Fascist Regimes and Other Dictatorships in Europe, 1918-1945

This chapter is a brief outline of the fascist and right wing autocracies which came to power in Europe during the period 1918 to 1945, a period of usually less the twenty years which, looking back at it, seems to have been much longer. Possibly this is because of the endless repetition of new and old world war 2 movies which have become a part of American mass culture. The following survey is to point out that fascism was not unique to Germany, that it everywhere was directly opposed to the interests of a nation's working class and/or peasantry, and that it was not uniformly anti-semitic. This latter fact should not redound to their credit or make those regimes any less odious.

The temptation to trade on the dead and to foster a self-adulatory chauvinism is apparently overwhelming for some. For them, Germany and the Germans remain the enemy of humanity who must forever bear the burden of their guilt - including those who were the original victims of fascism when the west was cozying up to such forces.

Many scholars today would reject the view that all the regimes listed here were fascist ones. They would hold instead that such regimes can only be understood as the unique outgrowth of the circumstances from which they sprang. While this view has some validity all of these regimes were repressive right-wing autocracies. By 'fascist' is here meant that a regime was (a) based upon military and police force to maintain itself; (b) fundamentally anti-working class, fundamentally opposed to the interests of that class; (c) a regime is based on the mass organization of its supporters, primarily the middle class, as well as by major industrialists and large land owners who see themselves as endangered by the left; and (d) a regime marked by chauvinistic ethnic nationalism and based upon militarism.

To the extent that such regimes achieved a higher degree of organization they were fascist. Where they didn't, they were often equally oppressive and murderous autocracies.

The dates following the names of countries indicate the duration of fascist regimes in those particular states. Many today would hold that many of these regimes were never fascist, or that they only became so through Nazi influence. I beg to differ.

Finland 1918 to 1944

Following the Finnish civil war (1917-1918), the regime headed by General Mannerheim established prison camps for 60,000 Finnish Red soldiers and supporters in which about a half the prisoners died through disease and starvation. Death squads curried the land arresting and executing those suspected of being Red sympathizers. A substantial emigration of the Finnish left scattered throughout the western world. Finland had a limited degree of democracy (with parties of the left mainly excluded) during the later 1920s but by the later 1930s the country was again in the hands of a nationalist and militarist regime. General Mannerheim and his successors became involved in a war with the Soviet Union in 1940 over the Karelia region, which they lost. Finland participated in the Nazi invasion of the Soviet Union with its own army of 250,000 men. Once the Nazi armies were driven back from Leningrad the Finnish forces were quickly overcome.
Finland is not usually counted as being a fascist state and the tens of thousands of Finnish working people murdered by the ruling regime are written off as the victims of the aftermath of a civil war. Moreover, that Finnish regime is lauded for not permitting the murder of its Jewish citizens during world war 2. Although the Finnish regimes of this era did not develop a significant Fascist party it is nevertheless here treated as being a right wing dictatorship only slightly different from fascism, a form of government which flourished in east and central Europe during the interwar period.

**Hungary 1919 to 1945**

Following the defeat and break up of Austro-Hungary at the end of world war 1 a communist regime headed by Bela Kuhn took power in Hungary, mobilized its own Red Army and defeated various incursions by Czech and other military forces until it was invaded by a 500,000 man Rumanian army. Rumania defeated the Hungarian Communist forces and handed over power of a territorially reduced Hungary to an ultra-reactionary regime headed by one Admiral Horthy.

If anything the regime which established itself in Hungary was too reactionary to be considered a fascist state, harking back to an 18th century regime it modelled itself after. It oversaw the reintroduction of bound labour on the Pusztak (the large rural estates). Its once vibrant working class was thoroughly oppressed; the regime outlawed all even vaguely left wing parties and oversaw roaming death squads during the first half of the 1920s which made Hungary a synonym for murderous reaction. Hungary joined Nazi Germany and supplied a 250,000 man army for the invasion of the Soviet Union in 1941. Throughout all of this Hungary's Jewish population of some 500,000-600,000 seemed to pass largely unscathed. A considerable number of Jews had previously become large land owners and successful businessmen, especially bankers, under the Austro-Hungarian regime and many became Hungarian nationalists during the interwar years. Most Hungarian Jews accommodated themselves with the Horthy regime.

As one commentator puts it, "One must not be misled by the fact that the authoritarian governments in Budapest were adverse to, and sometimes persecuted, some of the competing fascist groups, especially those which too obviously copied the Hitlerite model, such as Ferenc Szalasi's Arrow Cross movement. There were good foreign policy reasons for this. Budapest's ideal was rather the Italian type of fascism and any excessive influence on Hungarian affairs from the direction of powerful Germany was looked at askance by official circles in their cautious maneuvering"  Jaroslav Valenta, in *History of the 20th Century. Chapter 52, The Drift to Dictatorship in Central Eastern and South-Eastern Europe* (p. 1,436, 1969, London).

Hungary did not fundamentally repress Jews until after the coup carried out by the Arrow Cross party in late 1944 ousted Admiral Horthy and began the ghettoization and the mass murder of Hungarian Jews.

Despite the ultra reactionary nature of the Horthy regime, despite its prison camps and killings of the Hungarian left, its xenophobia and police state militarism, and despite the manner in which it reduced its rural working classes into quasi serfs between 1919 and 1944, the Horthy regime is usually not designated as 'fascist' but merely authoritarian by many observers today. This may be true, since there were many competing fascist forces in play, but the country was to all intents and purposes at least as fascist as Italy under Mussolini. And that is how it is considered here.
Italy 1922-23 to 1943-45

Following the end of World War 1, Italy was wracked by 'irredentist' claims forwarded by veterans of the Italian army who believed that Italy was a major power entitled to its share of lands taken from other nations. The Italian government had little capacity to check the campaigns of irredentist forces although it did mobilize its police and armed forces to suppress the wave of strikes and land seizures which coursed through Italy in 1919. It was from an alliance of ultra nationalist veterans, mobilized elements of the (especially rural) middle classes and an assortment of student and right wing groups that fascism emerged under the leadership of Benito Mussolini, a former left wing socialist. The hodge-podge of individuals and leaders thrown together in this movement marched on the national capital in 1922 and, with the tacit support of the King, seized power.

Mussolini often proclaimed that the purpose of his movement was to seize state power and then act in what it viewed as 'the interests of Italy'. This soon turned out to be a general militarization of the state, the crushing of the left, colonial expansion and advancing the interests of a melange of large industrialists and land owners who were, along with sections of Italian middle class, the main basis of Mussolini's support.

There was a period when Mussolini permitted a degree of opposition to exist in parliament but with the assassination of the Socialist leader Mattioti in the mid 1920s, fascist control over Italian society was fully instituted. It was the Italian example which gave the world the term 'fascism'. It soon generated considerable support from comparable classes through much of Europe, including Great Britain and France. Winston Churchill, that alleged defender of Western values and democracy, was an early enthusiast of Mussolini as he later was of the Spanish dictator Franco.

Italy did develop a mass-based, authoritarian party membership which along with uniforms and marches carried out suppression of the Italian left and even Italian democrats. Defining characteristics of fascism are that it be a ruthless defender of the interests of the owning sectors of the population, that it has an organized and militarized mass base, and that nationalist and militarist goals are inherent in its policies. And naturally that it was anti-socialist and anti-communist.

What Italian fascism did not do was to carry out any significant industrialization over its twenty year long rule, and wages and living conditions for the majority of working class and peasantry stagnated and declined over the period of Fascist power. Despite its touted military triumphs in Libya and Ethiopia (1932, 1935) Italy's military machine, especially its navy, fell apart completely with its entrance into World War 2. Until that happened it supplied some 50,000 military volunteers and armaments to aid Francisco Franco in the Spanish civil war.

As distinct from Nazi Germany, Mussolini engaged the support of a large proportion of Italy's small Jewish population. A number of Italian Jewish 'heroes' were acclaimed as bomber pilots in the war against Ethiopia and others in fighting democracy in Spain. Some 140 senior officers of the Italian army, navy and air force who were Jewish published their support for Mussolini in the late 1930s. A number of senior state advisors were Jewish and the Jewish Revisionist Zionists indicated their support for Mussolini's regime.

It was only at the very end of the 1930s and during the early 1940s that Mussolini began removing Jewish rights and prepared to send Jews to
concentration camps. It was only then that Mussolini showed his brutality, according to contemporary Zionists. All the previous oppression of the Italian working class, the invasion of foreign countries, was acceptable until he began to attack Jews. After 1943 the number of Jews deported was relatively small but the survivors emerged at the end of the war as 'victims of fascism and anti-semitism'.

Lithuania 1926 to 1944
Lithuania emerged as a reborn nation with the collapse of Tsarist Russia at the end of world war 1. A substantial part of its territory was seized by newly established Poland in 1919 and it went through a number of years as an anti-communist democracy until in 1926 power was seized by ultra-nationalists who immediately turned the nation into a society modeled after fascist Italy.

The Lithuanian rulers attempted to, and partly succeeded, in building a mass-based nationalist movement with the attendant youth organizations, uniforms, and corporate state organization. A substantial number of socialists and communists died at the hands of the Lithuanian courts, jails and secret police. Lithuanian had become a rightwing police state, and its rulers considered that they had established a fascist society. Lithuania was seized by the Soviet Union in 1940, a move which western leaders bewailed as a loss to the democratic world, which Lithuania clearly had never been a part of. A number of Jews escaping from the Polish colonels regime during the late 1930s made their way into Lithuania (which had a policy of treating all persons of non-Lithuanian background as second class citizens). With the German invasion of the Soviet Union in 1941 Lithuanian Jews immediately became a target and their murder in Lithuania was among the most thoroughgoing of the war.

Austria 1932-1945
Following the breakup of the Austro-Hungarian Empire at the end of world war 1, the six million member rump of German-speaking Austria attempted to join with Germany, a move supported by almost every party from left to right, but was blocked from doing so by stipulations in the Versailles treaty (the Treaty of St. Germain to be exact). There then followed some 13 years of economic stagnation, an inflation which wiped out all private savings, from which Vienna itself was partly removed by its election of socialist city governments. Both Italy and the Catholic church were strenuously fishing in the waters of Austrian reaction, which ultimately came to power in 1932 under the leadership of one Engelbert Dolfuss. He was supported by the right wing paramilitary known as the Heimwehr (Home Defense). His regime is generally designated as 'Heimwehr fascism.' Although predominantly Catholic this Heimwehr also enrolled some Jewish world war 1 veterans who were as reactionary as the organization they joined.

After a year of consolidating Heimwehr fascism throughout the country, Dolfuss decided to overthrow the Vienna city government, then dominated by the Social Democrats, in February of 1934. This resulted in a week of armed resistance by Social Democratic workers, especially in the Florisdorf district of the city, which was taken and many of its defenders executed.

Dolfuss was supported by and saw himself as akin to Mussolini's regime but was opposed by pro-Nazi fascists, who in an abortive coup later in the year shot Dolfuss. He was succeeded by a reactionary Catholic prime minister who tried to keep Austria from merging with Nazi Germany, but was overtaken by events which saw the bloodless German Anshluss (annexation) in 1938. All of these
events, the establishment of Austrian fascism, the destruction of the Social Democrats and the working class movement, the seizure of Vienna, the alliance with fascist Italy, etc. all still counts as 'democratic' in many history books. This does not change until Austria's annexation by Germany. The large scale emigration of Austrian Jews does not begin until 1938, after which discriminatory laws are passed against them.

During world war 2 Austria operated as an integral part of Nazi Germany know as the Ostmark (eastern province). It lost something like 400,000 of its c. 7 million people during that war. A number of Jewish working class leaders survived imprisonment in concentration camps to emerge after world war 2; one (Bruno Krieski) to become the President during the 1960s and 1970s. He reviled Israeli Zionism as an analogue of the fascism he had known in Austria, with the Palestinians replacing the Jews as the targets of oppression.

Germany 1933-1945

It is impossible to provide a thumbnail sketch of developments in Germany during the interwar years, but here is one take on events there. Germany had developed the largest and best organized Social Democratic movement in the world by the time of world war 1; however, its founding leaders had all died off and were replaced by a strain of cautious, labour patriots who came to support German claims during world war 1. They were faced by a split which removed about one third of their party into the Independent Socialist Party. With defeat in world war 1 and the general self-demobilization carried out by German soldiers returning from the fronts, the Social Democrats were faced with a Communist revolt in Berlin at the beginning of 1919. They called upon the already then forming Frei Korps (right-wing private armies) to suppress it, who proceeded to do so with unmeasured brutality. This was supported by the Social Democrat minister of defence Noske and placed a curtain of blood between the Social Democrats and the Communists and the Independent Socialists which even mortal danger could not unite.

A coup by the Frei Korps, now far larger than the restricted German Army itself, was attempted in early 1920 but was defeated by a united action of all the anti-militarist forces in Germany. This resistance included a nation-wide general strike and the mobilization of a fifty thousand man Ruhr Red Army. The coup crumbled but the plotters were all allowed to go free.

An unparalleled inflation during 1922 and 1923 wiped out all personal savings and reduced wages to a bare minimum. However after 1923 a considerable degree of stability was reestablished until the onset of the Great Depression. The Nazi party had been around since the early 1920s competing with other ultra nationalist parties, but garnered little more that 2 percent of the electoral vote. The Social Democrats, who had been the leading party at the beginning of the decade became a minority element in governments formed in the later 1920s. By 1930 a series of right wing regimes began to rule mainly through government decrees, although they still held elections. The onset of the depression conditions soon became horrendous in Germany, which at its lowest point had some 45% of the labour force unemployed - probably worse than anywhere else in the industrial world. None of the parties, other than the communists, had any plan of how to deal with this situation.

The Nazi party, which had previously polled something like 2.5 percent of the vote, ran on a platform which avoided any talk of war or anti-semitism but focused on an unspecified policy of national salvation. One election poster read
"You have tried everything else. Only Adolf Hitler can save us." They leaped from a support of some hundreds of thousands to one of millions; what their actual policies might be was largely unknown to the electorate.

Finally, in the elections of early January 1933, they emerged as the largest single party in Germany. The expanded Nazi vote was achieved by the general collapse of the 'centrist parties and those of other right wing parties whose support merged with the Nazis. The left also increased its share of the vote, the Social Democrats to some 8 million and the Communists to some 4 million votes. The working class vote for these two parties held firm and expanded but it was overwhelmed by the shift of the middle class and the rural vote to the Nazis. The Nazis took power democratically and Hitler was appointed as Chancellor by a semi-senile President Hindenburg. After that any real democracy ceased to exist. The regions which had elected local Social Democratic regimes were simply dissolved, a fire set in the Reichstag (Parliament buildings) was portrayed as a Communist plot. During a second election later in the same winter, the Communists were allowed to run but immediately declared illegal afterward. This allowed the Nazis to take a bare majority of the seats and immediately resulted in the establishment of a Nazi dictatorship.

The Social Democratic Party and other middle of the road parties joined the Communists as illegals. Concentration camps for political opponents were established, police powers were broadly expanded, Nazi members replaced others in a wide range of government positions, Nazi propaganda came to be disseminated from almost every source and in general Germany entered into the dark night of fascist repression.

Post war studies of Nazi membership in 1933 underline the middle class character of the movement - the proportionally largest membership came from Protestant ministers, followed by an assortment of professionals such as lawyers and doctors, followed by small shop owners, middle echelon state employees, and farmers. Miners and other industrial workers and the working class in general were generally absent from the Nazi party membership. This underlines an important fact of the Fascist parties throughout Europe - whose forces were not drawn from lumpenized elements in society - but instead represented the "respectable" middle class elements in it. To repeat - the triumph of fascism flowed from the support of the middle classes in their respective countries. Fascism, for all its use of goon squads and paramilitary organizations in gaining power, was the expressed will of the middle classes facing economic and political threat from the left in their respective countries.

And Hitler was successful, in a sense, initially. He suppressed the S.A. in 1934, he eliminated independent labour unions, he expanded the army in contravention of the Versailles treaty. He gradually began rearmament and, more amazingly, he put most of the German population back to work while the western world was mired in economic depression. Naturally, all strikes or attempts to raise wages were forbidden. Health and welfare benefits, which had been wide ranging in the Weimar era, were markedly cut back. As a gamble Hitler reoccupied the Rhineland, which had been treated as a protectorate by the Allied powers. This, understandably, won him wide support among the German people in general.

His campaigns against German Jews did not really begin until after 1936, when Jewish professors and state employees were hounded from their jobs. This naturally did not generate a widespread repugnance among the working class population which had been bearing the brunt of the Nazi attacks for three years by then. The attacks on Jewish shops and businesses which occurred during
Kristalnacht in the fall of 1938, as well as emerging anti-Jewish legislation, did evoke widespread repugnance for the Nazis internally. However it was much too late by that time.

When Germany entered what became the Second world war there were some 300,000 persons in concentration camps throughout Germany - the overwhelming majority of them not Jews but political opponents. It was considered treason to disseminate knowledge about conditions in the camps. Although the number of prisoners in concentration camps was relatively small (20,000-300,000) it was quite enough to scare the population in general, especially considering the hundreds of thousands of others under some form of police surveillance.

It might also be noted that the initial Nazi policy towards the German Jews was to force them to leave the country. That many of them didn't leave was partly due to the fact that other nations were unwilling to take them in as refugees. As it turned out, probably somewhat over a half of German Jewry escaped before world war 2 broke out. With the invasion and rapid defeat of Poland in September 1939 - essentially a squabble between two mutually hostile dictatorships which then raised lofty rhetoric in western circles about the 'defense of democracy' - Nazi Germany was faced with over 3.5 million additional Jews within its occupied territories.

Although a transfer of the Jewish-Polish population to a number of huge ghettos emerged in 1940 the large scale killing of Jews did not begin until the invasion of the Soviet Union in June of 1941. With the advance of the German army into the Soviet Union an additional million Jews were threatened by Nazi control; the Jewish Holocaust began in earnest. The massacre of Jewish civilians at Babi Yar, on the outskirts of Kiev, was only the most horrendous of such actions. Therefore it is somewhat surprising that the large Jewish populations of Hungary and Rumania apparently did not know of or disbelieved the accounts of the Holocaust, which filtered through to them, even in 1944.

In times of war, with killings going on everywhere, with a moderate degree of secrecy, it is possible that most people will not believe that the worst is going to happen to them. The German population generally did not know, or did not want to know, what was happening to Jews. And if they did know there was nothing they could do about it in any case - they were worried about their own sons and daughters and parents surviving the battles and the bombing raids. So it came about that some 4 or 5 or 6 million Jews were killed, mainly in Eastern Europe, primarily in Poland, Lithuania and Hungary, between mid 1941 and early 1945. The war also claimed 45 million non-Jews, including about 8 million Germans, many of whom died in or were killed during or shortly after that conflict was over.

Poland (1926-1935), 1935-1939

Poland reemerged at the end of world war 1 led by nationalist forces which by 1920 had sent its newly formed army to take over large parts of Lithuania, the western Ukraine and boundary regions of Germany and Czechoslovakia. At the height of the Russian civil war Poland occupied much of the western Ukraine, including Kiev, until driven out by the Red army which, however, failed to keep large parts of western Russia from Polish occupation. Nationalistic Polish Jews comprised a full division in that Polish army, although their participation was opposed by the high command and they were isolated within that army.

Something like one third of the population of Poland was composed of non-Poles by the early 1920s. Poland had claims against all of its neighbours and its
leaders were not reticent in putting them forward. It also became an increasingly reactionary as well as a thoroughly corrupt nation. Foreign, especially French, capital dominated the economy which it exploited throughout the 1920s. Although the Polish Popular Socialist party, a Polish variant of the Social Democrats, wielded some power in the early 1920s, they were supplanted by a kaleidoscopic assortment of conservative parties and cliques. This all came to a head in 1926 when Jozeph Pilsudski, the founder of the Polish military and national hero, seized power in an army coup. Although placed at the head of the government Pilsudski soon lost interest in ruling and allowed the state to descend into swamp of reactionary cliques competing for positions and cash, which was made all the worse by the depression when it struck.

Pilsudski died in 1935 leaving behind an amalgam of military officers and reactionary parties known as the 'Colonel's Poland'. Anti-semitism began to emerge in force, with specifically anti-Jewish legislation beginning to appear; for instance limitations and quotas to specific jobs intended to expel Jews from them. In general, industry operated at a much reduced level, unemployment was general, people retreated to the land if they could and Poland continued through the stratagems of day to day survival. After 1935 some people talked openly about 'Polish Fascism'; a regime with absurd militarist posturing along with endemic corruption. Poland even made efforts to direct as many of its Jewish population to emigrate to Palestine as they could, Some Zionist leaders, such as Menachem Begin and Yitzhak Shamir, members of a reactionary Jewish paramilitary organization known as Betar, finally made the passage to Palestine. Conditions became so bad that at least some Jews fled Poland for the seeming safety of Nazi Germany during this period.

Poland suffered heavily during the German occupation, especially among those who were not peasants or laborers. None suffered more than the Polish Jews, whose destruction made up the majority of those who died in the Holocaust. The figures are somewhat variable - of the 3.5 million Jews in Poland at the start of the war some 600,000+ survived. Some hundreds of thousands fled to Lithuania and the Soviet Union and either survived or died there. A few thousand others joined partizan units, in which many survived - some to carry out atrocities against German prisoners of war and civilians at the end of the war. Possibly over 2.5 million Polish Jews died in the concentration camps, most of which were established on Polish territory. Despite the heroism of some Jews, whose armed resistance was later blown up for western audiences during the 1970s, the overwhelming majority did not resist - as was the case for almost every population in Europe, including Germany. They tried to survive the best the could until it was too late.

However, the documented historical actions of some Jewish leaders, especially those of the right wing Zionist organization in Poland which supplied camp guards and policemen for the Jewish ghettos and participated in the rounding up of Jews for shipment to death camps, seems quite despicable. Some of their compatriots later became the rulers of Israel during the mid 1970s and 1980s, where they succeeded in directing and expanding home-grown Israeli militarism.

At the end of world war 2 most of the 9 million Germans living in the eastern parts of Germany were forced to flee by the advancing Soviet army, which carried out atrocities in those parts of East Prussia they had reached. Of that 9 million 1.5 million never crossed the Oder and were killed or imprisoned in newly established Polish concentration camps by the new Polish forces. These carried out atrocities every bit as bloodthirsty as those portrayed in propaganda films about Nazi
oppression. Of those who reached Germany in the winter of 1945 many additional persons must have died through starvation and disease and cold. These were all civilians. There was enough war guilt to go around for everyone involved, including the Czechs, who proceeded to drive out 3 million German civilians who had lived in their regions for centuries and to kill some 250,000 of them in the process.

**Rumania 1940?-1944**

Despite the emergence of significant fascist movement in Rumania during the 1930s (the Iron Guard), that nation was never sufficiently well organized to constitute a truly fascist state. However it was a truly reactionary state which sustained aspects of the early 19th century into the middle of the 20th. Its predominant peasant population was one of the most exploited in Europe, although there were many contending claimants for the position. The nation was run, to the extent that it was administered, by a class of large landlords, large merchants and exporters of agricultural products and oil, and by a shifting military camarilla centred around the Rumanian King Carol 11. Rumania did have a substantial army of over half a million men which it used on one side and then the other during world war 1, achieving its one claim to fame in the invasion and destruction of the beleaguered forces of Red Hungary in 1919. From this it acquired the Translyvania region from Hungary and soon afterwards the former Russian province of Bessarabia, which it seized during the Russian civil war. Although there had been a wide spread peasant uprising in 1907 which was brutally crushed by the Rumanian army, the country drifted through the 1920s and early 1930s, a synonym for a Balkan backwater. Its secret police were especially ferocious and surprisingly effective; no left wing political force established itself in Rumania in the interwar period.

As with all countries depending upon the export of food and raw resources, Rumania was hit hard by the world depression. It was during this time that a true fascist movement sprang up under the direction of one 'Colonel' Codreaneau. It is a comment on the nature of Rumania that this Iron Guard movement was considered as "radical" but it was somehow crushed by the Royalist forces during the later 1930s and Codreaneau killed.

However the high-jinks of the Rumanian king became excessive even for Rumania, although he took over personal control of the state in 1938. Two years later, after Rumania was forced to cede Transylvania back to Hungary, Carol was ousted and power passed into the hands of the Rumanian military. This left one Marshal Ion Antonescu in power, which he was able to consolidate. He legalized the fascist Iron Guard, which emerged from underground, and he led his country into an alliance with Nazi Germany in the invasion of the Soviet Union in 1941 on the strength of promises of Russian territory.

Anti-semitism had been an inherent fact in Rumania society, with some 500,000 Jews making up a broad strata of small traders, village artisans but also large merchants and exporters. Anti-semitic pogroms had occurred on a small scale throughout the interwar period but it was with the invasion of the Soviet Union that large scale massacres of Russian Jews were carried out by some Rumanians in the regions they occupied. However the military government of Rumania actively suppressed any anti-semitic actions attempted in Rumania itself and it's Jewish population was not only relatively safe but even participated in the military invasion of the Soviet Union as soldiers and officers of the Rumanian
army. (I met two Rumanian Jewish war veterans in Colombia during the mid 1960s who, although they were incensed at Hitler, were proud of their role in invading the Soviet Union. They had left Rumania during the mid 1950s because they were totally opposed to the socialist steps being taken there.)

So was Rumania fascist or not? It had neither the large corporate interests which backed fascism elsewhere nor was there truly a mass fascist party ever mobilized. Was it anti-Semitic? Yes, but in general the oppression of the Rumanian working class, such as it was, was more reactionary than fascist. So, in a loose sense we can say that Rumania during the interwar and war years was a disjointed oppressive state which allied itself with fascism.

When Soviet forces entered Rumanian territory the entire structure of the regime ancien broke down, many of its leaders fled. A nationalist revolt tinged with a great deal of xenophobia broke out and some 250,000 Rumanians of German ancestry, most of whom had been a part of Rumania for centuries, were murdered. No anti-Semitic pogrom in Rumania ever vaguely matched these mass murders.

After a brief interlude a communist government was installed, with little indigenous base. By the late 1950s and early 1960s Jewish disaffection with the regime was taken into account and a deal was struck with Israel to permit those Jews who wanted to leave to go in exchange for some hundreds of millions of dollars. Some 400,000 Jews left Rumania for Israel and points beyond. Whatever can be said about Rumania, it, like Finland, Spain, Bulgaria and to a certain extent Italy, did not deliver their Jewish population to concentration camps.

**Bulgaria 1925-1944**

Bulgaria only left several centuries of Turkish occupation behind in the 1870s, and became involved in a war with other Balkan states in 1911-1913 in which it lost most of its gains in European Turkey and in the trans-Danubian region. It was a classic peasant nation with a Royalist-military rulership which took Bulgaria into world war 1 on the side of Germany to retrieve its claims to Macedonia and the trans-Danubian regions. This regime collapsed at the end of that war. As distinct from Rumania, Marxist ideas had taken root in Bulgaria before world war 1 and a broadly populist Peasant party took power in Bulgaria after its defeat. Despite many difficulties this regime had broad support among Bulgarians when, in 1923 it was overthrown by a military coup, backed by the Bulgarian gran bourgeoisie. This was followed later in the year by a Communist revolt, which was soon crushed with extreme severity, its members being hunted down for some years afterward. Following this a more or less open dictatorship based upon the military rule, which naturally had no solution at all for the depression when it struck except to oust what parliamentary elements remained and establish a clear cut dictatorship after 1934.

It might be noted, as an aside, that most of these reactionary regimes which established themselves in the 1920s and 1930s had the full support of the British and French governments of their day who were quite willing to see right wing dictatorships established and the bulk of their nation's population repressed if their own business interests were maintained. These states only became 'vile enemies of democracy' when they allied themselves with Nazi Germany at the outbreak of world war 2.

As distinct from Rumania a considerable left-wing underground organization continued throughout the interwar years which emerged and grew with the Nazi assault on the Soviet Union. I am uncertain about the degree of anti-Semitic
actions by the Bulgarian rulers but during world war 2, the majority of Bulgaria's Jews were saved by the Bulgaria resistance movement. Bulgaria did not actually participate in the invasion of the Soviet Union but was allied with Nazi Germany and was given territory in Macedonia, claimed by Greece and Serbia.

Was Bulgaria a fascist state? Probably not, although it was a brutal and oppressive Royalist dictatorship which cared little about how the majority of its population lived and was typically as repressive as such states are. However, Bulgaria's army and government just melted away with the approach of the Soviet armies and it remained a peasant nation until socialist construction began in the late 1940s. The role of Jews within Bulgarian events of the interwar period seemingly was marginal.

Slovakia 1939-1944

Slovakia was the eastern half of Czechoslovakia, a non industrialized peasant region which was a backwater of the Austro-Hungarian empire and did not markedly improve under independent Czech rule. It became increasingly resentful of the economic advance in the Czech regions, partly because of the alienation of small peasant plots by larger landowners during the 1930s. Slovakia was also a region thoroughly dominated by the Catholic church. With the loss of Bohemia through the Munich pact of 1938 and the establishment of a right-wing Czech regime, the Slovakian leaders shifted to support its own form of fascism with the support of the Catholic church. It separated from Czechoslovakia in early 1939. A regime came to power under one Hlinka which is usually referred to as a clerico-fascist state, alluding to the deep and prominent involvement of the church in this regime.

The Hlinka regime was closely linked to Nazi Germany during the course of world war 2 and although it provided no troops for the invasion of the Soviet Union it did operate an Italianate fascist regime at home. It was rather disorganized but it was active in its suppression of communists and it lent its forces to a program for Jewish liquidation within its territory. Many Jews were killed in Slovakia. In 1944 a wide-spread revolt against the clerico-fascist regime arose but was crushed, with some difficulty, by the Hlinka forces. At the end of that year Slovakia was liberated by the Soviet army and reintegrated into Czechoslovakia. As elsewhere where the Soviet army crushed fascist regimes, their leaders, where they did not flee west to democracy, generally paid the price for their past crimes.

Croatia 1941-1945

Croatia was a part of the Austro-Hungarian empire which was attached to the newly formed Yugoslavia by the Versailles treaty in 1919 without any consultation with the people so transferred. Although the Serbs comprised the ruling sectors of that new state Yugoslavia had a very considerable portion of its population who were not Serbs - Slovenians, Croatians, Macedonians, Albanians as well as smaller numbers of Hungarians and Germans. By the late 1920s some of these elements were becoming increasingly hostile to Serbian rule. Already by the mid 1930s the Croatian Ustachi, which modelled itself after Mussolini's regime in Italy and operating with Italian funding, was challenging Serbia, resulting in a Yugoslav agreement which left Croatian administration and affairs largely in Croatian hands.

In 1941 the King of Yugoslavia - the leading force in a semi-dictatorial Yugoslav state since the late 1920s (and still claiming the aura of the Serbian
struggle against Turkey) signed a mutual non-aggression pact with Germany. This was a desperate attempt to stay out of the war which had so far developed. With the backing of the British secret service, who had a great many paid agents in Yugoslavia, a military revolt immediately broke out which deposed the king and rejected that nonaggression pact. Germany then invaded and within the course of less than a month the Yugoslav army had surrendered. This was followed by the almost immediate separation of Slovenia and Croatia from Yugoslavia, the latter coming under the rule of the Croatian Ustachi movement.

The civil/liberation war which then emerged - rather slowly at first - gradually became the largest and most powerful partizan movement to operate in World War 2, ultimately evolving into forms of mobile warfare, but riven by a kaleidoscopic array of armed forces. I have counted some seven different forces in arms, in addition to the German, Italian and Bulgarian occupation armies. In addition one must remember that in this sort of warfare individual commanders and units would operate more or less under their own recognizance, making for a highly localized system of conflicts and bloodshed. Forces of the various factions all fought against each other, usually in murderous and brutal ways. Although there was much competition for the title, probably the Croatian Ustachi were the most murderous of the lot. For those Yugoslavs who just wanted to be left alone it must have seemed that the world was ending - and for a great many it did.

The Ustachi had considerable support in Croatia, although hardly universal, as witnessed by the growth of the Croatian communist forces. The Ustachi mobilized its own army and party militia based on Fascist lines. They began the expulsion or extermination of Serbs living in Croatian territory. In the course of three and half years they murdered some 500,000 Serb civilians; sometimes individually, sometimes in village massacres and sometimes in the concentration camps they established. The Serbian Nationalist partisans (the Chetniks) under Michaelovich retaliated in kind when they were not busy fighting the Communist forces. Most of them operated on the basis of murderous ethnic chauvinism, except to a certain extent the Communist forces which garnered support from all ethnic groups in the former Yugoslav state.

It is impossible to decide whether the Ustachi was more anti-semitic than it was anti-Serbian since it murdered members of both groups. Given the short time they were in power the Ustachi did not have the opportunity to develop a more mature fascist regime, although the usual accoutrements of uniformed Croatian youth movements, veterans organization, armed party militia, allied women's organizations etc. etc. were established. The lands, houses, businesses and belongings of murdered or expelled persons wound up in the hands of Ustachi supporters.

With the overthrow of Mussolini in Italy in 1943, the Ustachi shifted to support of the German fascists which they maintained until their defeat by Tito's partisans at the end of World War 2. German and Italian prisoners of war were murdered en mass by the partisans, according to Djilas, a one time senior commander of Yugoslav partisans. Those of the leadership of the Ustachi who did not escape west were tried, convicted and executed for their war crimes by the Yugoslav communist regime.

Amazingly, after some forty years of Communist re-education, the Ustachi reemerged as a powerful and bloody force within independent Croatia during the protracted breakup of the former Yugoslavia during the late 1980s and 1990s. This time the 'western democracies' found little fault with the Ustachi and
hundreds of thousands of Serbs were expelled from Croatia, where their ancestors had lived for over a century.

The upshot of all this bloody ethnic chauvinism, as well as the German occupation, was that more than 1.5 million Yugoslavs died during the 2nd world war - more than all the Jewish dead of Germany and western Europe plus all those who died in Hungary and throughout the Balkans as a whole. That of course does not count as being a Holocaust.

**Greece 1936-1940 and later**

Greece began its modern history as a participant in the second Balkan war (1912-1913) in which it won control over a large part of Macedonia from Turkey. With the advent of world war 1, the Greek crown (a central figure in the Royalist-military-large merchant ruled state) attempted to steer Greece along neutralist lines but was superseded by British intervention which in 1915 installed a 'liberal' politician who had megalomaniac dreams of a Greater Greece. Greece joined the Allied side during that war but saw little returns for its efforts.

At the end of world war 1 this 'liberal' government was induced to send 60,000 of its troops to buoy up the separatist government of Georgia during the Russian civil war. When they were driven out in 1921 the Greek government launched a policy of seizing large portions of Turkey, where some 1.5 to 2 million Greeks had lived since time immemorial. Turkey was prostate and its sultan a captive of the British, who had plans of carving up all of Turkey between various interested parties. After initial successes the Greek armies were totally defeated and withdrew to Smyrna on the Mediterranean coast, ending with the total expulsion (in 1923) of the Greek population of Turkey. They then formed a large, impoverished, refugee population in Greece. Greece struggled through the next dozen years as an impoverished, unindustrialized, backward society and economy, with the sort of shifting camarillas of notables making up governments which could achieve nothing whatsoever.

In 1936 a Greek political general by the name of Metaxis took power, basing himself on the army, police and sections of the business community. Although he had no mass base and xenophobic nationalism on his part was restricted by the realities of the Greek condition, Metaxis' was then considered to be a fascist regime because of his repression of the nascent labour movement and his suppression of democratic elements in general.

So Greece stumbled along until 1940 when it was invaded by Italy, from recently seized bases in Albania. Metaxis responded with a call for national unity and sent in the small Greek army which in fact defeated and halted Italian forces on the border of the country. Metaxis briefly became a hero for some in Britain, his previous role immediately forgotten. He died shortly before the German invasion of Greece in early 1941. The British forces sent to defend the country retreated as fast as the Germans could advance over bad roads. The small Jewish population in Greece lost many of its members during the German occupation.

Greece may not have had a fascist regime in power but it was an autocratic, reactionary, anti-working class one. After the end of world war 2 the British helped build up an army led by right-wing Greek officers. A significant Greek resistance movement had developed during the war led by the local communist party. After the withdrawal of German forces near the end of world war 2 the communist-led Greek guerrilla movement came within an ace of seizing the country, only to be halted by British occupation troops and by large scale
American support for the kind of military represented by Metaxis. With the defeat of the Greek resistance this right wing regime then ruled Greece as a quasi-dictatorship for most of the next 25 years, driving out, killing or imprisoning its opponents in Greek concentration camps. This regime was supported to the hilt by both British and American governments, by both Labour and Conservative, Democrat and Republican administrations.

Spain 1939 - 1975/6

Throughout the second half of the 19th century Spain was wracked by civil war between 'liberal' forces and tradionalist-Catholic Spain. This seemed to have come of some sort of modus vivendi by the beginning of the 20th century which lasted through the dictatorship of Primo de Rivera and the deposition of the Spanish king during the late 1920s.

A left wing government was elected in early 1936 which included Socialist deputies but was rather Republican in outlook, despite its proposed program of breaking up the latifundia and giving land to the peasantry. It was the classic confrontation between liberal and conservative Spain. Following three to four months of increasingly bloody clashes between the right and left, a large part of the Spanish military, under four generals, the leading one being Francisco Franco, attempted to carry out a coup, which only partly succeeded.

A half of Spain was left on the Republican side, due largely to the spontaneous armed opposition of the Spanish people themselves. The scene was set for the Spanish civil war, which soon mobilized all of the left versus the right wing forces in the world in their support for one side or another. It is often forgotten that Winston Churchill, then still a Conservative backbencher, came out in support of Franco, as he had for Benito Mussolini's Italy. The left mobilized the support of largely communist sympathizers from around the world, some forty thousand of whom came to fight in Spain with the International Brigades which proved to be a crack force on the Republican side. The Soviet Union supplied arms and military specialists for the Republicans while Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy sent military equipment and a force of some sixty thousand men to the Nationalist side.

This is not the place to survey the military and political developments within Spain during the years 1936-1939 except to say that the Republican forces were steadily driven back despite the heroic resistance offered by the Spanish people. All of the 'democracies' of the western world, with the exception of Mexico, placed an embargo on any aid to Republican Spain and attempted to halt all volunteers from joining it. The Soviet Union disengaged itself early in 1939 and the final battles took place in April of that year. By then some 300-400,000 Spaniards had escaped across the borders to France, where French authorities herded them into French internment camps, where the conditions were quite horrendous. They along with other refugees (including German refugees) in France came to make up a large part of the 'French' resistance movement which later developed in that country. By late 1938 the British government had recognized the Franco regime and it rushed to offer financial aid to that regime, then still at war.

The death toll of the Spanish civil war has been estimated as totaling between 500,000 and 1 million people, in a population of circa 25 million, plus almost a million refugees. As soon as the Republican forces surrendered Franco imprisoned
many of them, adding civilians who had been active in the left, including women and children, in vast prison camps. Some 600,000 Spaniards were in Franco's prison camps at the beginning of World War 2, and of that number an estimated more than 100,000 were either executed or died of disease and starvation in them. What this means is that there were far more people in Franco's prison camps than there were in Germany's concentration camps at the beginning of World War 2. Few commentators felt this to be a post-war crime.

Was Franco's regime a fascist state? Certainly there were many people who said so at that time and afterward. A small Spanish fascist party had grown during the civil war and was prominent in providing the propaganda for the regime. And then too, Franco was a strong supporter of Italy and Nazi Germany during the 2nd World War, remaining neutral toward England and the U.S. but sending some 60,000 Spanish volunteers in the Division Azul (Blue Division) to fight alongside Hitler in the Soviet Union during World War 2.

Franco's Spain was an ultra reactionary state, allied with fascist foreign forces and with a substantial fascist party which had the support of a considerable portion of Spain's upper and middle classes. It also had the backing of the Spanish Catholic Church. However Franco rejected Hitler's suggestion that he intern Spanish Jews and the 30,000 or so of them remained as free as anyone was in Spain of the period.

Taken as a whole, I don't believe that Spain was a fascist organized society. This does not remove the odium of Franco's Spain one iota in my estimation. Just as it does not remove the odium brought upon themselves by the other right wing, 'simply authoritarian', states of central Europe. It only means that Fascism did not and does not have a monopoly on repressive, murderous, reactionary regimes. That Franco's Spain did not imprison its Jewish population has long been applauded by right wing Jews is of tertiary importance.

Vichy France 1940-1944

After the rapid defeat of Holland, Belgium, France and two Scandinavian countries in early 1940, either occupation governments were established or a Nazi-allied government established, as in Vichy France. Some of these governments, such as Vichy, had significant or widespread support within their nation. The majority of members of the last elected government of France met and constituted the Vichy regime, headed by one General Petain, an aged hero-general of the first World War. This regime governed the southern and eastern half of France, was an ultra Catholic regime which basked in the support of that church and relied upon assorted police and para military formations to maintain that state.

With the British 1940 surprise attack which sank much of the French fleet docked in Algerian ports, a growing anger toward the British spread through Vichy France. DeGaulle's later efforts to establish 'Free French' regimes in Senegal and Lebanon-Syria, mainly with British troops, was strongly resisted by the Vichy forces there and its soldiers, when given the chance to choose, overwhelmingly chose to return to Vichy France rather than to fight with DeGaulle and the Allies. In addition, a full S.S. division, the Charlemagne division, was raised from France and went off to fight with the Nazis against the Soviet Union.

Despite Allied war propaganda, the bulk of the French population seemed to accept the Vichy regime as a necessary evil while a considerable number actually supported it during the early years of the war. These supporters included the French equivalent of the American Legion (the veterans of World War 1) and two
major parties in Vichy France - the Action Francais, a reactionary and anti-semitic party, plus the Parti Populaire Francais, a more clearly Fascist one which later provided its own armed militia which aided the deportation of French Jews to concentration camps. The Vichy state also oversaw a host of expanded police forces, such as the paramilitary Garde Mobile, and a newly organized Milice. The Milice was an organization of rightists and thugs which grew into a small army, largely outside anyone's control. They fought the French resistance which emerged in 1944.

Public opinion began to change with the approaching allied victory and with the landings in North Africa. In 1943, Germany took over the administration of the remainder of France and disbanded the Vichy army, although kept its police forces in operation. Most of the Vichy leaders continued in their collaboration with Nazi Germany.

The French resistance, despite its extensive press in the west, did not emerge until after the invasion of the Soviet Union and was mobilized in part by the Communist party. It grew relatively slowly and was marked by fundamental internal conflicts. It was marked by assorted betrayals and penetration by German agents and by the near total defeat of the Maquis in the south of France when it rose in 1944. Along with the deaths caused by the German forces during World War 2, some 250,000 French men, women and children, died in the allied bombing raids against French targets, a toll which it was later bad form to even mention.

Jews who were French nationals generally seem to have survived by disappearing into the general population. However, many of the large number of Jewish refugees from throughout Europe who did not manage to escape to Britain in 1940 were gradually rounded up and deported to concentration camps. Some joined the French resistance. Some leading French Jewish politicians amazingly survived the camps but some 75,000 died there.

The German occupation forces also had significant, though far smaller, support in Belgium and Holland, from which various volunteer police forces were raised. The Germans also raised a volunteer S.S. division from Belgium and Holland, although the occupation governments in the later two states never had the broad support which the Vichy regime did in France.

After the German occupation ended a maelstrom of political vendettas broke out against anyone known or thought to have collaborated with the Germans. Any number of local tribunals were thrown up which tried and executed up to 50,000 French men and women, imprisoned others and removed much of the political right from political life for the next 20 years. Such trials were based on hearsay and hysterical hatreds and a great many were victimized, almost randomly. In some cases even members of the underground resistance were charged with collaboration.

What this brief overview shows is that Germany was by no means the only fascist nation and movement in Europe during the period. It is suggested that the first victims of the Nazis were not Jews but the German working class and left. While German invasion may briefly have spread its political ideology, European fascism was by no means a simple product of German occupation. A considerable number of fascist or closely allied autocracies came to power independently during the interwar period.
These regimes were sometimes not inherently anti-semitic, which along with their being anti-Soviet counts as a saving grace for some observers today. Jews in some of them played sometimes important roles in these regimes or at least acted as normally loyal subjects of them. That these regimes oppressed their own working class and peasantry is neither here nor there for some observers. Finland, Spain, Rumania, Horthy's Hungary did not markedly oppress Jews, unless they happened to be members of the left. The fundament of these states were policies of utter social and political reaction. Whether they were or weren't anti-semitic, whether they retained some semblance of parliament or not is all secondary. To repeat, Fascist regimes were not inherently anti-semitic and where they weren't Jews in considerable number took up roles in support of those regimes.

European fascism as a whole endured for 23 years, while Nazi rule lasted for a mere 12 years, a half of them involved in war. American imperialism, however, has lasted for well over a hundred years to date, with no sign of weakening, and now directly or indirectly rules most of the world.

An Overview of the Total Deaths in World War 2

The following figures are only very approximate ones since in some countries, especially in the Soviet Union, no figures on losses are reliable. Nevertheless, these figures do provide a general overview of the war's casualties. They demonstrate the remarkably few casualties sustained by America and Canada during that war. There, war causalities barely exceeded the industrial accident rate in these two countries.

Also of note are the truly horrendous proportional losses in Russia, Germany and Poland during this conflict, especially if one adds the post-war killings of more than 2 million persons of German extraction and the expulsion of nine million others from the lands of their birth. A few countries in Europe, mainly those of Scandinavia, escaped more or less unscathed by that conflict.

The following figures are only the loosest approximations and can be and are strenuously debated. They do not include those seriously injured and maimed during that war nor those, undoubtedly millions, who died shortly afterward or had their lives materially shortened due to hunger, disease, and overwork. Nor does it include those 11-12 million Germans and ethnic Germans expelled from their homelands and dumped into a starving and much reduced Germany at the end of the war.

All sources agree that in the figures given below the majority of those who died during world war 2 and its immediate aftermath were civilians: women and children and old people. This was a new development in warfare, a generalized return of barbarism by virtually all sides. This pattern has since become generally accepted by most states waging war against others.

The losses in the Jewish Holocaust are today not legally debatable without charges of 'Holocaust denial' being laid. Some earlier accounts placed the figure at 4 million Jewish deaths, compared to the currently doctrinal figure of 6+ million. In any case, Jews made up only a fraction of those killed during world war 2. Commentators have often insisted on the especially horrendous manner in which Jews died during that conflict, suggesting that the others who died did not also face horrendous deaths. It seems to me that a death is a death, regardless of whether it is expended in a noble or ignoble or in no cause at all - as attested to by the millions of dead children murdered by all sides during that conflict.
One may note that the Jews who were killed during that conflict comprise approximately some 10% of the total losses. A great many more non-Jews died in that war than did Jews.

A partial and largely undifferentiated survey of world war 2 casualties is provided by Martha Hoyle, in her *A World in Flames, A history of world war 2* (1969). She provides figures that few other historians attempt to do. Jewish deaths are incorporated into the losses of their particular countries. Deaths caused by allied bombing in the occupied countries of Europe are not distinguished and could be quite high. The circa 800,000 German P.O.W.'s who died after 1945 while in American and French P.O.W. camps are not listed at all, nor are the circa 2 million German civilians murdered by Polish, Russian, Rumanian and Czech forces. Also, the deaths of German civilians in bombing raids is very much underestimated here. The number of Soviet dead, military and civilian, remains anybody's guess.

For some reason, Holland's war casualties are not listed here. They comprised about 150-180,000 civilian deaths and c. 30,000 military dead. In any case Hoyle's overview is as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nation</th>
<th>Military deaths</th>
<th>Civilian deaths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>9,560</td>
<td>c. 60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Commonwealth</td>
<td>108,930</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>c10,000</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China (from 1937)</td>
<td>c1,329,000</td>
<td>estimates of 6-10 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechoslovakia</td>
<td>160,000 (?)</td>
<td>215,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>1,400-6,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>93,000</td>
<td>(includes civilian deaths)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>210,670</td>
<td>400,000 (including 200,000+ by allied action)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany and Austria</td>
<td>3,500,000</td>
<td>2,880,000 +(see above note)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>16,360</td>
<td>391,600 ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>280,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>162,650</td>
<td>146,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>1,858,800</td>
<td>658,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumania</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soviet Union</td>
<td>13,600,000 (?)</td>
<td>7,000,000 (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Soviet estimates vary from 7 to 30 million)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>320,000</td>
<td>5,384,000 (includes some 3 million Jewish dead)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>264,440</td>
<td>93,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>405,400 (?)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td>1,706,000</td>
<td>(includes military + civilian dead)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 2. Some Atypical Case Studies of the Holocaust

Judenrat. The Jewish Councils in Poland under Nazi Occupation

Isiah Trunk's 1972 *Judenrat. The Jewish Councils in Eastern Europe under Nazi Occupation* is a truly remarkable study in that it deals with the roles played by various elements within the Jewish community in Poland as the Holocaust progressed. It was written and researched by a Jewish survivor who has produced an unparalleled study of the forces and the events entailed. This book was originally written in Yiddish and published by the YIVO Institute of New York. Trunk had earlier written a volume entitled *Lodz Ghetto, a historical and sociological study.*

Apart from Trunk's understandable bone deep anti-Germanism, his account is a reflective and often revealing account of the social reality in the Ghettos under German occupation. He begins his introduction with the view that the Ghettos Councils were not something uniquely created by this particular period in history but rather that the Kehila (Ghetto governments) have previous analogues which should "prevent us from considering the Jewish Councils as a one-time phenomenon without any parallel in Jewish history" (Trunk, 1972: 575).

Trunk does not consider the hundreds of thousands of Jews hidden by Polish families during that period nor does he overly investigate those hundreds of thousands of Jews who had no dealings with their Ghetto leadership, primarily the Jewish working class, the Communists and similar left wing groups. Their responses to events of the times probably were very different to those dealt with in Trunk's account.

Although there is a recurrent mention of Jewish partizans, they generally do not play a major role in developments here. However heroic their actions and however correct their analysis of the situation, their example was not followed by the overwhelming majority of the ghettoized Jews.

According to Trunk, there were some 405 Ghettos established in Poland, Lithuania and the occupied Soviet Union by late 1942. Warsaw had by far the largest Ghetto, followed by Lodz and other major centres of Jewish settlement in the region. The Jewish Police force at Warsaw was also by far the largest, with 2,600 members at its peak but usually about 2,000. This was followed by the Jewish police forces of other Ghettos, normally numbering in the hundreds (Trunk, 1972: 493/494). In total there may have been about 5-6,000+ Jewish policemen controlling those committed into these Ghettos. In many Ghettos graduation from a Gymnasium (a college preparatory school) was required for police recruits (Trunk, 1972: 489). In short, these policemen were typically members of the Jewish middle class.

Of the Jewish Councils (Judenrate) themselves, each Ghetto had one. They ranged in size from 6 to 24 members, making up another 4-6,000 persons. Normally they also had numbers of clerical and other staff, for which Trunk provides no figures. Possibly some 12-15,000 Jews were involved in Ghetto administration and policing - a comparatively small percentage of the circa 3 million Jews involved but a very powerful strata. They typically acted so as to preserve their own families and close associates from being deported to death camps until the very end - but most of them died anyway.

The backgrounds of the Ghetto Jewish council members were typically those of peacetime leadership. They were successful merchants, entrepreneurs and Jewish community leaders in almost 75% of the cases. As for the Jewish police force,
some 43% had been merchants, 30% were white collar workers, while 16% had been 'artisans' with the remaining 11% which fell into various categories (Trunk, 1972: 490/491). As for the Ghetto leadership, Trunk suggests that while many were a class of nouveau riche, who advanced themselves in the brief time they were in power, it was basically the former, 'respectable' business leaders who made up the bulk of the Jewish Councils. Somewhat surprisingly, rabbis and Jewish religious leaders were not as prominent in them as one might have suspected.

As for their political affiliation, some 73% of the Jewish police force were one type of Zionist or another, despite the rather small following such groups had had in pre-war Poland. The right-wing Zionist Revisionists comprised some 43% of the Ghetto police forces, backed by their own para-military Betar youth organization. The General Zionists made up some 30% of the Ghetto police while Labour Zionists comprised about 16%. Non-Zionists accounted for the remaining 12% of the total (Trunk, 1972: 490/491). The central role of the Revisionist Zionists in the police force may have been due to the fact that many of them had previously been soldiers in the Polish army. In short, despite the relatively small backing which Zionist parties had in prewar Poland, during the ghettoization the Zionist parties came to the fore and took over the direction of the Jewish communities.

The Judenrate (Jewish Councils) were empowered to recruit and deputize as many Jewish police as they needed to carry out their tasks. Their task was to suppress any Jewish resistance, to ensure that forced laborers were delivered to their jobs, to enforce whatever regulations might be made - such as curfews and assorted restrictions - to suppress smuggling and to collect taxes paid to the Jewish Councils. In many cases these Jewish police helped round up and deliver Jews scheduled for 'resettlement' to the trains which carried them to the death camps (Trunk, 1972: 445,477). In the Lodz ghetto, the Jewish police were utilized to quell any resistance to the Rumkowski administration which ran the show there. They usually ran the distribution of food rations as well (Trunk, 1972: 480, 482). The ghetto police forces carried out punishments of those found breaking one or another of the Jewish Council's rules, including administering the death penalty (Trunk, 1972: 483). They took hostages from families whose members had refused to work as forced labour, they dragged those who refused to pay Ghetto taxes out to work on the streets, they confiscated property and they maltreated people - in sort they acted like the Vichy police and the Milice in occupied France.

Consider the role of the Jewish Ghetto police in rounding up Jews for transportation to what were by then known to be death camps. The Jewish Council leaders in Warsaw and in other Ghettos supported such actions because they felt it was preferable to have Jews carry out the deportations since they would be 'less brutal' and the task could be 'done with greater sympathy' (Trunk, 1972: 507, 508).

A Yiddish underground newspaper in Warsaw, Oyf der Vakh (On Watch) wrote on September 20, 1942, "The Police became mentally conditioned to doing this dirty work and, therefore preformed it with perfection. People are torturing themselves now, puzzling over how it was possible for Jews, the majority of whom came from the intelligentsia, to drag out children, women, elderly people, and sick ones, knowing well that they were being taken for slaughter" (Trunk, 1972: 510).

The utilization of Jewish workers for forced labor was outside the control of the Jewish Councils. Such events flowed from Nazi decisions. But it is Trunk's view
that in cooperating with the Nazis as fully as they did, the Jewish Councils and their policemen facilitated their own people's destruction. Although Trunk does not say it in so many words, his evidence documents that they were the worst kind of Quisling collaborators.

How was it that so many Jewish collaborators could be found so easily? Fear is a central reason. There was the hope that by gaining some role in the administration of the Ghetto communities the leaders and their families would somehow be spared the fate of the others. Suggestions that that might be the case was probably fostered by the German coordinators but the simple, self-generated hopes among Jewish leaders accounted for their total cooperation.

Secondly, the benefits in their short-term power over the lives of others and the short term material returns earned by Jewish policemen and Ghetto leaders were a corrupting influence. It was generally held that Jewish policemen were utterly corrupt and took bribes large and small from smugglers attempting to get food into the Ghetto. The police and the Ghetto leadership had wide-ranging powers of life and death which none of them had held before. They could and did beat people for a wide range of offenses and delivered Jews to the Gestapo for interrogation and execution. Both the police and the Ghetto leadership regularly took bribes to determine who would not be deported to the death camps first.

For a brief few years these Jewish police and the members of the Jewish Councils literally decided who lived and who died. As short lived and as limited as that power was, it was enough to corrupt many of them into feelings of immense self-importance. This is hardly a uniquely Jewish response to such situations and was demonstrated again and again among virtually every people who fell under Nazi occupation. Some refused the perks and satisfactions permitted by their positions, most did not. The Ghetto police were generally seen as traitors to the Jewish people. Some of them became Kapos (bosses) in the concentration camps. Needless to say, the Jewish Ghetto police and the Jewish Councils were generally opposed to any consideration of Jewish resistance and turned in those who supported such a policy to the Nazis. They established watchmen over the boundaries of the Ghettos so that none should escape at night (Trunk, 1972: 460-461). Sometimes they even published denunciations of those who had escaped and thereby had incurred the collective punishment of those who remained. In other cases they pursued those supporting Jewish partizans with the vigor and hostility of the Nazis themselves (Trunk, 1972: 458-460). It was generally members of the Left-Zionist parties, the Communists and the Bund who supported partizan resistance while the General and Revisionist Zionists opposed it (Trunk, 1972: 463).

In the case of the Warsaw Ghetto uprising, the most famous of many, it was only after the great majority of the Jewish residents had already been shipped off to death camps that the rising took place. Those who participated knew that they were doomed to defeat. However they wanted to make the statement that Jews had resisted. It was initially scheduled to take place in January of 1943 but virtually no arms were available. It broke out on April 15, 1943 and after desperate fighting was suppressed by rather small German-Ukrarian forces who used the operation as a training exercise. The Warsaw Ghetto was totally destroyed and those remaining in it were deported to death camps. The only ones who survived were those who fled the Ghetto and joined up with partizans in the countryside - not many.
Following the end of World War 2 'Courts of Honor' were established by the western allies allowing Jews to try those who were believed to be criminal traitors to their people, especially Council members and members of Jewish police forces. These courts ruled out any defense based upon superior orders, and held that Jews who objected to them could have left their positions. This Jewish court had basically two punishments: (1) a ban on the convicted individual from holding any position within the Jewish community for a specified length of time and a refusal to aid that individual in any way, and (2) a sentence of death (Trunk, 1972: 550-554).

The number of cases which came before this 'Court of Honor' were limited because either those who were open to accusation made themselves scarce or because they had previously been killed by those they had betrayed and persecuted. The trials mainly took place in 1948 and 1949, in Munich, Paris and Rome. In only a handful of cases was a death sentence delivered and all these seem to have been reversed on appeal. The overwhelming majority of those convicted were sentenced to a various span of time, usually ten years, when they were banned from participating in the Jewish community in any way. Such findings were broadly circulated to the international Jewish press and agencies.

Similar trials were held for Jewish collaborators in Israel between 1951 and 1964, although apparently none of the Ghetto police brought to trial in Israel were ever convicted, or if convicted had their convictions quashed by a superior court.

Trunk, like other scholars dealing with the Jewish Holocaust, is faced with the question of why there wasn't greater Jewish resistance or at least a greater attempt to flee. What he suggests is hardly unique but is largely persuasive. First of all (1) the policy of Jewish extermination was unique in contemporary European history - people simply could not believe what was happening to them, even as it was happening. Moreover (2) the Nazi leadership did not bruit about their policy openly; it was hidden even from the German people and the extermination policy was surrounded by claims of simply shipping Jews off to resettlement elsewhere. The process also happened fairly quickly, mainly over the course of two to three years and within a much briefer span of time for specific Jewish populations. It was attended with so many other dislocations and changes in peoples lives that it was difficult for them to focus on what may have been happening to Jews.

Trunk also suggests a special Jewish component to their disbelief in what was happening; (3) a certain millennial belief in the traditional culture of Orthodox and like-minded Jews in Eastern Europe. Trunk holds that many traditionalists simply would not believe that their God would permit a Holocaust to happen. They were, in a sense, awaiting a miraculous salvation until they were within the concentration camps themselves, and then it was too late.

There was also the question of what they might do and where they might go if they realized that death awaited them and their families if they did nothing. (4) It seemed that they were surrounded by a generally hostile population, who would turn them in to the Nazis if they did flee the Ghettos. This was true only in part and many non Jewish Poles sheltered Jews during the course of the war. (5) Those Jews, fairly large numbers, working for German war industries, did not believe that they would be shipped off to concentration camps. They felt they had a better chance of surviving if they co-operated fully with the German authorities while they could. Moreover (6) the entire recent Jewish history seemingly argued against their participation in partisan struggle, for which they had very limited
resources. Because of age and physical condition, joining partizan units would have been applicable only to a relatively small percentage of the Jewish Ghetto population in any case. Moreover, only some Polish partizans, mainly those linked with the Communists, who had previously been anathema to observant Jews, were prepared to accept them. And lastly, there was the blind but rather noble unwillingness of Jews to strike out for their salvation on their own, to leave behind their mothers and fathers and brothers and sisters, even if it meant death for them to stay.

Underlying all of this there probably was a combination of disbelief, a shocked numbness, and a dehabilitating mental collapse into surviving from day to day. It is all too believable and understandable. However, despite the terror applied to families sheltering Jews, some 300,000 Jews were hidden throughout the course of the war by Poles.

Of the circa 3.5 million Jews who lived in Poland in 1939, something more than 300,000 emerged from hiding and continued living in Poland until the late 1960s. Possibly another 100,000 survived in the concentration camps to be liberated by the Red Army. Possibly 100-200,000 remained in the re-annexed Soviet territories of Poland. An unknown but relatively small number survived in fighting partizan units. So the total number of Polish Jews who died in the concentration camps seems to have been in the order of some 2.9 - 3 million persons, including those who died of old age and illness. These rough estimates constitute a very large proportion of the Holocaust dead in world war 2. If we add the Jewish dead in Hungary and the Soviet Union, they comprise roughly 80+% of those who died during that war.

*Three Accounts of Jews Under Other Fascist or Dictatorial Regimes, 1923-1945: 1. Hungary and Rumania  2. Vichy France  3. Italy*

**The Jews in Rumania and Hungary during World War 2**

The primary source and the citations noted here refer to Nicholas Nagy-Talavera's *The Green Shirts and the Others. A history of fascism in Hungary and Rumania* (1970) issued by the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace.

Nagy-Talavera was born in circa 1930 in Rumanian-annexed Transylvania, which before 1919 had been a part of Hungary. He is something of a Transylvanian nationalist. Nagy-Talavera remained in Rumania during world war 2 and therefore escaped the holocaust which swept through Hungary in the final stages of that conflict. He was incarcerated in a Soviet prison camp between 1949 and 1956, released and emigrated to Hungary, only to be caught up in the Hungarian revolt. He fled from there to America in the following year and then took his Ph.D. in history at the University of California, where he apparently taught Central European/Balkan history. Nagy-Talavera is a rather iconoclastic emigre, which makes accepting his account of Central Europe somewhat problematic. Nevertheless, he makes some valuable points.

As a historic background to Rumania from the beginning of the century to the mid 1940s Nagy-Talavera reminds of the following. "What lay behind the imposing facade (of Rumanian economic development) was exposed in the bloody peasant revolt of March 1907. Touched off by abuses by Jewish tenants [i.e. rent collectors] in Moldavia, disorders spread with lightening speed all over the country and widened into a great Jacquerie. The government panicked. There was talk of foreign intervention, but the minister of War, General A. Averescu, did not lose his head. He called in the military to quell the rebellion and did not hesitate
to use artillery to burn and destroy villages, and to kill an estimated 10,000 peasants. This spontaneous, desperate outburst of the peasant masses showed better than anything else the reality behind the trappings of the artificial westernized salons of Bucharest" (Nagy-Talavera, 1970:17).

This revolt had largely passed into history but is often described as an outburst of anti-semitism, since so many of the rent collectors and merchants in Rumania were Jewish. However, the event is more understandable as a peasant revolt against their exploiters. While a number of Jews did die in this Jacquerie they were only a small number compared to the Rumanian peasants who died in its suppression.

Following world war 1, Rumania seized the Transylvanian region after a successful invasion of Hungary. About a half of the population of Rumanian-annexed Transylvania remained Hungarian, both by derivation and in their loyalty. The 1920's and 1930's passed with a welter of disparate but increasingly reactionary forces in the country, culminating in a Royalist dictatorship in the late 1930s. The ruling clique focused around the king seems to have been utterly incompetent and had replaced any semblance of democratic government. The level of corruption in that society became proverbial. The vast majority of the Rumanian people had no say whatsoever over their own lives.

Rumanian Jews tended to predominate among merchants, money lenders and among the larger importers/exporters of the country. They comprised a large proportion of the petty traders but were also involved in contracting the lands of large estates and collecting rents from the Rumanian peasants actually farming them.

In 1940 Rumania, which had sided with France early in world war 2, was faced with the mobilization of some 400,000 Hungarian troops intent on bringing Transylvania back into Hungary. Rumanian King Carol, who had previously imposed a personal dictatorship over the country, fled and one Marshal Antonescu took power. The Jews of Transylvania had been strong supporters of Hungarian irredentism, believing that the Hungarian leader Horthy would oversee their liberation from anti-Semitic Rumanian rule.

"On September 6, 1940, the same day [King] Carol made his disgraceful exit with his retinue, the Hungarian army began its march into Transylvania amid the great rejoicing of the Hungarian and Jewish population and the proud tormented silence of the Rumanians. The first thing the Hungarians did was to undo the Rumanian agrarian reform and install a full-fledged neo-baroque [manorial] system" (Nagy-Talavera, 1970: 309).

Nagy-Talavera remembers being a child of ten, wildly waving the Hungarian flag which his parents had hidden for 22 years. He adds that "History plays strangely with her participants. In this case, the departure of Rumanians and the arrival of Hungarians meant death for most of the cheering Jews" (Nagy-Talavera, 1970: 309).

By late 1940, under General Ion Antonescu, Rumania legalized the Iron Guard (the Rumanian Fascists) which then launched a nation-wide assault on Jews. Despite the horrors involved, the overwhelming majority of Rumanian Jews survived this assault. The disorganized haphazardness of this attack, its arbitrariness, and the colossal corruption that attended it all proved to be mitigating factors.

The government under Gen. Antonescu began to restrict Jewish rights. "Under the [Iron] Guardist regime, except for the decrees that authorized the expropriation of Jewish-owned lands, there was little anti-Semitic legislation.
Jewish veterans of World War 1 were exempted from expropriation and the definition of Jews was more a religious than a racial one... But the persecution of the Jews during the Antonescu regime was by no means indiscriminate. Geographically, the dividing line that separated relatively decent Rumanian attitude from unmitigated horrors runs along the line that separates the Bessarabian and Buckovinan areas which were ceded by Rumania to the U.S.S.R. in June 1940. If the treatment of Jews in the Regat [the Rumanian heartland] and southern Transylvania was reasonable, the Jewish masses of the former Soviet areas went through a nightmare..." (Nagy-Talavera, 1970: 333).

Both Hungary and Rumania (along with others) joined Nazi Germany in its invasion of the Soviet Union in June 1941. Both sent some 250,000 to 300,000 men as an occupation force. At Stalingrad by the winter of 1942/43, the tide of battle turned and those allied with the German army were decimated and gradually driven out of the regions they had recently conquered.

Within Bessarabia even the poorer Jews were rarely as poverty-stricken or oppressed as the peasants they operated among (Nagy-Talavera, 1970: 287). "This was despite the 'proletarianizaton' of Jews in that region. After the initial Rumanian recapture of Bessarabia, the Jews were driven across the Dniester by the tens of thousands, put into camps... In the camps they were starved, tortured and shot to death" (Nagy-Talavera, 1970: 332). Possibly 100,000 Jews in Bessarabia and in the U.S.S.R. were killed by Rumanian forces or by civilian mobs.

However, back in the Rumanian heartland, Jews continued in their previous enterprises under new Rumanian 'managers'. "The Rumanian Jews were fated to survive; the 'Romanisation' process slowed down to a crawl in 1942, and often behind the appointed Rumanian manager it was the Jewish owner who conducted the business. Many Rumanian Jews grew rich during the war and they were able in 1944 to help Hungarian Jews who escaped to Rumania before the much more consistent and much more ruthless Hungarian variant of the Final Solution" (Nagy-Talavera, 1970: 335).

More than that, at least some Rumanian Jews served in the Rumanian army in its invasion of the Soviet Union.

Apart from the pogroms that marked the initial months of the Anonescu government, and despite large scale killings of Jews in Bessarabia, the Rumanian government resisted all attempts to carry out the liquidation of Jews living within Rumania proper. The result was that the great majority of Jews living within the confines of that country survived to witness the collapse of the Antonescu regime when Soviet forces entered Rumania in mid 1944. Some 400,000 Rumanian Jews survived within that country but only a minority of those who lived in the regions acquired by Hungary. The great majority of Rumanian Jews emigrated to Israel some 25 years after World War II.

**In Hungary**

Hungary throughout the 1920s and 1930s was dominated by one of the most oppressive and reactionary regimes in Europe. The Rumanian army had crushed a Communist regime established at the end of World War 1 and a new Hungarian regime was led by one Admiral Horthy. Hungary reestablished an 18th century manorial regime with essentially bound peasant labor on the large estates. Throughout the early 1920s the nation was kept in a state of terror by assorted police and volunteer units searching out and killing anyone suspected of leftist sympathies. From its inception the Hungarian regime was known as one of the most bloody on the continent.
Apart from those who had previously supported the left, this state of affairs apparently did not overly trouble the majority of the Hungarian Jewish population. A great many had been and continued to be vehement Hungarian nationalists. A Social Democratic party was allowed a limited degree of leeway (but only within the cities) and it thoroughly collaborated with the Horthy regime.

In the countryside, of the 4.5 million people there over 3 million were landless laborers and many of the rest owned minifundia which did not alone sustain them. The great bulk of the land was in the hands of the 100,000 member 'Hungarian Nation', the gentry. Hungarian peasants and laborers, both old to young, could be and were beaten by their masters and supervisors on any pretext. Their women were frequently raped by their overseers. During the 1930's an average agricultural laborer's family had 5 cents per day per family member to eat and clothe himself and heat his dwelling with (Nagy-Talavera, 1970: 60, 80).

"Disciplinary measures in the village were entrusted to the Royal Hungarian Gendarmerie, which became the Praetorian Guard of the neo-baroque regime. They were recruited from peasants who, like the Janissaries, repressed their own kind with a brutality that one German SS man described contemptuously as 'Asiatic'. Together with the Royal Hungarian Gendarmerie's brutality went an iron discipline, efficiency and incorruptibility; like the Janissaries they obeyed every order without question or remorse." But by the late 1930's this institution slipped out of the hands of the Horthy regime; its officer corps became thoroughly filled with fascists. As an instrument of fascism it committed unspeakable crimes against tens of thousands of innocent citizens" (Nagy-Talavera, 1970: 61).

The circa 800,000 Jews in Hungary in 1920 constituted only a negligible proportion of the working class or agricultural labor. But their proportion in the bourgeoisie and professional groups was extremely high (Nagy-Talavera, 1970: 61).

**Percentage of following sectors who were Jewish in circa 1930** (Nagy-Talavera, 1970:40-41)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural laborers</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holders of dwarf-sized plots</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miners</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All types of 'industrial' workers</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport workers</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic servants</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army officers</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mine owners and operators</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrialists and owner-operators</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce and shop keeping</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and banking</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyers</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physicians</td>
<td>59.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the land, Hungarian Jews constituted some 16.5% of the 727 owners of properties over 1,000 hectares, and 57% of the persons renting large properties. Two major professions in Hungary (doctoring and lawyering) were totally dominated by Jews. As for banking, some 80% of Hungarian financing was Jewish, as were 48% of salaried bank employees (Nagy-Talavera, 1970: 41). Commerce and shop keeping was more than one half Jewish. But only approximately 10% of
the Jewish population worked in industry or in any other jobs involving physical labour. The old stereotype of Jews running the businesses and banks of a country apparently did have a certain validity in Hungary.

Hungary reoccupied Transylvania in 1940 and supported Germany's invasion of the Soviet Union in 1941. Apparently Hungarian Jews were largely excluded from the army by then so, unlike those in Rumania, they did not participate in those military campaigns. During this period, despite growing anti-Semitism and certain government restrictions, Hungarian Jews continued to live under the protection of Horthy's manorial regime. In late 1944, with Soviet armies approaching Hungary, a coup by the militantly fascist forces took place. It was composed of the reactionary elements which had largely ruled the nation for a quarter century.

"The Arrow Cross followers and Szalasi, those whom Horthy called 'the scum and the nitwit who leads them on,' were but the by-product and the yard stick of the Hungarian ruling class ... a failure to cope with the challenges of the 20th century. The Hungarian Nation [i.e. the ruling class] not only abdicated its responsibility to carry out reform, it also murdered, imprisoned, exiled or effectively cowed into silence those who could have offered a constructive alternative to its class-oriented rule. The common Hungarian people were not 'scum'. Szalasi and the Arrow Cross personified and gave voice to their despair" (Nagy-Talavera, 1970: 242/243).

Nagy-Talavera insists that there were some 825,000 Jews living within the boundaries of expanded Hungary in 1941 and that only some 255,000 survived the deportations and genocide which began with the overthrow of the Horthy regime. He claims that some 570,00 Hungarian Jews died within some three months at the end of 1944. This is a remarkable and almost unbelievable figure. He holds that the Arrow-Cross party, which had taken power, along with the cooperation of the Royal Hungarian Gendarmerie and Hungarian government officials, together were responsible for the rounding up and deportation of Hungarian Jews.

He notes that if the Hungarians had refused the German demands regarding the Jews with an "iron consistence", there was nothing the Germans could have done about it on their own. In 1944 there was no way that German forces could have marked, concentrated and deported a million people. They did so within three months only with the enthusiastic help of the Hungarian police and authorities. Eichmann had only a small staff; such speed and smooth work was only possible with the full help of the Hungarian government (Nagy-Talavera, 1970: 243).

What Nagy-Talavera does not mention is that this liquidation took place with the full cooperation of the established Jewish leadership in Hungary at the time. One Rudolf Kastner, then the head of the national Jewish organization, and his fellow 'leaders' assured Hungarian Jews that deportation was really part of a resettlement scheme. The majority of Jews apparently still believed this as late as late 1944. For this service Kastner and about a thousand other Hungarian Jews and their families were given exit visas to Switzerland. For the price of their own survival they facilitated the removal of the bulk of the Hungarian Jewish population to concentration camps and their ultimate death.

So, what can we make of all this? Both Rumania and Hungary were bloody and brutal police states which murdered and oppressed large sections of their own population in the years following world war 1. Neither Elie Wiesel nor many other Jews of those two nations were especially concerned with the overwhelming class oppression - until they themselves became the targets of attack. As elsewhere,
they had consistently failed to make any alliances with others. When that attack came it was too late to do anything.

Despite Rumania's long history of anti-Semitism and despite the pogroms carried out by fascist elements in that society, it proved to be the more supportive of its Jewish citizens. Hungary on the other hand, despite its long history of Jewish participation in sectors of that society and despite Jewish support of Hungarian nationalism, ultimately proved to be far more murderous than its backward neighbour. The speed with which the genocide took place in Hungary is also partly attributable to the collaborative role played by the top Jewish leadership there. While it may be true that the genocidal policies of the Nazi leadership underlay all this killing, it is also true that such policies could not have been implemented without the active support of some Jewish leaders and critical elements in the societies involved.

**Vichy France and the Jews**

Excerpts and page citations are taken from Michael R. Marrus and Robert O. Paxton 'Vichy France and the Jews', 1981, University of Toronto Press.

Throughout the later part of the 19th century France had had relatively few immigrants. But following world war 1, in which France lost 1.4 million killed and a larger number permanently crippled, it tried to make good its losses by encouraging immigration. By 1931 some 3 million immigrants were living in France, some 7% of the overall population. This was a figure higher than any other country in Europe. There was then a fear of immigrants taking French jobs and swamping French culture. There were as well 720,000 Italians and possibly 55,000 Jewish refugees in France during 1939 (Marrus and Paxton, 1981: 39).

In late 1938 a mass of 400,000 fleeing Spanish loyalist civilians and soldiers crossed into France. The French government panicked and tried to get Franco to accept the return of the refugees without reprisals. These refugees and French government policies were excoriated by right-wing French deputies. The French government had little answer to this new wave of immigration and soon placed most of the Spanish refugees in a series of newly built 'internment' camps. The camps were extremely crowded, shoddily built and cold; the food verged on starvation rations. Illness broke out which killed many internees, while the French guards were notably hostile to them (Marrus and P., 1981: 69). There were some 30 camps in the southern zone and 15 more camps in the northern one. In early September of 1939 German-Jewish refugees were seized by the French police and placed in a number of these internment camps, especially one at Gurs, to which Hannah Arendt was sent (Marrus and Paxton, 1981:172). In September of 1940 these camps housed some 68,500 foreigners interned in France, of whom some circa 50,000 were Jews (Marrus and Paxton, 1981:165).

These concentration/internment camps were not established by the Vichy government but had been inherited from the last 'democratic' French government.

With the military collapse of France in the spring of 1940, a collaborationist government was established, mainly from still serving members of their Parliament, under the leadership of Marshall Petain. Although this regime was very authoritarian and clerical it seemingly had the support of the majority of the French population initially. A purge and repression of the French left rapidly unfolded.

When did the Vichy regime know that a policy of Jewish extermination had been arrived at? The Jewish Agency and the World Jewish Congress were already
disseminating such claims in late 1941, but most observers and diplomats believed such claims were mainly local excesses mixed with Jewish hysteria until late 1942.

The reluctance of Jews themselves to believe these reports is understandable. "Not until 23 November 1942, after the arrival in Palestine of a group of women and children from Poland who confirmed the reports about Treblinka and Sobidor, did the Jewish Agency in Palestine feel certain enough to release a major public statement about the extent of the mass murders. Even then it was hard to believe that these stories were not exaggerations of wartime propaganda ... For instance, Leon Blum [a Jewish former Premier] emerged from Buchenwald unaware of the gas chambers. George Wellers, a Jew who had been arrested with a thousand Jewish leaders in December 1941, had left Drancy [a prison camp in France] on 30 June 1944 without having the slightest idea about the real meaning of the deportation of the Jews" (Marrus and Paxton, 1981: 349).

"As late as April 1944, two Slovakian Jews who had escaped from Auschwitz created a sensation with their accounts of what they had seen. All along the line, beginning with the Judenrat in Bratislava, [Jewish] authorities hesitated to give them full credence, and only in July [1944] did the Nazi policies become clear (Marrus and Paxton, 1981: 349-350).

"On reflection, it is naive to select retroactively - out of the myriad conflicting signals of wartime news, rumor, and propaganda - those reports that conform to the truth finally established upon the opening of the camps in May 1945, and to declare that once these reports had arrived in the West every one of good faith 'knew'. Most of us, however, 'know' only information that accords with prior expectation and patterns of intelligibility" (Marrus and Paxton, 1981: 350).

For one thing, the Nazis did their best to hide, from all but a few administrators and security officials and camp guards, the murder of millions of Jews. Even for collaborationist officials the extermination of the Jewish population did not seem to be a realistic concern, given the need for labor. The use of code words and the description of 'resettlement policies' seem to have fooled most observers, including a majority of the Jews themselves, until they finally arrived at the gates of the death camps (Marrus and Paxton, 1981: 351).

The three North Africa states under French colonial rule -Morocco, Algeria, and Tunisia - contained roughly 293,000 Jews, mainly Sephardic and long established in those regions. They earned a living from artisan trades and petty trading, as did many of the urban Arab population.

There had been anti-semitic sentiments among the French colons in North Africa since the 1890s, which broke out recurrently during the 1930s. "The advent of Vichy removed all barriers to this excess and their [the Jews] French citizenship was almost immediately removed" (Marrus and Paxton, 1981: 193).

A host of restrictions and wide ranging exclusions were implemented by Vichy authorities and local governments in Algeria between 1940 and 1943. But "Moslems continued to abstain from the anti-Jewish campaign. Although anti-Jewish measures in North Africa have sometimes been explained as a French concession to Moslem pressures, the educated Moslem elite, leaning toward the Resistance, seem to have supported the Jews" (Marrus and Paxton, 1981: 194). However 13 years later, during an even more horrendous campaign of torture and killing during the Algerian war of independence, the Algerian Jews generally sided with the French colons. This struggle ultimately took the lives of 500-750,000 Algerians. Israel's Mossad was active in helping the French fascists in Algeria.
Returning to 1941-42: possibly some 60,000 Jews had already died in Poland by the end of 1941. The invasion of the Soviet Union in June of 1941 set in motion a great increase in the scale of killing. On Jan. 20, 1942 the Wansee Conference was held among Nazi leaders in Berlin and an alleged policy of mass extermination of Jews set into motion. (Although from verbatim transcripts of this meeting, despite docudramas to the contrary, it is not at all clear that this was in fact the case. It is strange that Nazi leaders talking amongst themselves would have been so secretive.)

The initial roundup of French Jews for internment in French camps began in July of 1943. The Vichy regime then had about 100,000 police and paramilitary police under its orders and these were used, in part, to round up Jews for the transports. At no time was there any refusal by police to follow their orders.

There was revulsion on the part of many French people about the deportment of Jews and this may have opened doors for those trying to hide. But "What was happening to the Jews was still muffled to some degree, by the simultaneous arrest and deportation in late 1943 and early 1944 of hundreds of prominent Frenchmen and women, along with the continued deportation of thousands of young men to work in German factories" (Marrus and Paxton, 1981: 331).

If one wanted to worry, there were then still 500,000 French soldiers in prisoner of war camps in Germany.

There seems to have been some Zionists in French internment camps collaborating with the Vichy authorities for whatever power it temporarily gave them. For instance one Kadmi Cohen, born in Poland but raised in Palestine, fought in the French army in world war 1 as a foreign volunteer and was given French citizenship. He was interned in one of the Vichy camps in 1942 and founded a movement called Masada and tried to get the support of the Vichy regime for the establishment of a Zionist state in Palestine. He proclaimed himself a follower of Vladimir Jabotinsky, leader of the Zionist Revisionists. Cohen was bitterly hostile to the 'degenerate slackness and democracy of Jews' in western countries. "Cohen wanted, in return for his cooperation with the Vichy government, a cessation of deportations and an official position as special assistant to the French government for Jewish national affairs. Also a system of I.D. cards whereby his followers would not be subject to arrest" (Marrus and Paxton, 1981:313). He was sent to Auschwitz in March of 1944.

The subsequent horrors of the Final Solution have tended to obscure the autonomous French anti-Jewish project of 1940-1942. The measure of the first two years of this undertaking had catastrophic effects upon the Jews of France, allegedly snapping the material links that bound Jews to French society. Vichy confiscated their property through 'aryanization', dismissed them from governmental service, excluded them from professions and higher education. "Thousands of productive French Jews were thus turned into refugees, who swelled the ranks of those already uprooted by other states, and who offered self-fulfilling validation of the popular animus against 'parasites' ... The first two years of Vichy made it hard to see victims rather than problems."

"When the Germans began their systematic deportation and extermination of Jews in 1942, Vichy's rival anti-semitism offered them more substantial help than they received anywhere else in western Europe, even more than they obtained from such allies as Hungary and Rumania" (Marrus and Paxton 1981; 269).

This sounds like an overstatement of their case, especially when compared to Hungary, but chalk it up to expository excess.
The internment and deportation of Jews from 1940 to 1942, was a complex mixture of policies. "The first to feel the assault and internment were 'foreign' or 'refugee' Jews who had entered the country in the previous decade. They were without contacts in 'host' countries. Native and assimilated Jews, especially if they had 'contacts', were usually able to remain despite the increasingly harsh laws. But ultimately, no matter how important they were, those who did not go underground were deported unless they disappeared into the population with help of anti-government individuals and forces.

"Throughout Europe, the Germans [not 'the Nazis'] preferred conservative and nationalist leaders to fascist adventurers. The Nazis knew that the satellite fascists would further drain the Reich's resources by plunging their own countries into chaos, civil war, and expansionism," "Given the shortages of German manpower in the west, without the exertions of the French police and administration, the Germans would have had to withdraw substantial forces from military uses in order to have sent an equivalent number of Jews east by themselves" (Marrus & Paxton, 1981: 370-371).

According to Marrus and Paxton no one and no organization in France, other than personal friends, aided the Jews in their attempts to escape or go underground. None of the political parties allegedly did. Nor did the famed resistance among the French railway workers impede the trains carrying Jewish deportees to Germany. Somehow I doubt these claims, especially since they are in keeping with the claims of current Jewish chauvinists. It completely dismisses the hundreds of thousands of French persons forced to work in German industry, the hundreds of thousands kept in P.O.W. camps during the war and the hundreds of thousands killed in allied bombing during that war. Despite what these two authors believe, French Jews had no special claim on the support of others who were themselves struggling to survive.

The few Jews who went underground to join the resistance did receive what support those organizations could offer. But most Jews did not make that choice.

In France, as elsewhere, money and status, plus being assimilated into the broader society, spelled survival.

**Mussolini and the Jews**

Excerpts and page citations taken from Meir Michaelis, *Mussolini and the Jews. German-Italian relations and the Jewish question in Italy, 1922-1945*, 1978, Institute of Jewish Affairs. Michaelis provides a rather long quote from a fascist writer near the beginning of his book which he holds partly summarizes the interwar period. He begins his book with the following:

"Luigi Villari, son of a noted historian and the leading Fascist propagandist in the Anglo-Saxon countries until 1940, thought that the virtual non-existence of a Jewish problem in modern Italy was primarily due to the numerical insignificance of Italian Jewry and to the absence of a Jewish proletariat."

"Out of a total population of 42,000,000, only one per thousand are Jews. The immense majority of them are of the Sephardic branch exiled from Spain at the time of the Reyes Catholicos, or later immigrants from the Levant who are themselves of Spanish origin. Very few of the Italian Jews were poor, and there were not those seething masses of Jewish proletarians which elsewhere cause so much trouble of a social and economic nature. Above all, the Italian Jews have for the most part been resident in the country for many generations, and even if they retain their old religion - to which indeed many of them are deeply attached -
they have been completely absorbed into the body of the nation and regard themselves and are regarded by their neighbors as thorough Italians. Jews played an honorable part in the Risorgimento and the number of Jews who fought and died for their country in the world war are considerable, as may be seen from the rolls of honor in the various synagogues" (Michaelis, 1978: 5).

"In politics it was not a handicap to be a Jew. Italy had had one Jewish Prime minister [Luigi Luzzati] ... and another Sidney Sonnino, who although a Christian by religion, was the son of a Jewish father. Many other Jews have held ministerial rank; one, General Ottolenghi [circa 1903], was Minister of War and today, in the Fascist Government, the Minister of Finance, Guido Lungi, is of Jewish origin, while many other Jews hold high positions in the public service" (Michaelis 1978: 5).

At the outbreak of world war 1, Mussolini had been a left wing socialist and internationalist completely opposed to the war and to the state that supported it. With Italy's entry into that war he shifted to the far right. In 1919 Mussolini ranted about German militarism and of a Jewish-Bolshevik conspiracy against Italy and wrote an article to this effect. "The article - a rehash of all the anti-Semitic fables then current was bound to provide a reaction from the numerous Jews in Mussolini's entourage who, while supporting Fascism in its struggle against Bolshevism, were not prepared to be themselves the target of anti-Bolshevik propaganda" (Michaelis, 1978: 13).

"Various Jews took part in the conversion of the future Duce to interventionism (in world war 1) and nationalism (G. Pontremoli, E. Jarach, E. Jona, C. Sarfatti). There were also five Jews among the founders of the Fighting Fasci (fasci di combattimento) on March 23, 1919, and another three (Gino Bolaffi, Bruno Modolfo. and Dulio Sinigaglia) went down in history as so-called martiri fascisti (fascist martyrs), having fallen in the Fascist cause before the March on Rome" (Michaelis, 1978: 10/11).

The intervention of Jewish spokespersons appears to have had the desired effect, for in the following year the Duce publicly ate his own words: "Bolshevism is not, as people believe, a Jewish phenomenon. The truth is that Bolshevism is leading to the utter ruin of the Jews of Eastern Europe." This was followed with praise of the Jewish membership in the Italian army during world war 1.

On coming to power in October 1922: "Not content with giving assurances to the Italian Jews, Mussolini also took steps to improve relations with the heads of international Jewry. On 20 December, 1922 - less than two months after the March on Rome - he received a Zionist delegation composed of Dante Lattes [to whom Michaelis' book is dedicated], Angelo Saciarddoti and Moshe Beilkinson in order to discuss the possibility of a modus vivendi between Zionism and Fascism. He began by explaining to his interlocutors the reasons for his coolness towards the Jewish National Home [which he held] was a tool of British imperialism."

They countered by saying that Italian Zionists were as loyal as any other Italian and that Italy stood to gain from a Jewish Palestine, whereupon Mussolini agreed to discuss the matter with Chaim Weizman, the head of the World Zionist Organization.

Michaelis holds that Mussolini understood that there was no basis for anti-Semitism in Italy but he was opposed to the participation of Italian Jews in the Zionist movement. He overestimated the role which Jews played in international banking but whatever his private feelings, there was little external anti-Semitism in Italy until the late 1930's.
Mussolini attacked the Jewish bankers in Europe and America - the Mendelsohn's, Rothchild's, Schiff's, Wartburg's - and called them the 'Jewish-American bank. "Mussolini might have added that at least one of those German-Jewish bankers in America - Otto Kahn - was notoriously an ardent admirer of his, so much so that until 1938 the Fascist press chose to ignore his Jewish origins, describing him as a 'great American, rather than as an 'international Jew' (Michaelis, 1978: 33).

In 1930 Starhemberg, the leader of the Austrian Heimwehr (a right-wing militia), informed Mussolini that his organization accepted patriotic Jews as members. Mussolini expressed approval, noting that anti-Semitism as preached by the Nazis was 'unworthy of a European nation' (Michaelis, 1978: 35).

By 1932 even non-Fascist Zionists had become convinced of Mussolini's goodwill, and the Italian Zionist Federation was given freedom of action. In that year Mussolini appointed a Jew, Guido Jung, as his Minister of Finance, and there continued to be Jewish generals, officers, university professors, teachers, civil servants, and bankers active in Italy.

Italian Jews expatiated on the radical difference between 'True Fascists,' as represented by Mussolini, and the degenerate German variety. "... on 27 of October [1932], Israel [a Zionist weekly], in an editorial devoted to the tenth anniversary of the March on Rome, emphasized the 'radical difference between true and authentic Fascism - Italian Fascism - and the pseudo Fascist movements in other countries, and especially the unbridled hatred of the Jews as a means of diverting the masses from their real problems, from the real causes of their misery, and from the real culprits' (Michaelis, 1978: 29).

Between 1922 and 1934 "It is worth recalling in this connection that under [Italian] Fascism the number of Jewish university teachers continued to be disproportionately high, and so did the number of Jewish generals and admirals (See E. Ross, 140 Marshals, Generals and Admirals, 1936). Nor was the Fascist Party by any means Judenrein [free of Jews]. Guido Jung, a Jew, on being appointed Minister of Finance, became an ex officio member of the Fascist Grand Council. Alberto Liuzzi, a baptized Jew, attained the rank of consul general in the Fascist militia. Margherita Sarfatti was the Duce's first official biographer as well as co-editor of his monthly review, Gerarchia, for which only trusted fascists were permitted to write. She also was Mussolini's long time mistress. Gino Arias was the chief political theorist of the Stato Corporativo and a regular contributor to both Gerarchia and Il Popolo d'Italia. Giorgio Del Vecchio was the first fascist Rector of the University of Rome" (Michaelis, 1978: 52). These were all Italian Jews and supporters of Italian Fascism.

Between October 30, 1930 and September 1931 a series of fiscal laws were promulgated which established a central taxing authority which established 26 Jewish communities in Italy, membership in which was compulsory for practising Jews, which were to be run by the traditional leadership, which had a separate tax base and were responsible for the social and cultural needs of Italy's Jews. It was a modern sort of Ghetto system. "Even so, it won praise from Jewish leaders who rightly saw it as a significant expansion of their own power" (Michaelis, 1978: 54).

"In his attempt to win popularity in the West, the Duce made use of his loyal Jewish subjects. In October 1933, Sacerdoti [the Chief rabbi of Rome], in an interview with Henri de Kerillis, solemnly asserted that anti-Semitism was so foreign to Mussolini as to be beyond his comprehension" (Michaelis, 1978: 72). On the eve of Italy's war with Ethiopia, Mussolini said "Whatever the foes of fascism say... Neither I nor any other exponent of the regime has ever expressed
anti-Jewish views. In these great days of the Italian nation I declare that Italian and Jewish ideals are fully merged into one" (Michaelis, 1978: 83).

Despite the 14 year long oppression of the Italian working class and peasantry by Fascism, the wars of conquest against Libya and Ethiopia, and the sending of some 50,000 Italians troops to aid Franco in the Spanish civil war, all that Michaelis is concerned with is the position of Jews within Fascist Italy; whether they are being given a fair chance to participate in that regime.

Finally, in 1936, one Gaetano Pistillo, a Fascist spokesman, proclaimed Italy’s support for the Arab liberation movement in its struggle against British colonialism and Jewish settlement in Palestine. By 1936, "Hence, while abandoning his [Mussolini's] self appointed role as the patron of persecuted foreign Jews, he continued to reject Hitler's racial theories and to deny the existence of a Jewish question in Italy. Relations between the Fascist authorities and the Union of Italian Jewish Communities remained cordial and with the annexation of Ethiopia this cordiality was extended to the Falasha Jews" (Michaelis, 1978:100). The Falasha were given the status of a distinct community in Ethiopia under an Italian decree of September 1936.

Fascist representatives attempted to get Chaim Weizmann to intervene with the British government to lift an embargo on Italian trade imposed during the invasion of Ethiopia but were politely put off by Weizmann.

"Undeterred by these rebuffs, Il Duce and his advisors persisted in their attempts to harness Zionism to the Fascist chariot. At the end of 1935 they charged Corrado Tedeschi [a Jewish Fascist who wrote for Mussolini’s newspaper Gerarchia ] with the task of winning over prominent liberal and right-wing Zionists in Palestine. He was to point out that Italy, unlike most other countries in the world, was free from the taint of anti-Semitism; that the Fascist regime was friendly toward the Jews in general and the Jewish National Home in particular; that the Falasha Jews in Ethiopia were going to be among the beneficiaries of Italy’s 'civilizing mission' in that country. Given Mussolini’s pro-Jewish record, the Zionist press had a moral duty to draw the attention of its public to the above facts at a moment when Fascist Italy was the target of so much slander and abuse" (Michaelis, 1978: 85/86).

Carrado Tedeschi, Mussolini’s fascist spokesman, visited Palestine in 1936 and was met by a delegation of Revisionist Zionists as well as by Itlamer Ben Avi, the editor of the Revisionist newspaper Doar Hayom which came out with a favorable pro-Italian article on Abyssinia. The Revisionists were ideologically in sympathy with the Italian Fascists although other Zionists made it clear that they preferred the British (Michaelis, 1978: 87).

"In his final report, Tedesi expressed agreement with the prevailing view that the Revisionists (who had received Italian support since 1934) were Italy's best friend in Palestine, given the affinity between the Revisionist and Fascist movements and their common aversion to Britain" (Michaelis, 1978: 87).

Italian Zionists congratulated themselves that there was nothing inherently anti-Semitic in Italian fascism, but they overlooked its imperialist and racist nature. In Ethiopia, Italy promulgated quite oppressive racist 'native laws' which instituted a kind of apartheid system there. This apparently did not bother Italian Jews or their overseas supporters. The only, or the central, question which they deemed worthy of asking was Was Italian Fascism fundamentally anti-Semitic? Everything else it did was forgivable and understandable if it was not.

Michaelis notes Mussolini’s dealing with Chancellor Dolfus in Austria, a protege, in his opposition to Hitler, and later with Austrian Chancellor Schuschnigg’s drift
toward anti-Semitism. He held that a modest degree of anti-semitism was acceptable but he also supported Jewish claims to Palestine, declaring himself a Zionist as well. That is what Mussolini said to Nahum Goldman, a prominent Zionist spokesperson. In 1934 he promised to help the Jews build a Jewish state there (Michaelis, 1978: 69).

"After 1929 the Italian anti-Fascists began to worry about the honeymoon between the Duce and the Jews. In September 1931 Carlo Sforza, the former Italian Foreign Minister, expressed the hope that the Jews would refuse to play the Fascist game, despite Mussolini’s repeated profession of philo-semitism... On the eve of the Ethiopian campaign [1935] the Jews of Italy were described by Gaetano Salvemini as 'even more servile and abject' then that of their Catholic compatriots. And as late as 1937 Giuseppe Antonio Borgese lashed out at the Jewish intellectuals who were betraying the cause of Italian liberty because the Fascist dictator had so far refrained from persecuting their co-religionists in Italy. If the Jews are allowed a decent or at least a bearable life in Rome or Vienna, why bother about Italy? 'We cannot refuse our gratitude to Mussolini', thus spake one of them" (Michaelis, 1978: 407).

However, in mid 1938 a law was passed removing Jews from public positions and established 'racial distinctions' among Italian citizens. Some 3,500 of the c. 15,000 Jewish families in Italy were excluded from these restrictions due to either their voluntary military service in world war 1 or their early membership in the Fascist party. Another 834 Jews were excluded from the new exclusionary laws due to their exceptional political, cultural and economic merits" (Michealis, 1978: 255/256).

Figures suggest that support for Fascism until the late 1930s was as high among Jews as that among Italians in general. This is probably comprehensible because of their middle class position. It does, however, indicate that many Italian Jews were involved in the militarism and expansionism of Fascist Italy - much more so than the Italian working class and peasantry who were far worse off than the Jews under Italian fascism.

In Michaelis' view, Italian Jews who were militaristic patriots are worthy of praise. Others might suggest that those Italians who deserved praise during that era were the Italian members of the Garibaldi battalion of the International Brigades, or those working people who stayed at home and tried to live an honorable life despite fascism.

By the late 1930's "Mussolini knew full well that an ideological alliance with Hitler would automatically bring them into conflict with the Jews all over the world, despite his tolerant attitude to the Jews of Italy. Moreover, what was he to do with the Jewish generals and admirals in the armed forces, with the Jewish university professors at the Italian universities, with the Jewish officials in the Italian administration and - most embarrassing of all - with the Jewish journalists in the fascist press and the Jewish functionaries in the fascist party, once he decided to march with Hitler to the end" (Michaelis, 1978: 130/131, also 146/149).

In August of 1938, Mussolini began issuing racialist laws in Italy. He proclaimed that measures against the Jewish race were a 'logical consequence' of the racial policy pursued by fascism. Laws were promulgated against Italian marriages with Hamitic (Negroid) and Semitic (Jewish) races (Michaelis, 1978: 171). However, there was a gap between the stated and the unstated policies. One Roberto Farinacci, the Ras (fascist administrator) of Cremona, was one of the more
openly anti-Semitic of the regime, but he also had a close confidante, a Jewish woman called Jole Foa, working with him until 1940.

Other cases of Jewish discrimination in the late 1930s were: "Giorgio Del Vecchio, an ardent fascist and for many years Rector of the University of Rome, was dismissed from his post in October 1938, along with ninety-six other Jewish university teachers" (Michaelis, 1978: 228). Up until that time they had been quite prepared to work with the Fascists.

One might be forgiven for thinking that in Michaelis view, it was German barbarism which imposed anti-Semitism on the previously acceptable Italian fascism.

Italy entered the war against France-England on June 20, 1940, with its invasion of southeastern France after the collapse of French military resistance. At this time the process of 'dejudaeanization' took place: Jewish bank accounts were blocked, most Jews were ousted from their jobs unless they were self employed, Jewish children were expelled from public schools. Jews had already been expelled from government service. They were expelled from the Fascist party and from the military. This meant the removal of 140 Jewish admirals, ships captains and generals. Some 1,600 Jewish refugees were interned and more than 1,000 Fascist party members were expelled because of their defence of Jews (Michaelis, 1978: 294).

Michaelis provides a panegyric on the support which the Italian army and diplomats gave to the Jews in occupied Greece. "The Italian consular authorities in the German zone gave the broadest possible interpretation to the term 'Italian subject'. The most remote kinship to an Italian citizen was considered a sufficient reason for a certificate of Italian nationality, and so was anyone with an Italian name" (Michaelis, 1978: 313). Jews living in Italian occupied areas continued to receive protection by the Italian state and army, escaping the harsher anti-Semitic acts perpetrated elsewhere (Michaelis, 1978: 303).

In February of 1943 the German Foreign Minister Von Ribbentrop began demanding drastic measures against Jews in Italian occupied regions of Europe and Mussolini dared not contradict him. "Immediately afterwards, however, he allowed himself to be persuaded by his underlings that Italy could not be a party to Germany's crimes against the Jews" (Michaelis, 1978: 331).

Mussolini was overthrown by the Italian army and King on July 25, 1943. He was imprisoned but freed by German commandos and left to lead a 'Social Republic' regime in northern Italy. At that time Italian partizan activity rapidly mounted but an allied Italian government had to flee Rome and find protection with the Allies in southern Italy. The round up of Roman Jews began on October 16, 1943 although many had gone underground in the Italian countryside. Rome was taken by American forces in June of 1944 but northern Italy remained under German occupation until April 1945.

It might be noted that of the 44,000 Jews in Italy at the outbreak of world war 2, some 7,500 died in the Holocaust. Many of these were recent refugees from elsewhere in Europe. However, during 1935-1937 in the Italian war against Ethiopia, possibly 400,000 Ethiopians died. This was a period when Zionist leaders were still doing their best to stay on the right side of Mussolini and did not oppose these actions.

In 430 pages of text, there is virtually no mention of the resistance of the Italian working class to fascism. The only mention is contained in the following passage. "Between 2,000 and 3,000 [Jews] joined the Italian Resistance, and seven of these were posthumously awarded the Gold Medal, the highest Italian
decoration of valor" (Michaelis, 1978: 388). The Jew who had previously won that Medal had been one Bruno Jesi, who had won it for military valor in the Italian expeditionary forces fighting for Franco in Spain.

It is part of Michaelis' theme that while Fascism was undemocratic and that it ill served the Jews who supported it, their support was understandable. There were many Jewish fascists during Mussolini's heyday. According to the author the persecution of Jews were specifically German, not Nazi crimes. Even the Horthy fascists of Hungary get a good press from Michaelis. They only oppressed and murdered Hungarians, and left Hungarian Jews in peace until the 'right-wing' Cross and Arrow party seized power in late 1944 (Michaelis, 1978: 332/333).

What was an unspeakable evil was German Nazism, which was not just fascist but anti-semitic. It murdered Jews and not just other people.

---

Chapter 3. Democratic War Crimes?

'The Valor and the Horror'

In January of 1992 the CBC aired a three part documentary entitled The Valor and the Horror, dealing in one section with Canada's bombing offensive against Germany during world war 2. It immediately raised the hackles of many world war 2 veterans and of home grown patriots. While it treated with the 'valor' of the Canadian bomber crews (of whom 4,500 were killed in action) which carried out the attacks, it also documented the horrendous deaths among the German civilian population in increasingly undefended cities. Possibly 800,000 German civilians lost their lives in air attacks, in addition to the hundreds of thousands of others severely wounded, some of whom died within a few years of their injuries. Some 100,000 deaths occurred in Berlin alone, mainly civilians, in the last two years of bombing. Another 45-50,000 died in three fire storm raids* on Hamburg in mid July 1943 while anywhere between 90,000-130,000 died in the final days of the war in the city of Dresden, a city crowded with fleeing refugees and without any war industries whatsoever. This compares to the 45,000 killed in German bombing raids in England throughout the entire course of the war and the very much smaller casualties in France, Belgium, Holland. and Poland.

* A fire storm occurs when incendiary bombs create such a large fire, usually in the heart of a city, that the in-draft sucks in humans and debris, as well as available oxygen, whereby either incinerating or suffocating the victims.

The American, British and Canadian bombing raids were seemingly not a part of any rational war strategy but were simply a means to kill as many Germans as possible, mainly working people (who had not supported the Nazis in the first place). The rationale given for bombing homes and tenements in the cities was that since the allies could not effectively target factories, rail lines, and military installations they would destroy the German morale by destroying Germans. They did this with increasing intensity, targeting virtually undefended cities with 1,000 plane raids utilizing carpet bombing techniques. That is, everything in a targeted area would be destroyed - factories, hospitals, homes, everything.

Although the CBC series played much to the 'valor' of the Canadian aircrews going out to face anti-aircraft fire to drop their bombs, they also made room for the voices of some German survivors of the bombing offensive. To all but the most hardened patriot it was shattering stuff. Women who reminisced that the streets
of their entire district were afire, a neighbours' young daughter trapped in the flames of the roadway screaming for help and the mother running out to save her, only to be lost in the flames. That was juxtaposed with the technical reflections of surviving Canadian pilots and bombardiers. Some of these had briefly returned to the German cities they had bombed, feeling totally indifferent to the deaths they had created. I believe that it was the first time in 47 years that these events had been portrayed in a balanced way in Canada.

Brian McKenna and his brother Terence McKenna had spent three years in researching, writing and overseeing the production of the script into the television series. Canadian veterans groups and their politicians immediately raised a storm of protest to denounce the series and its producers.

"Senator Jack Marshall, veterans groups and many former servicemen are furious over The Valor and the Horror.. Marshall, a Newfoundland Tory, demands that the film's producers and the CBC explain themselves before the Senate's veterans affairs committee, which has agreed to investigate the matter. 'The sort of hatred and vituperation in some of the letters we've gotten is breathtaking', [Brian McKenna] said. 'It doesn't reflect at all the unbelievably favorable reaction we've had from the ordinary people who watched these films.'

However, J.W. Jolleys, Dominion president of the Royal Canadian Legion, says in a letter to CBC president Gerard Veileux, 'The time has come for veterans to ask themselves how much more contempt they must endure from Canada's national broadcasting service.' Jolleys called the film a 'superficial and nasty little portrayal'. One Cliff Chadderton, head of the War Amputees of Canada, says that he has asked various historians their opinion of the film and they claim it has some extremely serious errors. 'The Bomber Command' segment suggests that Canadians were unwitting pawns in a campaign of premeditated massacre aimed at civilians. The Normandy program portrayed Canadian soldiers as poorly led cannon fodder" (Vancouver Sun, April 10/92).

It is true that the McKennas placed much of the guilt for the policies of mass murder on the head of Britain's Bomber Command, Sir Arthur 'Bomber Harris'. This was presumably to salvage Canadian pride in their war effort. It would have been more accurate to say that the role of Canadians was as knowing and enthusiastic pawns in those bombing raids. I suppose that is a treasonable thing to say about those who risked their lives in the defense of the imperial interests of their masters. It was allegedly a 'War of Democracy versus Dictatorship'; therefore all means of killing were legitimate.

In an article entitled 'Inferno' (Vancouver Sun, June 18/92) Bill Singleton relates the account of one Freeman Dyson, who was a coordinator of the fire storm raids on Hamburg and Dresden. He tells us that there were only two successful fire storm raids although many more were attempted. However, he berates himself for not then shouting to the British public what their air armadas were doing and that he had then only grieved in silence.

On June 24/92 the Vancouver Sun reports that the Senate hearing into The Valor and the Horror are about to start. Senator Jack Marshal, a Jewish world war 2 veteran, is heading the Senate Veterans Affairs sub-committee investigation into the McKenna brothers and the series which aired on CBC. Writers groups "say that the film is a victim of censorship and the Senate hearing constitutes a kangaroo court." Marshall replied that his filing cabinet is filled with protest letters about the series, which include complaints from 44 outraged veterans groups.
On July 2/92 a letter to the editor appears in the Vancouver Sun from one F.E.W. Smith who holds that without world war 2 there would be no free speech in the world, which is why we should suppress accounts like The Valor and the Horror. "Magna Carta, habeas corpus, English common law, the parliamentary system of government and democracy were not created by peaceniks but by fighting men." Hurrah!

The Globe and Mail of July 3/92 reports comments by one professor Bert Hall. He says, in part, "The immense sacrifice demanded of those who fought the war nurtures a strong desire to see wartime policies and policy makers as offering some justification for all the suffering. But matters don't always work out that way." Was Arthur Harris a killer or a hero? Neither, says Hall. "Instead, we might ask ourselves a different question. Do we honor or dishonor the thousands who died in the Second world war when we shield Arthur Harris from criticism behind the sacrifices of this men?"

The Vancouver Sun of November 3, 1992, reports that the chairman of the National Film Board supports the film series produced by the McKenna brothers, despite the howls of indignation of Canadian veterans organizations. Apparently, the CBC has rebroadcast The Valor and the Horror three times since it originally appeared.

On November 5/92, as the Senate investigating committee is drawing to a close, the Vancouver Sun reports that the Canadian Airforce Veterans demand a full apology from the CBC for its war documentary. They also demanded 2.5 million dollars from the CBC to produce their own account of the air war over Germany. "Men who bombed German cities from night skies attacked the program as a simplistic work that made it appear that their only accomplishment was to kill women and children ... Says bomber pilot Barr, "We couldn't see the moral high ground from 20,000 feet because it was covered with smoke, the smoke from the death camps." So they added their own mass murder to them?

On November 9/92 the Vancouver Sun reports the the CBC's own patriotic ombudsman, one Bill Morgan, attacked the Valor and the Horror and its two producers following testimony given at the Senate sub-committee on veterans affairs. He held that the account was riddled with errors and departed from a prejudged decision to attack Bomber Harris and a leading Canadian general of the day. However, he apparently doesn't know the first thing about the events and is determined not to let anyone hear the contending evidence.

The criticism which emerged in the Senate hearings were the following: (1) The program held that the Canadian Queen's own Rifles had lost almost half of its 900 man complement on D Day, when the toll was only 149 on the first day. (2) The program said that in the Nuremburg raids of March 1944 Canadian aircrew losses were almost as large as the entire losses during the Battle of Britain, when in fact the losses were only 545 while the British air losses during the Britain battle were 1,485 (although some 537 were the critical fighter pilots). (3) The program held that Arthur Harris refused to support the Allied invasion at Normandy, preferring instead a policy of bombing German cities into submission. In fact he provided supporting bomber raids after he was ordered to do so by Churchill. There really seems to be little different from what the McKennas said.

In short, the entire thrust of the Senate's and war historians' maligning of the Valor and the Horror revolve around the minutest of nit-picking and demonstrates that the series was essentially correct in its assessment.

The Vancouver Sun on November 11/92 (Armistice Day) reports that the upper brass of the CBC, however, following its normal process of apologizing for
speaking the truth if significant others are offended, does just that. It holds that \textit{The Valor and the Horror} was flawed historically and should not have been shown. Galafilm, the company which actually produced the series, called the Senate report on it 'a miscarriage of justice' and 'a manifestly unfair' process. In particular it cites Mr. Morgan's use of three historians to review the presentations which he feels were clearly prejudicial. Galafilm accuses the CBC ombudsman of misrepresenting historians who supported the series to make it appear as if they were critical of it.

Canadian veterans organizations, however, remain adamant in their rejection of the entire series.

Also on November 11/92, the McKeena brothers reject the report tabled by the CBC's ombudsman, claiming that he had not permitted their presentation of evidence in support of the series. "The McKennas have argued that their work was meticulously researched and error-free, and that the series was intended to celebrate the valor of individual soldiers, not defame them. The McKennas' detailed, point-by-point rebuttal of the Morgan report argues that the ombudsman's approach has been prejudicial to them" (\textit{Globe and Mail}, November 11, 92).

On November 12/92, the \textit{Vancouver Sun} publishes a report by one Ken MacQueen entitled 'Senators ran low on honor in skirmish over valor'. It notes that on the eve of Remembrance Day, the CBC promised not to rebroadcast the series until some allegedly fundamental errors are corrected (such as holding that the toll of the bombings were unjustifiable) and it fully apologized to veterans for any slights they may have felt by its original broadcast.

MacQueen notes that the Senate subcommittee members involved in the hearings about the series will undoubtedly feel vindicated. "They should not. The Senators have cheated and distorted and bullied. They took a parliamentary forum and twisted it into an obscene show trial. In the style of poisonous U.S. Senator Joseph McCarthy, they have appropriated the heroism of others while smearing the loyalty and patriotism of all they oppose."

As part of the hearings, one Quebec senator John Sylvain, distorted the account "... making it appear as though McKenna had ridiculed Canada's soldiers as fools. Later, Sylvain asked McKenna whether he denied the Holocaust too ... There was heckling throughout and no attempt by chairman [Jack] Marshall to hide his contempt for the few dissenting voices."

Apparently even Cliff Chadderton, the chairman of a national veterans organization who had initially requested the hearing, was disgusted by it. "The Senators conduct", he lamented, "made veterans look like a bunch of jerks."

MacQueen ends with this. "But the fight for that national memory has only begun. History is full of doubts and questions and the prejudices of a later age. Remembrance is a painful process, lest we forget" (\textit{Vancouver Sun}, November 12/92). Instead of 'Lest we forget' he might have said 'Lest we ever learn' the truth.

A letter to the editor of the \textit{Vancouver Sun} on November 13/92 by one Malcolm McSporran also raises the charge of McCarthyism against the Senatorial investigating committee. He holds that the McKenna film was one of the very few attempts by Canadian television to break free from 40 years of propaganda movies about world war 2. He says he learned of the heroism of the Canadian troops and aircrews but also of the gutlessness and incompetence of many of their leaders. 'What the Senate was engaged in was nothing other than unjustifiable censorship'. 
Another letter to the editor in the *Globe and Mail* (November 14/92) reads as follows. "I want to express my support for Brian McKenna and his excellent documentary series *The Valor and the Horror*. I also want to express my disgust at the cowardly conduct of CBC management. To watch a talented filmmaker be smeared before unfair hearings in the Senate is to watch one injustice. But then to watch as one's own organization appears to participate in that smear by caving in to outside intimidation is particularly disturbing." The letter is signed David Malahoff, Executive producer of CBC Radio Performance.

The Canadian Senate's subcommittee on veterans affairs submits its full recommendations about *The Valor and the Horror*. It holds that a reissue of the series must (1) clearly state that the opinions expressed are those of the film makers and are not necessarily shared by historians. (2) The CBC should not re-release the series in its original form. (3) That the National Film Board should prepare a brochure pointing out the 'inaccuracies and biases' contained in the original, and (4) that the CBC and the National Film Board should prepare another documentary on the topic addressing the 'inaccuracies and imbalances' in the original.

The CBC administrators promise to add a critical section following each of the edited portions of the original story. In short, they grovel before the veterans' lobby (*Vancouver Sun*, January 28/93).

The May 1993 edition of the journal *Saturday Night* contains a feature article entitled "The Battle Over 'The Valor and the Horror'." It mentions that Senator Jack Marshall, who launched the McCarthyist inquisition into the McKennas' documentary, was the 'national commander' of the Jewish War Veterans of Canada. Hmm.

Some years earlier the McKennas had made another documentary film entitled *The Killing Grounds*, dealing with Canada's 'contributions' to world war 1, including some 60,000 Canadian dead. That did not raise a storm of criticisms while it excoriated the military commanders. But it did not involve the mass murder of hundreds of thousands of enemy civilians.

Their documentary intended to validate the valor of the ordinary soldier and airman but also to charge many of their top commanders for their bungling and bloodlust during that war. One wouldn't think it would raise any hackles today but it obviously did, especially among the professional war veterans and those still praising themselves for their unparalleled contributions to defending democracy fifty years after the end of the world war 2.

"The character of Bomber Harris, the British officer in charge of the [bombing] offensive, the morality of the campaign itself, and how big a contribution it actually made to the defeat of Germany had been subjects of controversy in Britain for all of the five decades since the war, but had barely ruffled the air in Canada" (*Saturday Night*, May/93: 47).

Beginning in the late 1980s the McKennas involved themselves in intensive research and writing, plus attempts to find funding for the production - which ultimately was split between public and private sources. The episodes are woven together around the experiences of two or three central characters per segment but with additional experiences and analyses by dozens more. Brian McKenna said the series was ready to be shown in January 1992, when it was telecast by CBC but he had no conception of the outrage it would stir up among Canadian veterans. "I guess", he says "with the power of TV the curtain was ripped aside and it was devastating for some of these guys, much more than I realized" (*Saturday Night*, May 93:48).
Senator Jack Marshall, the chair of the Senate Subcommittee on Veterans affairs, believed he had an especial the right to speak about world war 2. "There's nobody", he says, "who can understand the feelings of a veteran about the service he gave." He treasures a photograph of a war memorial created on the Dutch Frisians islands for fallen allied flyers. Saturday Night comments, "The sacrifice is made noble, the ugliness of their deaths smoothed over and placed under an appropriate marker. Here at home, the McKennas of the world smear the picture, dishonor their fathers. The war had put Jack Marshall on the other side of a gulf that the sons can bridge only with unending gratitude" (Saturday Night, May 93: 48).

Senator Marshall began to act as the spokesperson of the 40 odd veterans groups in Canada. Another spokesman for one of those organizations called Marshall nothing but a 'grandstander' and the Senate subcommittee as 'latecomers and upstarts' who simply muddied the water of veterans causes. One Cliff Chadderton, the head of Canada's War Amputees, initially wrote to the McKennas praising the authenticity of their portrait of events, only later coming to resent their portrayal of the destruction of German cities. Chadderton proved to be one of more monomaniac in pursuing the CBC for airing the series.

He mounted an attack on the CBC and the CRTC (the government agency which oversees radio-television broadcasting) in newspaper ads across the country, calling on veterans and other Canadians to send their protests to the CBC. He then concentrated his charges against Bill Morgan, the CBC's ombudsman, who cracked under pressure and called for a public apology by the CBC on the series.

Senator Marshall's Senate Subcommittee hearings on The Valor and the Horror proved to be stacked with those unalterably opposed to the views put forward in the series, as were the overwhelming majority of the witnesses giving evidence. They charged the series with everything under the sun, including being pro-German to anti-Semitic. Others expatiated about Canadian veterans saving Democracy in the world for which no one could ever adequately recompense them.

This show ran on during early summer to early fall of 1993. No witness was allowed to sidetrack the inquisition with disreputable facts or accounts. Finally, it petered out, but not before a servile CBC management promised not to release the series again until after it had added the countervailing objections of veterans groups.

At the height of the furor a newly created 'veterans organization' calling itself 'The Bomber Harris Trust', claiming to represent the circa 25,000 Canadian Airforce veterans, launched a libel suit asking for $500 million dollars from the CBC, the National Film Board, the two McKenna brothers, Galafilm Incorporated, and Harper Collins which published a book version of the series, as well as a suit against Monique Landry, the minister of Canadian Heritage and the Federal Attorney-General. They were particularly incensed with the segment entitled Death by Moonlight, which they held presents a view counter to all previous accounts. A damning charge in their estimation. No one had previously heard of The Bomber Harris Trust, which was headed by someone called Don Elliot. It held that after lawyers are paid, the bulk of the award would go to establish a professorship 'for ethical electronic journalism' (July 13/93 Vancouver Sun). Was this intended as a joke?

As far as I can make out, no critic had actually ever questioned the casualties inflicted by the bombing, or generally who the victims were.
In a defense of their television series "The writer-director team of Terence and Brian McKenna has steadfastly defended the accuracy and fairness of their six-hour Gemini award winning series. 'I know they're alleging errors. There are no errors', Brian McKenna said from Montreal. 'They want to make sure no one will ever shine a flashlight on some of the dark places of our history again'."

That ends the commentary on the McKeena brothers and *The Valor and the Horror*.

Two more official accounts of the Allied bombing campaign may be worth mentioning here. The first is Noble Frankland's 1965 *The Bombing Offensive Against Germany. Outlines and Perspectives*. It is an overview of the four volume official history of those operations (*The Strategic Air Offensive Against Germany, 1939-1945*, Charles Webster and Noble Frankland, 1961) by one of its original compilers, then the Director of the Imperial War Museum, London. It was specifically written to defend the British air operations and to reject any scurrilous imputations then beginning to make the rounds in Britain. For him, winning the war against German barbarism is all the 'moral justification' needed to do anything.

To do this he totally by-passes any estimates of the number of civilians - women and children, old people, the sick and wounded and workers - killed in allied bombing raids. He claims that everyone's statistics are totally unreliable and that there is no way we will ever have an even approximate figure of the deaths. His original four volume report was filled with lists and tables down to the last T - they tell us how much gasoline was used per plane per raid, what the hours of repair were required per plane were, how much of what kind of bombs were dropped, the number of tires used up, virtually everything one might wish to know - other than the estimates of German deaths. In Volume 3 there is a section entitled 'Causalities'; however, this deals exclusively with the dead and wounded allied aircrews (some 50,000 British and Canadian officers and crew).

More than that, the purpose and the consequences of the allied saturation raids on German industry and dwellings, are largely by-passed. The consequences of the Dresden bombings at the very end of the war are also by-passed because Dresden fell into the Soviet zone of occupation and losses allegedly could not be verified. In this isolated case he does give an estimate of German dead - 80-120,000 in three days of raids in mid February of 1945, when the war was about to end and the city was flooded with fleeing refugees.

Dresden "... was indeed, the climax of the night area offensive. It was the crowning achievement in the long, arduous and relentless development of the principle of bombing which the Royal Air Force had initially adopted as a retaliatory measure" [emphasis mine] (Webster and Frankland, 1961, Vol. 3: 109).

Most accounts make it clear that any claims to 'pin-point' or 'strategic' bombing were simply propaganda. The air armadas the allies sent in, even with the best crews and the best bombsights, were simply incapable of hitting discrete targets and the raids soon devolved into saturation attacks on cities, especially on the workers' housing of those cities. They utilized high explosives and incendiaries. They systematically, even irrationally, killed and burned to death hundreds of thousands of German civilians in this war to defend human decency.

In Frankland's volume 4 he says that "... a powerful body of opinion, led by the Prime Minister [Churchill] himself, favoured, not an oil offensive, but a direct attack on German morale through the destruction of towns as a whole" (Webster and Frankland, 1961: 58). The British Air Force stated "... that for
approximately 3/4 of each month it is only possible to obtain satisfactory results by the 'Blitz' attack on large working class and industrial areas in the towns... Both of these aspects of the plan were written into the bombing directions of 9th July, 1941" (Webster and Frankland, 1961:59).

The first of the 1,000 bomber raids was made against Lubeck, in March of 1942, then Cologne and the Rhine cities. In late July of 1943 four major air attacks against Hamburg effectively leveled that city and killed an estimated 45,000 civilians, far more than the entire Canadian war losses in 6 years of fighting (Frankland, 1965: 70-71).

One Larry Bidihian has produced a somewhat less official account of German civilian losses caused by bombing in The Combined Allied Bombing Offensive Against German Civilians, 1942-1945 (1976). It is a very conservative estimate and lower than many others, but he claims that the probable figure was at least 500,000 dead. Others place the toll at 650,000 and upward (David Irving, The Destruction of Dresden, 1970).

Bidihian goes through assorted records and lists, mainly those kept by German authorities during the war, and shows them all to be necessarily underestimates for a variety of reasons. He notes that David Irving's estimates of 650,000 deaths is probably a more realistic figure than most.

One figure however is clear. "One of the peculiar characteristics associated with the German civilian fatalities produced by Allied bombing was that the majority were among women and children." Since so many of the male population were in the armed forces, "a disproportionately larger percentage of the civilian population that remained was made up of women and children." He holds that the 17 large scale air raids on Darmstadt were fairly typical for a middle-sized city. In them, "... a minimum of 8,960 people were reported to have been killed. Of this total, 7,107 or 87.9% of all these air raid fatalities occurred among civilians. Women represented 43% of these causalities, children 31% and men 27% of all civilian fatalities. Similar proportions applied elsewhere (Bidihian, 1976:44-45).

I leave these figures without further commentary.

Eisenhower and the P.O.W. Death Camps

On March 28, 1990, as part of the 100 anniversary of 'Ike' Eisenhower's birth, the US senate proclaimed that entire year dedicated to his memory. Rousing and appreciative speeches were delivered by president George Bush, Winston Churchill's grandson, Walter Cronkite and assorted other public figures. Naturally no one mentioned or probably even knew of Eisenhower's role in the systematic murder of some 800,000 German P.O.W.s after the end of world war 2 (New York Times, March 28/90).

It is uncertain how many German Prisoners of War perished in the Soviet Union during and after world war 2. It has been estimated that of the circa 100,000 who surrendered at Stalingrad in the early spring of 1943 less than 10% survived captivity to return to Germany after the war. It was once fashionable in the west to attribute virtually all of the German P.O.W. deaths occurring during the war to losses in the Soviet Union, making them responsible for some 2-2.5 million dead prisoners. Today such claims are largely dismissed. However, hundreds of thousands, possibly a million, of originally healthy men did die while in Soviet captivity.

Until the late 1980s there was very little discussion of German P.O.W.s held by the western allies who died in captivity. Views were typically centered on the
relatively few German P.O.W.s who were held in America and Britain. It now emerges that deaths in US and French P.O.W. camps in Europe during the later half of 1945 and throughout 1946 were as appalling as the losses attributed to the Soviet Union, possibly even more so. By some estimates more than 800,000 German P.O.W.s died in allied hands during a brief period of usually less than 18 months. This was at a time when western stockpiles of food, medical facilities and housing were more than adequate to shelter and feed the prisoners.

The above figures do not include the toll of German civilians in territories 'liberated' by the Soviet armies. There, in eastern and central Europe, considerably more than 2 million Germans or those of German ancestry perished at the hands of local nationalists and at the hands of Soviet forces. None of these victims were ever charged with any crimes and none of them had any sort of a trial - it was enough that they were of German ancestry to be deemed worthy of death. Nor does this include the 10 to 12 million persons of German ancestry who were driven from their homes, 9 million from Eastern Germany in territories conveyed to the Poles. They lost their homes and farms and possessions and were driven into a bombed out, starving, Germany, where an additional but unknown number died.

The entire German population of East and West Prussia, Pomerania, and Silesia - where they had lived for many centuries - were dispossessed, driven out and in many cases killed by the Poles. Some of the prison camps established by the Poles were possibly more brutal than were even the German concentration camps. One and a half million Germans died in them or in their flight to escape from the Russian army.

In Rumania, a jacquerie of Rumanian nationalists murdered some 250,000 'German-Rumanian' civilians, most whom had been in that country for many centuries. Possibly an equal number fled West, however difficult that was. In Czechoslovakia, that alleged pearl of Western democracy, another 250,000 persons of German ancestry were killed, mainly by Czech nationalists but under the eye of the Russian occupation forces. Some Czech apologists claimed that 'all the Germans in Czechoslovakia were guilty of collaboration with the Nazis and so they were punished as a group.' That's what mass murderers always claim. Some three million additional Germans were expelled from the country and decanted back into a starving Germany. No charges were ever laid and no trials were ever carried out - people were just killed at the whim of their captors. An unknown number, probably running into the hundreds of thousands, of Germans in former Hungarian and Yugoslav lands were treated similarly, resulting in the deaths of at least tens of thousands. Some of these cases have their own historians, others do not.

In addition were the much increased deaths in Germany itself between mid 1945 and late 1947. Food supplies had been exhausted by the end of the war and what remained was often ransacked by the occupation forces. Mass starvation was only partly avoided - severe malnutrition was not. All food was rationed and most people did not receive even a c. 2,000 calorie per day ration, one intended for resting adults living in sheltered conditions. Millions were living in bombed out cellars, typically there was no or very little coal for heat. On top of this were the 11 or 12 million refugees expelled from their homes in lands seized by new regimes in the East. All this must have had a very considerable impact on the survivorship of civilians who were not interned in P.O.W. camps.

The total number of deaths of German P.O.W.s and civilians during and after the end of the war are quite horrendous. Such German deaths are never
mentioned by anyone. They have never had a panoply of ethnic organizations commemorating their deaths and calling for retribution against those guilty of them. 'Their side' lost the war.

Questions about the lethal conditions existing in German P.O.W. camps after the war were raised by a handful of people, mainly some Britons and a few Jews, during the later 1940s. But their charges never rose sufficiently to the surface to inconvenience those responsible for the mass deaths.

What we will discuss here are the fates of German P.O.W.s who fell into the hands of the American forces at the end of world war 2. The basic source is the work of a highly credible non-historian, one James Bacque, a Canadian writer who stumbled upon the story in the mid 1980s and wrote a compelling but little reviewed book entitled *Other Losses. An investigation into the mass deaths of German prisoners at the hands of the French and Americans after world war 2* (1989). 'Other losses' was the deceptively neutral term under which the mass deaths in the P.O.W. camps were listed and hidden in official US reports. Reports which no one in authority apparently read or cared about.

Bacque's book is based on a mass of original Allied/American army documents, many of the central tabulations reproduced in their original form in his book. Of the few who officially noticed Bacque's book, some merely dismissed it as something not written by a professional historian. Others held that it was outrageous that someone would imply that a Great American like former General-President Eisenhower could be implicated in war crimes. Yet others dismissed it as 'Revisionist history'. But no one attempted to debate the evidence provided by Bacque. After a year or so the topic slipped back into public non-existence. Here is what the book documents.

Of the more than 9 million German and Austrian P.O.W.s held by Allied forces at the end of world war 2 some 800,000 of the c. 5 million held the by US died in American hands during the 12 to 18 months they were in captivity. Of the nearly 1 million P.O.W.s handed over to French authorities after the end of the war some 200,000 German P.O.W.s died during the 2 or more years they were held. Of the 3 million prisoners held by British authorities something like 100,000 died during the 12 to 16 months they were in captivity. This suggests a mortality rate ranging from 3% to 25% in a year and half. This figure leaves some hundreds of thousands of German P.O.W. s unaccounted for.

As I have noted above, the deaths which occurred in American hands were listed under the innocuous title 'other losses'. If one adds the estimated deaths of German P.O.W.s in the Soviet Union this gives a total of circa 2 million German prisoners of war killed while in captivity by the various nations fighting for 'justice and democracy' during that war.

It should be noted that the deaths of German P.O.W.s in western hands were not due to any particular disorganization or general lack of food. The American arsenal in Europe was overflowing with food. Moreover, when members of the German population attempted to share their limited rations with the P.O.W.s they were driven away at gunpoint. Although there were barracks and other structures still standing which could have provided shelter, many, probably most, prisoners in these camps where not provided with any shelter whatsoever. Drinking water was extremely limited for long periods of time in some camps.

The years 1945 and 1946 witnessed cold, rainy summers and many P.O.W.s contracted infectious diseases, for which little or no medical provision was made. That, and the lack of any sanitation or sewage removal, plus the incredibly overcrowded conditions of the P.O.W. camps created conditions for the general
spread of infectious diseases. Bacque suggests that it was the intent of the higher American authorities, particularly of Dwight Eisenhower, to create conditions which would lead to the mass deaths among the German P.O.W.s. Neither Eisenhower nor any other of the American worthies in charge left any known record of their intent. (Nor did those Nazis loosing the Holocaust leave any written orders to that effect.) Eisenhower repeatedly said during that conflict that he 'hated the Germans' - not the Nazis but the German people as a whole. He had also publicly said that all 3,500 members of the German General Staff should be executed. A pretty bloodthirsty guy to have in charge of P.O.W.s.

The Geneva Convention, adopted by all countries in the mid 1920s, stipulated that Prisoners of War were to be fed and housed on standards sustained by the armies which captured them. There was to be no killings or torture of prisoners or placing them in lethal conditions, as the Americans clearly did. The International Red Cross and some third party, represented by a functioning state, was to act as a supervisor and watchdog of conditions as they applied on the ground.

The first of these protections was stripped away when Eisenhower and his senior staff of the European theatre of operations decided that they would not accept any more prisoners as P.O.W.s and re-dubbed the majority of the prisoners that they had as Disarmed Enemy Forces (D.E.F.). This move was completed in July of 1945. It meant, or it was taken to mean, that those millions of prisoners classified as D.E.F. would have no protection under the Geneva convention whatsoever. It meant that they could be fed or not fed, just as their American jailers chose. Some camp commanders who requested requisitions from the huge stockpile of food the Americans had built up were reprimanded and their requests rejected. In general it meant that starvation rations would be irregularly supplied to the prisoners, who immediately began to die.

As with food so with the provision of shelter. In most cases 20-50,000 men were simply herded out into small bare fields, barbed wire was strung around them and watch towers erected and manned. They were given no shelter whatsoever, sometimes for 12 months, through the rain and the cold. They dug holes into the fields and cowered in them as dysentery and other infectious diseases, caused by the crowding and filth, swept through them. In most cases no sanitary facilities whatsoever were provided. They lived and starved and died in cold, excrement filled fields. Medical care was normally not provided. Nor was potable water available for long periods in some camps. At night, some of the more 'patriotic' guards fired rifle and machine guns into the huddled prisoners.

All of this was strictly forbidden by the Geneva convention and by any minimal standards of humanity. But the Americans did it anyway.

They did it as practices stemming from the American Supreme Command, which meant Dwight Eisenhower and his cronies. He himself signed many of the orders to this effect. Of course, neither Eisenhower nor the others implicated, stood trial at any war crimes tribunal. Rather they were welcomed home as heros and Eisenhower later was elected as president of the United States of America.

As for the Red Cross supervision of the P.O.W.s and the conditions in which the were kept, they were simply not allowed to visit the camps. The illegality in such actions was simply swept under the rug. The Swiss government, which until the end of the war had acted as a stipulated representative for the German prisoners of war, was simply dismissed in the early summer of 1945, on the pretext that a German government no longer existed and that there was nothing more for them to represent. Both the Red Cross and the Swiss government contested these decisions but their protests were simply brushed off. The mass slaughter went on.
It should be noted that neither the British nor the Canadian governments accepted this new D.E.F. status for the German Prisoners of War they held and complained to the American authorities about conditions in the American camps. They too were dismissed. However, all of the German prisoners in British and Canadian hands were treated as P.O.W.s in the traditional sense. There was only the merest fraction of the deaths among them compared to the American case.

In mid summer of 1945 the US turned over some 750,000 of their prisoners to the French (who already had taken 300,000 prisoners in various surrenders). They claimed they intended to use them in the reconstruction of war losses. In many cases those turned over to the French were already in advanced stages of starvation, as well as being ill. In one transfer only one third of the prisoners were in any kind of shape to work. However, the French proceeded with their own revanchist polices, using starvation, beatings and killings, to kill off some 20+% of the prisoners they held.

The conditions in these camps and the treatment of the German P.O.W.s defy brief summary. One has to read the compressed accounts scattered throughout Bacque's book. To be noted is the way in which the majority of Americans running and guarding these camps hid behind the rationale that they were 'only carrying out orders."

As distinct from the conditions prevailing in Nazi concentration camps, conditions in the American P.O.W. camps were open to inspection by assorted American officials and other visitors. Visits were made to the P.O.W. camps by American senators and other officials, and by those who accompanied their investigating trips. Visits by a host of others, officially and unofficially, were quite common in 1945 and 1946. These camps weren't secret at all. However, nothing came of those investigations. Indeed, some American politicians roused their home-town audiences by their tough stance toward imprisoned 'Nazis' and proclaimed their support for a policy of 'not coddling them'. They too were participants in the mass murder which occurred.

"At least ten times as many Germans - undoubtedly 800,000, and probably more than 900,000 - died in the French and American camps as were killed in all the combat on the Western Front in northwest Europe from between 1942 to April 1945." (James Bacque, 'The Last Dirty Secret of World War Two', p.46, Saturday Night, September 1989).

Writing in the Globe and Mail, September 2, 1989, reviewer John Gellner writes, "Surprises never end. Here we have a book which, as far as I can ascertain, tells for the first time and in great detail the story of how approximately one million German soldiers were left to die in American and French camps after the Second world war. The men were prisoners-of-war and DEF (disarmed enemy forces-soldiers who surrendered after the end of hostilities), and they were killed by starvation and disease caused by lack of shelter and medical attention."

"Considering that these were all young to middle-aged men, a rate of one in four dying in so short a time certainly points to deliberate neglect of even elementary care."

"The death rate is also incomparably higher than in the British and Canadian camps. The prisoners there were not coddled, but they were adequately housed and clothed and provided with plain but sufficient rations, and with medical care when necessary."

The one qualm which Gellner seems to have is that there has been little documentation of such crimes by the German survivors themselves. It is sort of strange, but then one thinks about how German prisoners who survived might
feel about repeating atrocities they themselves had experienced. During most of
the post war period who would believe their accounts?
Gellner notes that the Bacque book is bound to be unpopular, especially in the
US. "One of their country's past presidents, a national hero, is accused of being
the initiator of a policy - if indeed there was a policy - as contrary to any
principle of humanity as those initiated by Hitler or Stalin ... James Bacque has
certainly stirred up a hornet's nest" (*Globe and Mail*, September 2/89).
Gellner is the founder and former editor of the *Canadian Defence Quarterly*.
The following week a number of letters to the editor flowed in to the *Globe and
Mail* about Bacque's book and the review it got. A former doctor of the
Wehrmacht captured in mid 1944 and conveyed to a P.O.W. camp in the US,
writes to say that conditions in them were quite passable and that he was treated
quite properly. "The tragic events reported by Mr. Bacque were not planned by a
vicious US General Dwight Eisenhower. They were the unfortunate results of
adverse and severe circumstances. How could you deal with a human avalanche of
four million prisoners in a country with devastated cities, millions of refugees,
displaced persons and released war prisoners wandering the roads of a Germany
totally broken and demoralized? And on top of that a desperate food situation?"
(*Globe and Mail*, September 16/89).
Well, how is it that the British P.O.W. camps witnessed casualties at one tenth
the level of those at the US and French camps, existing in the same or under more
stringent conditions than did the Americans? In any case, experiences in P.O.W.
camps in the US are quite irrelevant to the issue.
A rabbi Wayne Allen, of Willowdale Ontario, writes in to attack Bacque's book
as an example of the 'revisionist history' which is creeping into prominence.
"As revisionists purposefully work to deny the facts of the Holocaust, others
unwittingly work to remove the Jewish component of the Holocaust. While Mr.
Gray's piece disputes the former, it supports the latter."
This is a non sequitur since Bacque's book does not deal with the Holocaust at
all, which rabbi Allen would know if he'd ever read it. For him everything about
world war 2 begins and ends with the Jewish Holocaust and to discuss anything
else is odious revisionism and deeply offensive to Jews as a whole. Well, so what?
J.Terence Bates, a Toronto MD, also writes in to revile the alleged 'historical
distortion' conveyed in John Gray's article and in the Bacque book. He insists that
3 to 4 million Jews were murdered at Auschwitz and "... the omission of this fact
[?] or any other comment about the systematic genocide until the penultimate
paragraphs. Yes, I question his motives for writing the article and yours for
printing it." In point of fact, neither Bacque nor Gray deal with the Jewish
Holocaust at all, but with the mass murder of German prisoners of war. It is those
who refuse to consider this revealing account who are the real proponents of
historical denial.
On February 3, 1990, the *Globe and Mail* runs two articles about 'Other
Losses', one entitled 'The uproar that never came' and the other a reminiscence of
the American death camps by a German P.O.W. 44 years later. In the 'Uproar'
article, John Fraser, the editor of the *Saturday Night Review* which featured an
overview of Bacque's book the previous September, wonders why there had been
no reaction from Americans to the claim that Eisenhower had been involved in
the operation of what essentially were death camps.
"'Most people think that was the only good war', Mr. Bacque said in a recent
interview. 'We won, we killed the devil and the world became perfect, except for
the little flaw of the cold war.' "While 'Other Losses' has been published in
Germany and Canada and will soon be released in Japan, the Netherlands, France and England,' he said, 'US publishers have shunned the book and its subject matter.'

The US ambassador to Canada replied that Mr. Bacque had utilized "arbitrary assumptions and an ambiguous category which invalidated his thesis." So there! A Patricia Monaham, an editor of the Washington Post, said that her newspaper "had not reviewed 'Other Losses' because Bacque had approached them in the wrong way". Besides, "Its a very large thing, after all, to be claiming that president Eisenhower did this." She said that she had spoken to an investigative reporter on their staff who, without seeing the record, proclaimed the charges unbelievable. This is all too typical of how fact and fiction are decided by the press.

In the reminiscence of one Gunter Hansen, a German P.O.W. interned in US and French camps, 'Other Losses' was compelling and duplicated his own experiences. Until that book was published he told no one but his wife and his children about conditions in the camps. "'I wouldn't be believed', he explained. 'The other thing is, the moment I open my mouth people recognize my accent and there is still the story that German equals Nazi equals war criminal.'

Mr.Hansen, a former inmate at a US P.O.W. camp, remembers that the 3,500 men housed at Metz received one sixth of a pound of bread per day and a bowl of watery soup. After a few months his weight declined from 150 pounds to 80. Thirteen or fourteen men died of hunger and disease every day but the camp population was periodically added to to keep the figure interned at 3,500.

He remembered a 'show' put on for some visiting dignitaries, when everyone was given a few full meals, but after the dignitaries left they were returned to the bread and water diet, mainly without the bread. He was finally released and shipped back to Germany when wounds he had acquired became infected and it looked like he was going to die (Globe and Mail, February 3/90).

On February 17, 1990 the Globe and Mail published a letter from a former American camp guard, which I reproduce here in part. Martin Brech from upstate New York writes,

"As a former US Army prison guard at one of 'Ike's death camps' I feel I must come to the defence of James Bacque's book 'Other Losses.' The truth may help end the cycle of self-righteous hatred and retaliation fed by racism, this time against the Germans."

"In early April 1945, I was sent to guard a prisoner of war camp near Andermach along the Rhine. There were more than 50,000 prisoners of all ages in a bare field surrounded by barbed wire. They slept in the mud without blankets, shelters or adequate clothing, cold and wet, eating grass because we were deliberately starving them. Dysentery raged and, because they were too weak and the number of silt trenches inadequate, they were sleeping in excrement. I saw no evidence of medical attention and no sign of the Red Cross, only bodies being hauled away."

"When I protested, I was told they [the camp administrators] were following orders from 'higher up', and assured me they would not risk court martial doing this to so many men if it was not general policy. When I asked a friend in the kitchen to slip me some food to throw the prisoners, he said he would because they had far more food than we needed. When I was caught, I was threatened with imprisonment. The policy was strict, they said... The only bright spot in the midst of our atrocity occurred during a night shift when I discovered civilians slipping food to the prisoners. My response was to tell them I admired their courage because we had orders to shoot to kill to stop any contact at all. Mr.
Bacque's expose is suppressed in the United States and a best seller elsewhere, adding to our loss of credibility" (Globe and Mail, February 17/90).

One may add to this the dozens of other first hand accounts to be found in 'Other Losses'. Bacque characterizes these camps as 'slow death camps' - but they weren't all that slow. Apart from the fact that there were no gas chambers or crematoria (the dead were buried in mass graves) these camps were quite as deadly as Nazi death camps. Those imprisoned in them were generally as innocent of any crimes as were the Jews.

Bacque said he had received about one thousand letters from German former inmates of the American P.O.W. camps, and a few from former US guards, who confirmed his account of the conditions which had existed. American authorities continue to dismiss the charges against them, or hold that they are exaggerated, or that the deaths should be attributed to natural and organizational problems. Most just don't want to know.

PART TWO
Chapter 4. On the Near Universality of Anti-Semitism

We all know that anti-semitism is the cardinal sin of which everybody must always be constantly aware and ever ready to combat. Seemingly reactionary and militaristic Jewish policies must be understood as simply a defence against world wide anti-semitism. Opponents of anti-semitism must be ready to oppose any rewriting of history (which has been fully perfected) or any view which challenges claims to Jewish centrality in all important issues. Anti-Semitism is a charge raised against any objections about Israel, its deeds and its supporters.

The Holocaust revival industry is concerned to drive home the claim that no crime in human history exceeds that of the Holocaust. Considering the toll of wars and massacres since the end of world war 2 this is a questionable claim. Moreover the approximately 40-50 million dead, on all sides, during world war 2 outstrips the Jewish toll some ten fold. Civilians were killed, to say nothing of military deaths and those of P.O.W.s. However, Jews were specially targeted, which makes their deaths so much more important than that of others. Right?

Claims to the near universality of anti-semitism have persisted for many years. Anyone who challenges such charges is held to be either stupid, engaged in denial, or anti-semitic themselves. The list of entire peoples, whole nations, particular regimes, religious persuasions and political views which are anti-semitic is a long one and seemingly includes the majority of the people of the world today. The criteria for being anti-Semitic are quite flexible so that the charge can be made to fit anyone and any situation. Let us consider a brief overview of just a handful of such charges. These are mainly drawn from claims made in the mid 1980s to the early 1990s.

The Germans are and will always be anti-Semitic

What of specific peoples who have been charged as being anti-Semitic as a whole? First of course are the Germans and Austrians, and more recently the Swiss. Weren't they all responsible to some degree, as a race, for the Holocaust?
Even if the Germans were themselves living under fascist oppression they should, somehow, have helped save the Jews or died trying.

Jewish rabbis have held that the sin of the Holocaust is carried by an entire people until the seventh generation. However, A.M. Rosenthal, the former editor of the New York Times holds that the crimes of the German people can never be forgiven. He holds that Germans should forever bear that stigma of the Holocaust. He tells us that only the victims can forgive, and since the victims are all dead no forgiveness can be forthcoming. It is surprising that these Jewish moralists do not consider that such charges will ultimately bring a response, not of grovelling shame, but of dismissive resentment.

For the Holocaust revivalists, Germans, despite all their learning and technology, should stand at the bottom of human creation, along with the beasts and other anti-Semites. The Jewish-Soviet writer Ilya Ehrenburg, a thoroughgoing Stalinist, was a leading war propagandist in the Soviet Union during world war 2. This is what he wrote in the Red army's newspaper 'Red Star' in September of 1942.

"The Germans are not human beings. ... From now on the word 'German' will trigger your rifle. We shall not speak any more. We shall not get excited. We shall kill. If you have not killed at least one German a day, you have wasted your time... If you cannot kill your German with a bullet, kill him with your bayonet... If you kill one German, kill another - there is nothing more amusing for us than a heap of German corpses. Do not count the days, do not count the miles. Count only the number of Germans you have killed. Kill the German - this is your mother's prayer. Kill the German - this is what your children beseech you to do. Kill the German - this is the cry of our Russian earth. Do not waver. Do not let up. Kill." (Quoted in Alfred M. de Zayas, 1989: 168-169)

That was written by a cosmopolitan Russian Jew, who worked through the entire Stalinist horror of the 1930s as a state intellectual. All socialist principles had disappeared by then.

This appeal was acted upon by some Russian soldiers when they entered German territory, followed by the Poles. They murdered some 1.5 million German civilians and expelled 9 million more. Stalin warned Russian soldiers that the war was a struggle against German fascism, not against the German people. Some Russian soldiers listened, but others engaged in systematic looting, rape and murder when the Red army occupied German lands.

Following wide-ranging Nazi war crimes trials lasting from 1945 until the 1960s Germany was presumed to have been cleansed of those who had committed past war crimes. However, in the late 1970s, with the emerging Holocaust revival industry, a growing number of public attacks are made on Germany and its people, declaring them all guilty of crimes against humanity in perpetuity. Ethnic hate mongering became central in Jewish and Israeli campaigns.

Between early 1985 and late 1987 a very fragmentary survey of the Vancouver Sun, the Globe and Mail, and the New York Times yielded far more than 100 separate articles raising the specter of German anti-Semitism, past and present. The following few snippets can hardly do justice to the breadth and venom of such sentiments.

In early 1984 German Chancellor Helmut Kohl visited Israel while it was under Yitzak Shamir's administration to sign one agreement or another. There he was greeted by demonstrations of people wearing facsimile concentration camp garb and bearing signs reading 'Chancellor Kohl - S.S. again?' That was about Germany's decision to sell some modern fighter aircraft to Saudi Arabia.
While the speaker of the Knesset greeted him in German the leader of the opposition Labor party waved a yellow Star of David in protest. "It was to remind ourselves and to remind the Chancellor that we should never forget what the Holocaust was to the world, especially to the Jewish people."

Kohl grovelingly replied that: "The face of man was disgraced in the name of Germany. It is impossible for us today to imagine what happened then. But it did happen and Germany bears responsibility for it in history" (Globe and Mail, January 26/84). All his grovelling abasement did not change Jewish sentiments one iota.

A letter to-the-editor to the New York Times, August 27, 1986 by one Moshe Kam is entitled 'Cain's Mark'. It notes that Helmut Kohl has said that there can be no talk of normality in Germany as long as the Berlin wall exists. "Yet the real symbolic value of the wall is exactly that it prevents normality in Germany - as it should. It is a central part of the punishment cast upon the German nation for its world war 2 atrocities. In the long run, it may stand as a last reminder of the worst beastliness and murderousness a nation has demonstrated in modern times."

"Mr Kohl wants normality, but his nation does not deserve that. Postwar Germany has yet to deal fully with anti-Semitism and animosity toward strangers ... In a world where revisionist historians deny that there ever was a Holocaust, Cain's mark on Germany's forehead still serves a useful purpose."

It is pointless to argue with the Moshe Kams of this world or to remind them that a fascist dictatorship ruled and directed Germany during the Nazi era - a dictatorship which began by oppressing the German working class and the left long before it turned its attention to the Jews. Nor to remind him that those who do not support a regime are not responsible for its actions. That view is not part of his racial understandings.

On November 26, 1986, the New York Times reported the Israeli Knesset's reaction to the news that that country's President, Chaim Hertzog, would make a visit to Germany in the coming year. The first by an Israeli head of state.

"The plan was criticized by several members of the Israeli Parliament. 'The time has not come yet', said Eliahu Ben-Elissar, a Likud lawmaker who fled Nazi-occupied Poland in 1942. 'Sometime, I don't know when, but not in this generation.'

Another Member of Parliament, Shevah Weiss of the Labor Party, urged the President to reconsider his decision. Mr. Weiss said, 'If it's decided already, I recommend the President go only to Dachau concentration camp, and give a speech reminding them that some of them are still to blame and all are still responsible and then return home.' ... 'The President believes that the visit can strengthen consciousness of the Holocaust, which he feels has diminished in recent years'" (New York Times, November 26/86).

On September 7, 1987, Israel's Minister of Defence (and later Prime Minister) "Yitzak Rabin visited the site of Dachau concentration camp in south Germany and said that a new wave of anti-Semitism had gripped the world" (Globe and Mail, September 8, 1987). Really? 'The whole world, Germany included, ... is called upon to nip these tendencies in the bud. Together we should succeed in preventing another Holocaust', said Mr. Rabin".

Speaking after laying a wreath to Jews murdered at Dachau (but not to the greater number of non-Jews who died there) Mr. Rabin said "At the moment we are witnesses to a resurgence of an anti-Semitic and neo-Nazi wave whose
supporters make a mockery of the view that a murder of peoples in the future is ruled out."

However there already have been a number of holocausts since the end of World War 2, if you consider people other than Jews. And there is growing evidence that Israel itself is involved in mass murder.

These are merely the merest hint of contemporary comments made about alleged German anti-Semitism. They are by no means the most venomous ones.

**Russians and Ukrainians are anti-Semitic**

Of course Germans aren't the only anti-semitic nation in the world. The list of the nations of Europe which collaborated with the Nazis is a long one - Lithuanian and the other Baltic states, the Ukraine, also Rumania, Slovakia, Hungary, and Croatia were all involved in the Jewish Holocaust. In addition were all those collaborationist forces which emerged in occupied countries which aided the Nazis. All of these nations and groups are co-responsible for the Jewish genocide - in so far as they didn't prevent it. The same can be said about the neutral countries which did not enter the crusade against Nazi Germany. There is no end to the peoples who can be charged with collaboration with anti-Semitism, the reigning evil of all time.

Among those most guilty of anti-Semitism are the Ukrainians, Russians, and Poles. Weren't Jews living largely confined to ghettos and shetl's in those countries until the mid 19th century? The Russian hatred of Jews allegedly burred up during the 1890s and the early 1900s in a series of pogroms, the most serious of which, at Kishinev, caused the deaths of some ninety Jews. This was the pogrom which unleashed a flood of Jewish emigration from Russia to America.

The Russians 'are born and raised as anti-semites', according to some Jewish commentators. This had been so throughout the centuries of Tsarist rule and allegedly has only changed very slightly under the Soviets. It may be true that a great many Jews rose to prominence in the ranks of the Soviet administration, but others were persecuted because of their ethnic allegiances and their continuing religious beliefs, if not actually for being Jews. The fact that the Soviet communist party contained a disproportionate number of Jews only compounds the crime; the Soviets destroyed traditional Jewish culture, which was fundamentally religious, and incorporated Jews into their evil regime. Assimilation is a form of genocide in the annals of anti-Semitism.

On July 30/87 the New York Times carried a letter to the editor by one Alfred Kutzin, a writer and researcher on Holocaust topics. He notes that possibly some 200,000 Soviet citizens were buried in Babi Yar ravine, on the outskirts of Kiev, not simply the 30,000 Jews who are murdered there. While most of those Jews were massacred in the early days of the war, some 160,000 other Soviet citizens were killed there over the following 3 years. These included communists, partizans, and civilians killed in retaliation for anti-German resistance. Kutzin ends by saying "The massacre at Babi Yar, the largest site of Nazi genocide in that country, is a Soviet, not just a Jewish tragedy."

Even if the numbers of Soviet citizens killed at Babi Yar are exaggerated, the toll of Russian-Soviet losses during that war far outweighs the number of all Jews who died in the rest of occupied Europe, combined. This may be an anti-semitic argument, even if true.

Even worse than the Russians are the Ukrainians, whom Israeli Prime Minister Yitzak Shamir held to be criminal partners of the Nazis in World War 2. Weren't
Ukrainians involved in informing on and killing Jews during the Nazi occupation? Yes, some did but the vast majority of Ukrainians did not.

According to Shamir, Ukrainians are "...taught anti-semitism at their mothers' knees and grow up with a thirst for Jewish blood." Shamir and his lot have been saying this about Ukrainians and Poles since their youth in the 1930s. By the 1980s it became permissible to broadcast this outlook to the world without any qualms.

The Vancouver Sun of February 4/92 runs a letter to the editor by one William Nicholls, a Professor Emeritus of Religious Studies at U.B.C. He attacks an earlier letter by one Agnes Kripps who held that Ukrainians have nothing to apologize to Jews for over alleged anti-Semitism during 1941-1944. Nicholls holds that "These claims obscure both history and morality [his speciality]. No honest historian could deny the centuries-old history of anti-Semitism in the Ukraine and its persistence to recent times." He begins with the crimes of Chmielnicki in the 1640s and carries on to the alleged collaboration of Ukrainians with the Nazis during world war 2. As for those Jews who supported the Communist regime from 1917 and on, Nicholls holds that they had thereby left the fold of the righteously observant and were no longer Jews in any meaningful sense. He ends with a call for the 'new' Ukrainian republic to "break its ties with the past and denounce its history of anti-Semitism just as they are breaking their links with communism." Only then can they be redeemed as a people.

So that is what they teach in Religious Studies at the University of B.C.

**Poland is anti-Semitic**

Prime Minister Shamir also said that, "Poles are anti-Semitic from birth". Amid a dispute over a Roman Catholic Carmelite convent near the site of Aushwitz in Poland, he said in an interview with the Jerusalem Post that "'They suck it in with their mother's milk...' This is something that is deeply imbued in their tradition, their mentality. Like their loathing for Russia... These two things are not connected of course. But that, too, is something very deep, like their hatred of Am Israel (the Israeli people)" (Globe and Mail, September 9/89).

Didn't Poles just stand by while the Nazis carried out the extermination of Polish Jewry? It is beside the point to note that possibly 3 million Poles died in that conflict. All that Shamir and his lot care about is that they didn't save the Jews. Anti-Semitism runs in their blood it seems.

However more than 300,000+ Polish Jews were saved with the help of Polish families, usually at the risk of their own lives. However this is neither here nor there for Jewish chauvinists. Nor that some 200,000 Polish Jews escaped to sanctuary in the Soviet Union during that war.

Responding to articles which claim that Poles were almost universally anti-Semitic during world war 2, C.M Musial writes, "In response to Claude Lanzmann's statement that Polish peasants are supposedly anti-Jewish (A Powerful and Grim Portrait of Death, Globe and Mail, June 19) I would like to point out that in Dabrowa Tarnowska county, one of 17 counties of Krackow province ... Jews were sheltered in all of the county's 100 villages. At least 56 Poles were executed by the Nazis for doing so."

"The fact that the Nazis forbade such actions under threat of death, that they propagated anti-Semitism and offered a reward to those who would turn Jews in, and that it was nearly impossible to keep sheltered Jews a secret from their fellow villagers, did not deter Polish peasants" (Globe and Mail, August 12/86).
One might ask how many Jews in Israel have hidden and given aid to Palestinians fleeing from persecution and possible death at the hands of the Jewish police?

A later Polish election campaign became mired in charges that the front runner, Lech Walesa, was anti-Semitic. Walesa replied that he "is proud to be a Pole so why shouldn't Jews be proud to be Jews'. Polish Jews take this as a deadly insult while Israeli and American Jews consider this to be an indication of Mr. Walesa's deep anti-Semitism. Since the Poles allegedly 'suck in anti-Semitism with their mother's milk' how can it be otherwise?

"The mix of anti-Semitism and politics is not unique to Poland. But what is different here is that there are almost no Jews left, yet anti-Semitism lurks beneath the surface ... the very word *Zyd* -Polish for Jew- is considered a terrible slander and is used to denigrate politicians" (*Globe and Mail*, November 24/90).

After having won the Polish election Lech Walesa made a tour of Israel, where he is faced by the glowering hostility of Yitsak Shamir. Abraham Rabinovich, the *Globe and Mail*'s Jerusalem-based "reporter", notes that "the vast majority of Poles according to Jewish historians, were apathetic or hostile to the Jews, who once comprised 10 per cent of Poland's population" (*Globe and Mail*, May 29/91). For Shamir and his kind the entire world is composed of anti-Semites, either actual or potential.

**Rumania and Hungary were/are anti-Semitic**

Most of what I have to say about the nature of these two nations is dealt with in a previous chapter. It only requires that a little about their post world war 2 trajectory be mentioned here, especially developments since the collapse of socialism.

The 600,000 Jews who had remained in Rumania during world war 2, despite some localized pogroms, were largely untouched by the Holocaust. There were various pieces of anti-Jewish legislation, such as those which "aryanized" (i.e. confiscated) Jewish property or placed a host of minor restrictions on their activity. However some Jewish entrepreneurs managed to amass fortunes from the sale of Rumanian products to Germany.

With Soviet occupation, Rumania joined the communist bloc, although with a deep nationalist tinge. This tendency led to its later split from the Soviet camp. During the late 1960’s Israel struck a deal with Rumania to permit the wholesale emigration of Rumanian Jews to Israel for the payment of a stipulated amount of money. Some 400,000 Jews left for Israel. Alone among the Soviet bloc, Rumania developed a deepening relationship with Israel.

Although a degree of undisputed anti-semitism had existed in Rumania, this sentiment seemingly dissipated after the emigration of the great majority of Rumania's Jews. Those who continued to live there apparently did not join the nation's working classes but seemingly continued in various administrative and professional undertakings.

After the overthrow of Nicolai Ceausescu, Rumania's last 'communist' ruler, the *Globe and Mail* (December 28/89) commented on Israel's special relationship with Ceausescu since his was the only 'communist' state which did not break relations with Israel after the 1967 Arab-Israeli war. "The gratitude won by Israel's only ally in a hostile Communist block has survived, although Israel has condemned the killings by the secret police. It pledged support for its leaders. 'Speaking as Jews and Israelis, we cannot remember our enemies and forget our friends', Israel's former ambassador to Bucharest, Abba Geffin, said yesterday on Israel radio."
must not enter into the anti-Ceausescu hysteria" (Globe and Mail, December 28/89).

However, Chief Rabbi Rosen of Rumania held that Ceausescu had been an anti-Semite and that he now feared the possible return of Rumanian nationalists and active anti-Semitism, such as that connected with the Iron Guard some 50 years earlier. Rabbi Rosen had been criticized for acting as a tool of the Ceausescu regime but he holds that there was good reason for him not to show the intense dislike for Ceausescu which he now professes. "It could be called survival', he said. 'Everything was in his hands,' the Rabbi said. 'The life of my people was in his hands" (New York Times, January 3/90).

I am unsure what political role Rumanian Jews took up after settling in Israel. It may well have been to add their support to the right wing Herut bloque. A large extended family of Rumanian Jews who I met in Colombia during the mid 1960s regaled me with tales of their service with the Rumanian army in its invasion of the Soviet Union. While they generally despised Germans they had an even greater hatred toward the various socialist regimes which had ruled Rumania before their departure.

Members of the Hungarian ruling and middle classes probably were broadly anti-Semitic. After the successful counter-revolution of 1919, Hungary was the nation which, following Poland and the Soviet Union, contained the largest number of Jews before world war 2 - well over 600,000 in 1944. Most of them apparently were loyal supporters of the quasi-fascist regime of Admiral Horthy; proud Hungarian social patriots.

Allegedly some 400,000 Jews were killed there during the final months of the Hungarian dictatorship in late 1944. A surprisingly, even suspiciously, rapid process taking place over the span of little more than three months. The leadership of the Hungarian Jewish community deliberately collaborated with the Nazi and Hungarian fascists in the round up of Hungary's Jews at the price of their own survival and transfer to Switzerland.

Let us here leave aside the doings of the recently appointed, Swedish ambassador, one Raoul Wallenberg, who stepped in to save thousands of Jewish lives by issuing Swedish passports and papers on the spot. There is a later chapter on him.

Following 1945 Hungary was incorporated into the Soviet economic system. About 30% of Hungary's pre war Jewish population continued to live there, gradually becoming integrated into Hungarian society. This later became seen as 'cultural genocide' by those wishing to retain unique Jewish communities everywhere.

By the late 1980s the incipient breakup of the Soviet socialist system witnessed the reemergence of a Jewish ethnic nationalism. This was supported by the new Hungarian leadership, presumably in a bid to obtain American financial aid as American business interests bought up Hungarian enterprises at bargain prices. An alleged reemerging anti-semitism was ascribed to traditionalist sentiments which had been suppressed during communist rule.

On February 20, 1990, the New York Times runs an article entitled 'A Survival of the Past. Anti-Semitism is Back'. It quotes assorted B'nai B'rith officials as saying that Hungarian Jews are again 'sensing hints of a historical anti-Semitism' which had been suppressed during 40 years of Communist rule.' A B'nai Brith official in
Hungary 'discovers' various 'coded messages' in the Hungarian press directed against a new political party called the Free Democrats which has the backing of prominent Jewish intellectuals.

John Grey, reporting for the *Globe and Mail* on April 6, 1990 notes anti-Semitic threats issuing from a Hungarian organization which styles itself after the Russian Pamyat. One Thomas Zala, a leading spokesperson of the Budapest Jewish community, holds that some 200,000 Hungarian Jews were killed between 1939 and 1945 [about one half of the figure claimed by most Holocaust accounts]. However he is not particularly alarmed about the present mood of the country. In fact, he blames the former Communists for most of the anti-Semitic leaflets circulating throughout the country, trying to scare Hungarians into believing that neo-Fascism is standing ready to reemerge. Grey says "The signs of anti-Semitism in Hungary that so alarm others do not make Mr. Zala afraid. 'If (somebody) doesn't like me, So what? So What? and that's it'" (*Globe and Mail*, April 11/90).

A disgracefully cavalier view of the undying anti-semitism to be found among the Hungarian people.

The implication of the above is that by allowing their economy to be taken over or liquidated by external and domestic capitalists, the Hungarians are now breaking free from the terrible scourge of socialism and anti-semitism and are entering the sunny uplands of free enterprise. As of yet, few Jews or others have strenuously recounted these two nations’ backgrounds of anti-semitism. This a vein still be be mined.

**Greece is also anti-Semitic**

Edward Koch was the mayor of New York during most of the 1980s. He had started out as a Democratic Reform candidate but by the time he became mayor he was deeply in the pockets of that city's real estate developers. His stock in trade became denouncing 'left wingers', blacks and alleged anti-Semites everywhere and anywhere. He recurrently won the backing of New York's Jewish majority, themselves increasingly reactionary, through such ploys. On September 15, 1986 in an article in the *New York Post* he charged the Greek socialist government of Andreas Papandreou "of being anti-American and anti-Semitic." The *New York Post* is a Jewish newspaper which can find anti-Semitism in a bowl of corn flakes.

This charge was leveled because the Greek government had not rushed to replace the statue of Harry Truman (destroyed by a bomb) which memorialized Truman's role in supporting the Greek dictatorship which won the Greek civil war. Koch also attacked the socialist Mayor of Athens, one Dimitris Beis, for remarks that he had made about Jews. He had said that 'for him 'Jews' was synonymous with 'big capital'". One may here note the modern American usage of 'anti-Semitic' - anyone opposed to American capitalism is ipso facto anti-Semitic.

"The Koch article, titled 'A Modern Greek Tragedy' occasioned much harsh commentary here [in Athens] by newspapers and individuals, particularly over the suggestion that purported Greek anti-Semitism facilitated Germany's war time killing of 65,000 Greek Jews." There was a storm of protest from members of the Greek government about this charge but Mr. Koch "...said that he stood by what he had written "(*New York Times*, October 6/86).

It should be noted that neither the reactionaries nor the C.I.A. colonels who ruled Greece for so many decades after the civil war, who murdered or flung communists into concentration camps were anti-American or anti-Semitic.
France is anti-Semitic

France was a deeply anti-Semitic nation despite the fact that its 300,000+ Jewish community had generally done well for themselves. During the 1890s, this anti-Semitism came to a head in the Dreyfus Affair. In that case a senior Jewish army officer was charged with and convicted of selling military plans to the German government and imprisoned on Devil's Island. France was so anti-Semitic that the writer Zola had to mount a rebuttal of those charges, and in a series of increasingly bitter set-los by his supporters and opponents, had the charges revoked and the government overthrown. (Dreyfus himself was a reactionary who disdained the help of French progressives for his release.) The Dreyfus Affair is recurrently pointed to by those hunting for evidence of French anti-Semitism.

More recently, investigators of French anti-semitism can hold up the Action Francais party of the 1930s and early 1940s as an example. It was a very reactionary organization which was clearly anti-Semitic but mainly directed its venom at 'secular humanism' and the French left in general. At its high point during the 1930s it won almost 10% of the general vote. There were also more clearly fascist parties which rounded up another few percent of that vote. They, along with a majority of the French population, came to support the Vichy collaborationist government of 1940-1944. During that war the great majority of native born Jews managed to go into hiding although some 60,000 Jewish emigres in France were rounded up and sent to concentration camps. The Vichy police forces and the militias of the right wing parties aided in this action. Many of those involved in such endeavors were executed, legally or extra-legally, in 1945, part of the circa 40,000 French men and women executed for supporting the collaborationist government.

As for those French men and women who were part of the resistance during the war, especially the Communists, nothing need be said - except to ask how many Jews they saved?

The French Catholic church is held up to scrutiny for its anti-Semitism and open support for the Vichy regime. While there were more than enough real anti-Semites among French conservatives one has the sneaking suspicion that the degree to which France is held to be anti-Semitic varies with the degree to which it supports or fails to support Israel. When France was supplying military equipment to Israel all its anti-Semitic past was swept under the rug but when it began showing some sympathy for the Palestinian people all the past charges surfaced again.

Few charges of anti-Semitism were leveled at France in the years following world war 2, when France was fighting to preserve its empire in Indo-China, Algeria and elsewhere. During those years France had supplied Israel, all be it unwillingly, with the resources for Israel's initial atomic weapons. Organized charges of French anti-Semitism emerged only in the 1970s when it became a topic of interest for those concerned with Israel's well being.

The Vancouver Sun of August 14, 1982 ran a story entitled "French Jews try to defuse anti-Semitic bomb." 'The bomb', allegedly, is the anti-semitism lurking in French society. After a number of Jews were killed by a real bomb placed in a Paris restaurant Israeli prime minister Menachem Begin held that France was suffering from ".... 'a new wave of rampant anti-Semitism'... Begin blamed the Mitterrand administration for fostering a climate that encouraged anti-Jewish terrorism, and followed up by accusing France of "behaving like an enemy". This
"... raised the specter of Jewish persecution, recurrent in French history". 'Recurrent anti-Semitism' exists anywhere where Jews live - apparently...

Assorted Jewish organizations denied that there is any anti-Semitism in France since the end of world war 2. But the Israeli embassy was incensed by French reports on the massacres and war crimes carried out by Israeli military forces in Lebanon, and set out to counter-attack. At a vigil for six Jews killed in the bombing of a Paris restaurant, a Jewish spokesman, one Claude Lanzmann, said that "One does not play unpunished with the Jews. One does not play unpunished with words when these are about Jews." Punishable words eh?

On September 18, 1989, the Globe and Mail reports 'Holocaust doubter badly beaten by French youths'. 'French' in this case means French Zionist Jews. It reveals the existence of Jewish Defence League-like groups operating in France. The doubter was one Robert Faurisson, a sixty year old revisionist historian who was recovering from a savage beating which left his ribs broken and his jaw and face smashed in. It was unsure to what extent he would recover. Later reports said that Faurisson had sustained a brain injury and might not be able to continue his work.

"A previously unknown group, The Sons of the Memory of the Jews', took responsibility for the attack. It said, 'Professor Faurisson is the first but will not be the last. Let those who deny the Shoah beware'" (Globe and Mail, September 18/89. These siccarim are not terrorists of course but proud new Jews.

The New York Times of October 31/89 reports that the French "Chief Rabbi Joseph Struk, in an interview to be published Wednesday, assaulted the Socialist President [Mitterrand] for accusing Israeli soldiers in the occupied territories 'of treating Palestinian protesters like animal targets.' He referred to a recent comment made by Mitterrand at the European Parliament who said 'Nothing justifies this continual repression where men become wild game.'

The Globe and Mail of June 12, 1990 runs an article entitled "Racism has sunk deep roots in France". It takes notice of the desecration of Jewish cemetery in southern France. Jewish spokesmen hold that France has trivialized the event and has not pursued the guilty parties and all other anti-Semites. The article repeats assorted Jewish claims about French anti-Semitism, in some cases going back to the middle ages.

The above will serve as an indication of the bone-deep anti-Semitism present among the French which only the total support of Israel and its wars can partly vitiate.

**Japan is again becoming anti-Semitic**

During the height of the Japan-bashing which surged through America in the mid to late 1980s some Jews launched accounts of the Japanese mistreatment of the Jewish refugees in China during world war 2 and raised the reminder that Japan had been an ally of Nazi Germany.

Jewish sources say they are concerned about allegedly anti-Semitic books in print in Japan. One "Professor Haberman mentions a book by one Shichihei Yamamoto entitled 'The Japanese and the Jews' which explores alleged similarities between the two. The book plays on the notion that Jews know how to make money and that Japanese can learn their methods of success. Yamamoto has sold some 3 million copies since the book was published a dozen years earlier."

In a follow-up letter to the editor (New York Times, March 25/87) one David Goodman, a professor at the University of Illinois, Urbana, praises Haberman for raising the curtain on Japanese anti-Semitism. He notes that anti-Semitism is of
long standing in Japan, going back to the founding of the modern state in 1870. He notes the early publication of Shakespeare’s *The Merchant of Venice* and other works, "which the historian Norman Cohen has called 'a warrant for genocide'" (I thought that was the Holy Bible).

Goodman notes that "anti-Semitism has greater intellectual currency and respectability in Japan than in perhaps any other industrialized country." He notes what he considers to be an 'anti-Semitic short story called 'Passover' by a Japanese woman residing in Los Angeles. It won a prestigious Japanese award recently. The author replies on April 13/87 in the *New York Times*, saying that she is amazed to be referred to as an anti-Semite because her single story had an unflattering portrait of one Jewish woman.

Given that recent Japanese ministers have refused to accept Japan's exclusive culpability for world war 2 "Japanese anti-Semitism reveals itself as but one manifestation of widespread racist thinking "that has permeated the highest levels of Japanese government and business bureaucracy... We know from bitter experience the potential consequences of this state of affairs and everything possible should be done by all people of good will to reverse it before this annoyance has real political repercussions" (*New York Times*, March 25/87).

On May 4/87 the *New York Times* carries a notice by one Fritz Kaufmann who was member of a committee representing the c. 40,000 Jews in Shanghai during world war 2. He strongly rejects the claims of another letter-to-the-editor which held that the Jews under Japanese occupation were generally safe and not ill treated. Instead, Kaufmann holds that "The Shanghai Jews escaped extermination by the skin of their teeth... Everything is business with them [the Japanese] and they can be very brutal and mean if it suits them." However, it remains the case that all the Jews in China during the war did escape unscathed. As opposed to the millions of Chinese who died.

The gambit about Japanese anti-Semitism seems to be mainly a response to Japan's growing economic strength and the gradually declining financial/industrial power of the US. Charges of anti-Semitism were part of an orchestrated anti-Japanese campaign which arose in America during the later 1980s.

**Much of Latin America is anti-Semitic**

Latin America has its own roster of alleged anti-semites. These normally do not include the right wing dictatorships which ruled much of Latin America in the recent past. Israeli military and police trainers have been active in arming and training the death squads in many such regimes, so of course they are kosher. This was the case in Guatemala and El Salvador and Colombia, as they were in Somoza's Nicaragua and Panama under General Noriega.

The survivors of the 300,000 people murdered by the Guatemalan and Salvadorean regimes presumably have not forgotten who helped arm and train their killers. Nor have the forces of the Colombian resistance movement forgotten the role played by the Israeli military in arming and training the right-wing Colombian death squads and army during the 1980s. If they should come to blame Israel for the murder and torture of their fallen comrades they too will be charged with anti-Semitism.

The same applies to Nicaragua during and after the overthrow of the Somoza regime. When the Sandinista government began to nationalize and redistribute the large land holdings of Somoza's cronies, who had fled, the Sandinista government too was charged with anti-Semitism because some of these land
holders turned out to be Jews. American newspapers repeated this torrent of anti-Sandinista abuse to accompany the invasion of American-backed contra forces.

Fortunately neither the former military dictatorships of Bolivia or of Brazil nor the regime of General Pinochet, installed by the military coup in Chile in 1973, were anti-semitic. In fact Pinochet gained the almost immediate support of the Israeli government, which rushed a new ambassador to Chile as its soccer stadiums and prisons were filling up with 40,000 political prisoners. It is also difficult to guess what gains the Israeli government got out of that arrangement, other than a public notification that Israel would back bloody right-wing dictators anywhere if they supported Israel.

The Argentine military regimes which periodically ruled that nation over the past 40 years actually did have fascist elements in them and were to some degree anti-semitic. By the 1970s many of Argentina's 100,000 Jews began to emigrate to the US and Israel. At this point American Jewish organizations began to accuse Argentina of being the home of Nazis. This put Israel in something of a bind since it was then engaged in peddling arms to the Argentine military, a deal which it didn't want to curtail just because some Argentinean "leftists" were being murdered.

This was resolved by the Argentine-British war over Argentina's invasion of the Falkland islands. With the Falklands made safe for sheep and democracy, the collapse of the Argentine military regime was followed by a deep economic decline. Thereafter few expatiated on the fate of Argentina's remaining Jews.

We will consider the interrelationships between Latin American right-wing dictatorships, Israel and alleged anti-Semitism in a later chapter.

**Canada is anti-Semitic**

Canada also is, or until recently was, an anti-semitic nation. This despite the fact that it has generally supported Israel throughout that country's existence. However Canada voted with the overwhelming majority of the states in the United Nations in favour of Palestinian rights and against Israel's retention of the occupied territories. What could be more anti-semitic than that?

Irving Abella's much cited book, *None Is Too Many* (1973), implicates Canadian bureaucrats in the Mackenzie King administration before and during world war 2 for systematic anti-Semitism. They were responsible for blocking the entry of any substantial number of Jewish immigrants fleeing the Nazis in Europe. They were also implicated in the infamous refusal to accept a ship load of Jewish refugees to Canada in 1939. This group was refused entry in all other states in the western hemisphere and returned to Europe and to the death of many of them. Fighting against Nazi Germany in world war 2 does not absolve Canada from its ingrained anti-Semitism.

More currently, let us consider a letter to the *Globe and Mail* of February 11, 1985, by one Edith Bailey. She writes, in relation to the fire-bombing of a synagogue in Vancouver: "If we believe that the Holocaust no longer exists, we are living in a dream world. The West German government of a few years ago reported the existence of 450 Fascist organizations in 22 countries which were affiliated with the groups in Germany. A characteristic of such groups was their hatred of Jews. We deceive ourselves if we look upon the massacre of innocent people as the special work of Germans or Nazis, as though somehow this explained it. The Jews are an ancient, honorable and holy people who were persecuted for hundreds of years before the advent of the Nazis."
I take it that anyone who does not find the Jews to be an especially honorable and holy people is part of the international network of anti-semites.

The Globe and Mail of October 30/90 carries a letter from one Steve Samuel, excoriating the UN and Canada's vote in it which demanded that Israel establish an independent commission of inquiry to investigate the killings of [17] Palestinians which had occurred on the Temple Mount earlier in October [1990]. "This is an example of a despicable 'double standard' applied against Israel. Where was the condemnation and calls for investigation of the deaths of hundreds of Muslim pilgrims at Mecca recently, or of the Indian storming of the Sikh's Golden Temple a few years earlier? Where were such calls when China massacred thousands on Tiananmen Square or when Saddam Hussein gassed tens of thousands of Kurdish villagers? The vigor of the UN's actions against Israel is surpassed only by its silence and inaction on a litany of crimes around the globe. This betrays the shameful double standard which the UN has been exercising against Israel."

Canada's support of UN resolutions is facilitated by its own lingering anti-Semitism, the writer suggests.

On January 4/91 the Vancouver Sun reports that Jewish groups are denouncing the action of New Democrat MP Send Robinson and Conservative MP Bob Corebett for meeting secretly with PLO chairman Yasser Arafat. "The meeting has upset Jewish groups", says Paul Marcus, national director of the B'nai B'rith's Institute of International affairs. "There is only so far you can go in playing with the devil' Marcus said." (Is this a case of the Devil citing the Talmud?)

The Vancouver Sun of January 31/91 notes that the Israeli Minister of Defence has visited Canada and denounced it for not giving sufficient aid to Israel. He said that "rich nations like Canada should provide more aid to the Jewish state. Speaking to the Canadian Jewish Congress, he noted that Canada had joined 14 other nations at the United Nation and condemned it for its handling of the October 8/90 'riots' which occurred on Jerusalem's Temple Mount, where 14 [?] Arab demonstrators were shot to death by the Israeli police. He said he had asked Canada's ambassador to Israel whether he thinks the Canadian Mounties could have done a better job, to the laughter of his audience."

Seventeen Palestinians murdered by the Israeli police is clearly a laughing matter for some.

Anti-Semitism in Quebec

Ingrained anti-Semitism applies doubly to French Canada and the people of the province of Quebec. They are charged with the crime of resisting conscription in both the first and second world wars. Moreover didn't a right-wing Catholic church dominate Quebec society, support Mussolini and facilitate the escape of various Vichy war criminals after world war 2? Didn't an ingrained anti-semitism extend throughout traditional Quebec? I don't know but traditional Quebec opposed a great many things accepted in the modern world.

This all changed radically during and after the 1960s when Quebec became one of the least traditional regions in the country and Quebec activists began looking outward and demanding a fuller control over their own society. Quebecers came to support the cause of the Palestinian people much earlier than Canadians in general. This presumably is another example of their continuing anti-semitism.

The Hassdim in the Outremont district of Montreal have grown in numbers through a high birth rate and are now pushing French Canadians out. According to Quebecers, the Hassdim do not mix with others but actively disdain them; they have bought up more and more properties and they refuse to learn the French language. When these issues were brought up in the La Presse newspaper B’nai B’rith and the Canadian Jewish Congress issued strong protests to that newspaper’s editors. "They saw what La Presse did as the harshest manifestation of anti-Semitism in Quebec in years.' It's not true', replied La Presse. "We are not a racist, anti-Semitic society' ... They compare our nationalism to Dachau. They don't understand our nationalism is coming from people who are oppressed. As long as I write good things about Jews, it’s O.K. When I say there is a problem here, I cannot say that."

"Irwin Cotler, the former national president of the Canadian Jewish Congress believes that 'stronger punitive action is necessary". Naturally, what else? "He said a complaint to the Quebec Press Council" would have shown that "it was not just the Jewish community telling La Presse there was a breach of the canon of ethics of journalistic responsibility ... It is not enough that the victim should stand alone. A victim is vindicated by the law. What we've had are discussions. There has been no vindication of the victim or the community by the law" (Globe and Mail, January 2/89). With Cotler the (former) Minister Justice in Canada, one can appreciate the desire of Quebecers for independence from such administration.

The above suggests that while there has been a certain abatement in anti-Semitism in Canada over the past half century it is still a living force which requires unceasing watchfulness. Some of the people doing the watching are noted in a later section dealing with the doings of Mordecai Richler.

**On American anti-Semitism in the recent past**

One might think that America, with its unparalleled Jewish lobby, its grovelling parliamentarians, and its vast financial support for Israel would be the last place on earth where one would find anti-Semitism. But nothing and no one is supportive enough for lovers of Israel.

The range of charges of American anti-Semitism are too numerous to even discuss here, except to say that they are extraordinarily imaginative and vituperative. America is charged with not entering world war 2 early enough and for not saving European Jews from the Holocaust. How it might have done so is never suggested in any meaningful way. F.D. Roosevelt, despite being the recipient of overwhelming Jewish support, has recently also been found to be anti-Semitic. Roosevelt is allegedly responsible for not throwing open America’s doors to Jewish refugees fleeing Europe during the depression era. This charge is surprisingly not made against the Republicans of that period who were especially committed to closing America’s doors to immigrants.

Indeed, there was a good deal of anti-semitism in America and restrictive immigration quotas did exist. As is charged, some fashionable hotels, resorts, clubs and other hangouts of the wealthy were effectively off limits to Jews. However this had no bearing on the lives of the great mass of the Jewish and non-Jewish populations since they couldn’t afford such venues in any case.

There was also the case of 'restrictive covenants' which shut off Jewish ownership of houses in certain areas. This included houses built by Jewish contractors and sold by Jewish real estate dealers in places such as Levittown, a huge new suburb built in New Jersey and another on Long Island at the end of world war 2. America allegedly does not lose its anti-Semitic character until the
mid 1950s. While its anti-Semitic past is behind it, it requires continual surveillance since there is always a danger of it slipping back into its evil past.

Today, both the Republican and Democratic parties, along with all the major media outlets, are deeply committed to the American Jewish lobby. There has been a disproportionate increase in the numbers of Jewish judges, lawyers, corporate managers and political leaders. The last thirty years have seen the Holocaust raised as the central event of the 20th century. The centrality of Jewish suffering in the past was, allegedly, rescued only through the creation of the state of Israel. The requisite lesson to be learned by all non-Jews is that their duty is to support Israel, whatever its actions. Jews on the other hand must support Israel as a matter of ethnic obligation.

**The Pope and the Catholic church are anti-Semitic**

The Pope of Rome, the Catholic church in general and probably most Catholics also are said to demonstrate varying degrees of anti-Semitism. After all, wasn't it the Catholic church which established the Inquisition in Spain in the early 1400s which pursued and persecuted Spanish Jews (even if Jews were only a small portion of those persecuted by that institution)?

Didn't the Catholic church make peace with and support Mussolini's fascist government in Italy? However, so did the majority of Italian Jews. Isn't Catholicism and Christianity built partly on the claim that Jews were responsible for the death of their lord, and didn't that charge lead to innumerable past pogroms? Yes, but that church like all others is built on all sorts of inconsistencies, as is typical of any religion which believes in all-powerful creator god(s).

Didn't Pope Pius XII, risen to the throne in 1939, play a major role in leading other national Catholic clergy into support of fascism in Italy, France, Croatia, Austria, and Slovakia? Yes, that is true. The Catholic church certainly was then one of the more reactionary organizations in existence. That, however, does not much concern contemporary Jews unless the Church was also anti-Semitic.

Wasn't Pope John Paul II both a Pole and a Catholic, and didn't he carry the impetus of his nation's anti-Semitism into the current era through his support for the Palestinians and the refusal of the Vatican to recognize Israel? Not really. Pope John Paul was a thoroughgoing anti-Communist and reactionary who supported reactionary regimes wherever the church had influence. But he was not anti-Semitic. Indeed, he spent a good deal of time in the middle of his papacy reminding listeners of the persecution of the Jews during the Holocaust. His support of the Palestinians, a people under foreign oppression, was somewhat surprising.

Didn't that Pope invite and hold meetings with Kurt Waldheim, the alleged Nazi who had headed the United Nations? Yes he did, but Waldheim was primarily a scapegoat of the World Jewish Congress and similar organizations. One can hold Pope John Paul II guilty of many reactionary dealings during his 24 year reign, but anti-Semitism was not one of them.

After Pope John Paul said a few words in support of the Palestinian people he was thoroughly reviled by sundry Jewish spokespersons in Israel and America. Although he bent over backwards to repent about the church's previous relationship with the Jews, he was treated as an unrepentant sinner and on the 'suspect list' of most Zionists (who weren't the least troubled by his other reactionary views). According to them, Catholics in general are tainted with anti-Semitism to some extent.
**What of the other Christian churches?**

The Greek, Russian, Rumanian, Syrian and other Orthodox churches can also be charged with various degrees of anti-semitism, especially those operating among the Palestinian population, ten percent of whom are Orthodox Christians.

The Greek Orthodox church has sometimes been hostile towards Israeli treatment of the Palestinians. Didn’t these churches bewail the massacres carried out at Sabra and Shatila camps and the Israeli invasion of Lebanon during the early 1980s? Did they protest the action of Palestinian children rioting in Israel and throwing real stones at peaceful Israeli soldiers and their tanks during the later 1980s and 1990s? No they did not! Is their criticism of Israel evidence of their inherent anti-Semitism? Many Jews would say 'yes, it is.'

Among Protestant Christians, although there are many pro-Zionists scattered among the mainline protestant churches, far too many of them are too concerned about the fate of Palestinians. They and churches like those of the Mennonites are overly concerned about so-called 'social justice' and are all potentially anti-Semitic. What did all these churches do to save Jews from the Holocaust anyway? Wasn’t Luther himself an anti-Semite? And didn’t Lutheran ministers make up the proportionally largest membership of the Nazi party? That the Lutherans have been a generally conservative force would be alright if they were pro-Israeli but Lutheranism is basically a German church. So what can you expect.

A similar estimation can be made of Anglicans and other established European religious organizations. After all, what did any of them do to oppose Nazism during its emergence and what did they do to save European Jewry? Next to nothing.

Some sixty years ago persons of liberal persuasion considered American bible-belt evangelicals as fundamentally reactionary, as well as generally being anti-Semitic. However In the intervening years many of these fundamentalists have reconsidered the Old Testament and the people who produced it. They have come to regard Jews as a God-favoured people and Israel as a God-guided nation especially since Israel's acquisition of nuclear weapons.

Many Christian fundamentalists look to Israel as a model for the way to treat restive minorities everywhere. They are now the strongest non-Jewish supporters of Israel in America, defending every action the Israelis commit. They are among the few groups currently not charged with anti-semitism and have joined the handful of 'good goyim' in the world. These evangelicals also back American military ventures everywhere in the world.

**On Muslims**

Although the Jews lived together in general peace with Muslims for some 1,200 years, Muslims are now viewed as indelibly marked by anti-Semitic and anti-Israeli sentiments. This view is underscored by Hollywood and American media commentators. Arabs are portrayed as religious fanatics who would rather see their children starve than accept western democracy. They are "beasts who walk on two legs", to use prime minister Menachem Begin's potent phrase after Israel's military incursion in Lebanon during the early 1980s.

This applies, more or less, to all other Moslems in the world, from Africa and to Central Asia. It is somewhat surprising that after almost a millennium and a half of living together in relative peace this near universal hostility should emerge only near the end of the western colonial control over Muslim countries. Could Israel's increasingly oppressive
role as a crusader state and near universal support of Israel by international Jewry have a bearing on this?

**The UN is anti-Semitic**

The United Nations has become a virtual mouth piece of world-wide anti-Semitism and anti-Israeli sentiments. It has sunk so low as to sometimes oppose the policies of Israel and America, possibly because it is dominated by representatives of newly emerged third world countries. These are usually backward societies ruled by autocratic cliques. Because they are poor they are given to envy wealthier nations, such as Israel and America, and are easily swayed by anti-semitism.

During the early 1970s the UN actually voted to support a statement branding Zionism as a form of racism. This odious act was not reversed until Ghanaian Kofi Anand, the UN's later Secretary General, rescinded that clause. By then the UN had largely receded as an international body of any consequence. However the UN's lopsided votes in favour of Palestinian rights makes it an agency of international anti-semitism. If such a position is backed by persons such as Nelson Mandela and Desmond Tutu, it merely indicates how far out of step they are with the current world.

During the mid 1970s the United Nations fell so low as to elect the Austrian Kurt Waldheim, who had once served as a very junior officer with the German army, as its Secretary-General. Waldheim was later subjected to a world-wide inquisition by Jewish organizations for his unsavory past. This campaign continued through Waldheim's run for the Presidency of Austria. Today the United Nations is largely a talk shop whose base unAmerican and anti-Semitic tendencies carry no weight with the nations that matter in the world.

**The Red Cross is anti-Semitic**

On November 13/86 the New York Times carried a letter to the editor by one Bernice Tannenbaum holding that a name change of the Red Cross was a "deliberate and blatantly hostile act of discriminatory anti-Jewish and anti-Israel rejection." It had "excommunicated the Red Star of Magen David Adom as a humanitarian peer group... The purport of this action, restricting international Red Cross recognition to Christian and Moslem emblems, is Israel's exclusion from the international agencies that synchronize and regulate aid for victims of natural catastrophes and wars. This act prejudicially imposes two religious emblems on a universal movement while flagrantly blackballing a third" (New York Times, November 13/86). So you see, the Red Cross too has become anti-Semitic.

On May 27, 1987, the New York Times published a letter to the editor by one Gil Troy, a PhD candidate in history at Harvard University. He notes that not only did the International Red Cross not get food parcels to Jews confined to concentration camps during world war 2 but actually played into the hands of the Nazis by inspecting a model camp they had established. While it did deliver some aid packages to certain prisoners, these usually did not include Jews. Until 1944, the International Red Cross allegedly "joined the Allies in the conspiracy of silence." What conspiracy might that be? The one about the existence of concentration camps, of course.

So, the Red Cross is not only ant-Semitic but co-responsible for the deaths of Jews who died in concentration camps during world war 2 (New York Times, May 27, 1987).
The Globe and Mail is anti-Semitic

The Globe and Mail newspaper of Toronto is also accused of being anti-Semitic. This happens whenever it publishes any material which some Jews dislike. In a single case, one Aba Bayefsky writes a letter to the editor of the Globe and Mail on August 16/82 which says the following:

"Your crocodile tears reflecting on the injustice of French anti-semitism (La Maladie Francaise, August 11) are not very convincing... The odd article denouncing anti-Semitism is meaningless while you, in the very same issue, and for months past fan the flames of anti-Semitism by planting items such as 'Something Explosive to Suit Every Occasion' (August 11)."

"I would suppose that there is hardly a newspaper or news channel in North America which has not been demeaned by such [anti-Semitic] charges" (Globe and Mail, August 16/82).

Things are in a bad state when Canada's leading newspaper is guilty of such thoroughgoing anti-Semitism. Read the New York Post if you want a true perspective on the world.

As far as I know no one has yet charged Brahmanism and Confucianism with anti-semitism. As far as I am aware no practitioners of Native American religious beliefs have yet been charged with the odious stain of anti-semitism. Neither have the Inuit nor the Pygmies of the Ituri forest been found to be anti-Semitic. This is a relief to those who were coming to believe that anti-Semitism was a universal human sin.

In sum, virtually all non-Jews in the world have shown greater or lesser degrees of anti-semitism in their past - a force which is ever ready to spring forth again unless a continuous watch is placed upon them. There is almost no country on the face of the earth in which Jewish groups cannot find anti-semitism at some time in the past or present. Such findings then become the topic of books, documentary films and much finger pointing. All the ages of slavery, serfdom, colonialism and capitalism, which have bedeviled people in all lands, are swept away in such denunciations.

Chapter 5. The Precursors

The Case of Isaac B. Singer

Isaac Beshevis Singer was born in Poland in 1907, the younger son of an Orthodox rabbi. His older brother, also a writer, came to America early in the 1930s and Isaac followed him there in 1937. His sister emigrated to the United Kingdom during the same period. Singer did not speak or write English well enough to publish in that language until his later years and instead wrote most of his novels and stories in Yiddish. Many of them were published in the New York Yiddish newspaper Vorwarts They began appearing there in the mid 1940s but only gained a broader audience, in translation, during the late 1950s and 1960s. Mainly they were all set in Jewish shtels (towns, villages) of Poland’s ghetto past, ranging back from Singer's youth to the 17th century.

Singer was a remarkable writer and he always had excellent translators to aid him. His style is deceptively simple without much inner dialogue or any recourse to surrealistic treatment - even his devils and other demonic figures are quite straightforward in their tricks and dealings. All the accounts revolve about Jewish characters with the goyim playing very tertiary, stock roles. They are quite an
assortment, from holy rabbis and their hangers on, successful and not so successful businessmen, village beauties, old crones, disaffected wives, fools and the initial entry of worldly Jews - not to mention a passel of Jewish holy men who dispute and ferret out the wisdom of traditional Jewish teachings. Somehow Singer makes these reactionary concerns and his characters come alive, even if most of his readers wouldn't want to live in places like that for more than a day.

Less acceptable is the fact that Singer was throughout his life a xenophobic Polish Jew who looked down on virtually everyone unlike him. Without exception the Polish peasantry, from whom the Jewish traders made their living, are all portrayed as abysmally ignorant Catholic fanatics, whose men drink up any money they earn, get into fights and beat their wives, who themselves are superstitious believers in evil spirits. They are always ready to create pogroms and to murder Jews whenever the mood strikes them. The Polish landlords are also drunkards, bullies, spendthrifts and other kinds of degenerates who borrow from Jewish money lenders but are unwilling to repay them until forced to by the law. They too are anti-Semites. The Russians are the overlords, luckily easily corrupted by Jewish contractors supplying timber, stone, and food for the Russian troops in Poland. Russian soldiers rarely appear, although when they do they are invariably murderous Cossacks.

Singer's eulogistic accounts of ghetto life attracted numbers of younger Jewish-American readers but many of his own generation shook their heads in disbelief, happy to be away from that world. Said the 75 year old grandmother of a friend of mine, "Most of my generation struggled to get away from that kind of world. It was nothing but poverty, dirt, illness and ignorance, and here you have modern people glorifying it. It's unbelievable." It really is.

Singer virtually dismisses the existence of a Jewish working class in his books. In fact the great majority of Jews living in shtels were chronically poor, often hungry and as much oppressed by 'their own' leaders and bosses as by anyone else. In Singer's accounts they are occasionally portrayed as violent Jewish butchers who sustain some illegitimate Jewish notable, people who create mob scenes in temples but who are led back to righteousness by some wonder Reb or another. In Singer's view virtually all productive work in the society of which they are a part is done by the goyim, the non-Jews, who fortunately lack any insight into why they live like they do and even more fortunately are attuned to working like oxen throughout their lives. In one of his novels (The Penitent) Singer paints a brief sketch of a 70 year old Polish woman who takes in the hero's family's wash each week, a staggering load which she carts home with great difficulty and washes by hand - for a few groschen. Singer finds this shocking yet appropriate for the goyim, exalting only that the woman's son does not help support her but rather spends his money in taverns. There is not the slightest suggestion on Singer's part that this is the kind of world which demands to be overthrown and replaced by something better. His is simply traditional Jewish chauvinism resurrected for a wider public.

In his novels set in the late 19th and early 20th centuries Jews who disdain the ways of their ancestors make an entry but normally wind up being convinced of the pointlessness of their new freedom and return to Judaism before the end of the book. Socialism and Communism to Singer are devilish ploys by the goyim. There are anti-Semites, murderous fanatics, and grasping exploiters among the goyim wherever Singer's characters go. It is surprising that his perpetual slander of non-Jews did not raise any qualms about creating a backlash. Strangely enough he did not write about the Jewish Holocaust.
The Jewish shtels and ghettos were governed and run by a cabal of leading contractors, traders and rabbis, who acted to protect their own interests and to oppose any socialist philosophizing among their own working class as a dangerous foreign disease. By the beginning of the 20th century this did not work anymore and a rather militant Jewish working class movement had grown up in Poland and Russia. When they emigrated to America or elsewhere, at least the first generation carried with them their socialist visions and joined them to comparable movements in the countries they settled in. If they or their children became "unbelieving Jews", or married non-Jews, they were held as lost, as dead actually, by the orthodox. The terrible cancer of assimilation had stolen them away.

According to Singer the history of Jews in the diaspora involved a selective process - that it was only those who were most determined to remain Jews, the most determined to maintain their separate national identify and culture, those most opposed to assimilation who remained Jews. Existence in the diaspora, where Jews were surrounded by non-Jews capable of absorbing them, weeded out those 'weak in allegiance' and retained those with a 'strong' Jewish identity. This proceeded over generations and millennia, with the 'weak' constantly removed from the Jewish community. This is a process in which only the most separatist Jews remain.

Singer's ghetto ideology is a natural concomitant of an ethnic bourgeoisie. Its interests are to act as the leaders of a separate group and it naturally loathes to see any alliance between members of 'its own community' with 'outsiders'. Indeed, virtually all conflicts are perceived as inter-group conflicts and never those of class conflicts, which would link Jews to others.

In general, this view holds that any distinguishable group is unalterably distinct - that this distinctiveness allegedly runs in the culture (or 'in the blood' as it is once again becoming fashionable to say). It leaves disadvantaged sectors under the thumb of the capitalist-theocratic leaders of 'their community'. Emphasizing conflicts with surrounding society is an old but sure way of retaining control of their communities.

The term 'ghetto' conjures up visions of crowded, slum-like enclaves containing disadvantaged and impoverished people. However true that may be in some contexts, the fact is that ghettos also contained individuals of considerably greater wealth than that found among the surrounding population. While the typical Jewish ghetto of 19th century Poland and Russia usually contained far more poor Jews than others, successful Jewish merchants, living on trade with the surrounding peasant population, tavern keepers, money lenders, contractors, timber merchants, suppliers and wholesalers etc. were also to be found in them. Ghettos were not exclusively inhabited by the poorest people of any given nation. It is difficult to hold that Jews were the most exploited in any nation.

One rarely finds much sympathy for the exploited non-Jews among the moral philosophers of Judaism. This holds true for Isaac Singer. Indeed, the impoverished masses are more typically viewed with contempt, fear and disdain. While there were important exceptions, a great many Jews did view the goyim - both the poor and the more wealthy - with contempt. And the goyim knew this perfectly well.

The leaders of the Jewish communities, basically the wealthy, had ongoing relationships with the wealthier non-Jews, the large landlords, government officials, and others of the ruling classes. These tended to also be the oppressors and exploiters of their nation's subordinate classes. This relationship in fact was a
bone of contention between the early Zionists and the established rulers of their communities.

Given the objective interests involved in the operations of ghetto capitalists it would be surprising if a class ideology had not emerged and in fact a deep rooted class chauvinism did exist. The Ghetto was not like a big (un)happy family.

In Singer's works the non-Jewish lower classes are portrayed as ignorant, brutish and only slightly removed from the level of beasts. They are the suitable creatures to do the heavy labour of the world; gluttonous, sexually promiscuous, spendthrifts, ever ready to commit violence and drunkards to boot. They are incapable of morality, they abandon their parents in age, and they are generally unclean - both physically and ritually. They are *traif*. They are the 'dirty goyim', to coin a phrase. This can be seen in their readiness to eat anything, pig meat, crabs and fish without scales, meat and milk mixed together, blood sausage and a whole roster of foods which are ritually untouchable. Worst of all the poor goyim are envious of the wealth accumulated by others. Such envy is both the sin and the threat of the lower classes. It drives their most disgusting fault - their readiness to use violence against their betters.

All the above propositions have been made by varied Jewish commentators of whom I.B. Singer is only one. If any group of people are regularly described this way it should not be surprising if they turn their hostility on those who make such charges. It was not merely anti-Semites who remarked upon this dynamic - the response to Jewish chauvinism. Many of the early Jewish socialists pointed out this quality of ghetto culture. They, the most vital elements in Jewish society in Eastern Europe, did not see such comments as the rationale of external anti-Semites.

With the emigration of so many Jews to North America and Argentina during the late 19th and early 20th centuries, their ghetto philosophy was challenged as many Jewish workers began working beside non-Jews. This, along with the secular enlightenment which came to pervade the lives of many, countered the age old ghetto sentiments. However, with the gradual disappearance of working class Jews and the transition of most Jews to various rungs of the bourgeois ladder, many of the sentiments of ghetto nationalism have reappeared.

It would be worth while to consider the specifics of a number of Singer's many books - *The Manor, The Estate, Satan in Goray, The Slave* and his varied collections of short stories. Most of these were written in the 1950s to the early 1970s. They entail many specifics of the general theses mentioned above, portrayed in multifaceted color. However there is no space here to do this.

Late in life, shortly after the Sabra and Shatilla massacres of 1982, Singer spoke of younger Israelis as materialistic and irreligious of whom one could well believe all variety of crimes. He held that the remaining true Jews were those who wore their prayer shawls and attended services each day, be they in New York, Jerusalem or elsewhere in the world, and who did not murder anyone. For an inherently reactionary writer his accounts can be quite alive. After living in New York for the better part of his life Singer finally won the Nobel prize for literature. Despite his chauvinism and reactionary sentiments, he deserved it as much as anyone does.

*Hans Morgenthau, the Morgenthau Plan and Barbara Tuchman*  
Hans Morgenthau was a senior American banker and a close advisor to F.D. Roosevelt from before and during world war 2. He was also the supportive uncle
of the writer Barbara Tuchman, whose career he had helped start and direct during the late 1930s.

Morgenthau was active in a major capacity during world war 1 and had clear visions of the proper role of the people of the world in relation to America. His plan, broached during the height of world war 2, envisioned a perpetual serf-like condition for the German people after the war. The 'Morgenthau plan', which for some years was prominent in the American view of a post war Germany, envisioned reducing the nation to a series of ministates, totally de-industrialized, whose larger cities would be abandoned as Germans were pushed onto the land to eke out an existence by growing potatoes and cabbages. German universities would be closed or restricted to nonscientific studies; the study of physics would not be permitted. A German merchant marine, army, and airforce would be totally forbidden: Germany would return to some sort of 18th century entity of backward ministates. German emigration would also be strictly forbidden. This would occur after all Nazis and Nazi sympathizers were removed from public life and a thoroughgoing Americanization program, a program of 'Education in Democracy', instituted in those schools which remained. There would also be a long period when Allied governors would have the ultimate say in the decisions of the ministates which were to emerge.

Germany was to become a pariah nation whose people were to enter into a condition which Nazi planners had envisioned for Poland some years before. That the Morgenthau Plan almost became a part of American postwar policy is an indication of how rapidly America had descended into racist ideology and revanchism in the course of a few war years. However, by the end of 1944 it had become evident, even to Roosevelt, that this policy was unworkable in Germany, unless he was willing to sanction the mass starvation of the German people.

Morgenthau quit public office at the end of that year and returned to his banking concerns, from which he was occasionally dredged up to recapitulate on his plan for a defeated Germany.

From 1938-9 and on his niece, Barbara Tuchman, developed her skills as an 'interpretive historian' with Morgenthau's support and under his influence. They were both upper class American Jews. For the next forty years of her life she expended her efforts in books like The Guns of August (1967), a tome resurrecting claims that Germany had sole responsibility for world war 1, and The Zimmerman Telegram. This latter book soberly repeated the childishly propagandistic charges that Germany had made deals with Mexico (then in the throes of revolution) and with Japan (then the Yellow peril) to join Germany in an invasion of the US, even specifying which parts of America would be ceded to each of them.

When this 'telegram' was first 'revealed' by British intelligence, just before America's entry into world war 1, it seemed to be a transparent fabrication. It had allegedly been found stashed away in the dispatch case of a junior member of the German embassy in Iraq. Some fifty years after the original scam Tuchman dusted it off and peddled it to the American public as 'restored history'. Her books often became best sellers and won her a number of literary prizes. This forwarded her claim to being a leading interpreter of history. She also extended her upper class hostility toward the Soviet Union, and to indeed to any state which did not bow to British-American supremacy during the 20th century.

After filling bookshelves with propagandistic fantasies, Tuchman died in the 1990s, a much respected American 'writer-historian'.
**William Shirer. American War Patriot**

William Shirer was the author of *Berlin Diary: The journal of a foreign correspondent* (1941) and *The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich. A history of Nazi Germany* (1959) as well as another ten books. Some of the following commentary is drawn from Shirer's autobiography, *20th Century Journey. A memoir of life and times Vol. 1* (1976).

Shirer was born in Chicago in 1904 into a lower middle class family which soon moved to small town Iowa. His mother's family were old stock New Englanders who had moved to the middle west before the American civil war while his grandfather on his father's side had emigrated from Germany in the 1840s. William Shirer throughout his life remained a patriotic American 'war liberal', cast in the mould of Woodrow Wilson. It was something he learned young and never broke free from.

We don't know much about Shirer's family life when he was growing up but by 1917 he was already gobbling down all the war stories about the bestiality of the Hun which British/American propaganda agents were then so assiduously spreading (and which in post war investigations turned out to be mainly manufactured). As a 100% American patriot Shirer cast about for some way to do his bit and the following year he hooked up with a project then making the rounds in a war-crazed America. He took up a role as a fourteen year old volunteer drill instructor for a passel of young ladies from a private school, whom he trained to march, to shoulder wooden rifles, to keep watchful eyes out for saboteurs and unAmerican deeds and to forward American 'Preparedness'. Shirer took all this quite seriously which, even for a fourteen year old, strikes me as remarkably juvenile.

In 1919 he was accepted into the state's National Guard and spent a summer drilling and 'living under canvas'. He says "Nevertheless, I found it hard to swallow the fact I would never fight in the war to make, as President Wilson said, the world safe for democracy. Well, I would be ready for the next one" (Shirer, *20th Century Journey*, 1976:152/153).

Shirer spent some years at one Coe College in Cedar Rapids, Iowa during the early 1920s. There he patronized Czech immigrants and their new nation, which has just been freed from 300 years of Austrian domination by Wilson. The new Czech nation included a population 40% of which wasn't and didn't want to be Czech. Shirer then wound up as a reporter for one of the more reactionary newspapers in Chicago. The *Chicago Tribune* was owned and run by one Colonel Robert R. McCormick, a descendant of the McCormick Reaper Company fortune and one of the more prominent reactionaries in the newspaper business. Its stock in trade was classic 'yellow journalism'.

This *Chicago Tribune* had something less than a sterling regard for truth in reporting and was geared to reproducing what it believed its readership wanted to hear and what its owner thought they ought to be told. It seems to have been mainlymeaningless glop and mountains of American self adulation.

At one point Shirer tells us about a case where he 'reported on' the crash of a US dirigible in the middle west. He had not been on the scene, knew nothing about it except what he got from a few lines of a wire dispatch. But he worked these few lines into a long account.

"All of us around the copy desk became more or less proficient at this sort of 'expansion' of the news. I had a chance at it a week after I arrived when the US Navy dirigible Shenandoah went down in a thunderstorm... I wrote two columns of vivid description from the usual wire cable. Less than a month later I did it
again when the US submarine S-51 was sunk in a collision off Block Island and thirty-two crewmen were lost. The harrowing details of these two tragedies that came out of my imagination perhaps outdid the facts a little, what we knew of them. Just as Thurber was an ace for fictionalizing President Coolidge, I was in demand for inventing the details of horrendous accidents in the air or sea" (Shirer, *20th Century Journey. A memoir of a life and times* (1976: 225).

All this without knowing the first thing about an event. Shirer is humorously proud of such skills. He was an archetypal *Chicago Tribune* reporter.

Since Shirer is a thoroughgoing American patriot, there is never, anywhere in his accounts any reference to the ingrained racism prevalent in his country or of the murderous sweatshop conditions which prevailed during his youth and young manhood nor indeed anything about the exploitation of the American working class by their bosses. There is nothing about the wide ranging reaction which pulsed through America nor anything of the general know-nothingism which prevailed there. There is certainly nothing about American imperialism rising to world power nor its role in Latin America. There is nothing about the role of the older imperial powers, Britain and France and Holland, in the colonial world. Shirer had nothing to say about the 'construction of socialism' in the Soviet Union, ruthless though it was.

Surprisingly, he wrote next to nothing about the devastating depression which gripped America and most of the capitalist world during the 1930s and created some 15 million unemployed in his own homeland. His accounts are about fundamental American good sense and the sometimes charming but basically backward ways of old Europe.

By 1925 Shirer is in Paris, sopping up the left bank culture scene and American emigre artists, then back in America. A few years later (1927) he is in Paris again and then in India and Iran (1931) and back in Europe in 1932. He spends an 'idyllic year' recuperating in Spain during 1934, in a country already then in the grip of revolutionary conflict. After this he lands a job reporting for the Parisian English-language *Herald.* In 1936 he transfers to a reporting job in Berlin. From there he flits about western and central Europe, providing Will Rogers-like 'insights' into the events of the day.

Throughout his memoir Shirer contributes an unintentional satire by picking minor pieces out of various cultural histories and turning them into the central guidelines of other societies. For instance, Austria in the early 1930's is described as follows:

"Music was in their blood and left its mark on their character. Baroque too. You could not understand the Viennese unless you realized what Baroque was, and how it too, had become a part of them and their style of life... Baroque was a call to the pleasures, fantasies and dreams of life... It was warm, sensuous at full movement. In Vienna, at least, it led to a special vision of life" (Shirer, *20th Century Journey* 1976: 432). This is an example of his meaningless characterizations of people he discusses.

He is stationed in Berlin from 1936 to the end of 1940. A world traveller who, one might think, was well seasoned through watching, first hand, the events of his time unfold. But somehow he still seems like a *Chicago Tribune* reporter covering the city scoops of the day.

Shirer recounts this part of his life in *Berlin Diary* (1941). It seems to me that many of his 'first hand accounts' and alleged interviews with the great and famous of the Nazi regime partake of such imaginative renderings as he told us about for his early Chicago reporting days. *Berlin Diary was all* reproduced from
his memory of five years spent there. He didn't keep any notes, he tells his readers, because he didn't want to endanger the lives of those who talked to him. I realize one does develop a certain skill at reproducing dialogues when doing field work, but that is valid for only a few hours afterward, until the account can be gotten down on paper. It is impossible over the course of five years. Nevertheless, that is the basis for Shirer's initial work on Nazi Germany.

Some 300 of the 450 pages of Berlin Diary deal with the first 16 months of World War 2. They are written in diary style, with the date and Shirer's personal observations and asides for each day - a strange procedure seeing that this 'diary' was all reproduced from memory.

There are some very suspicious sounding reminiscences of his 'interviews'. For instance, following the invasion of Poland in 1939, Shirer recounts a discussion with a Fraulein X, another person whose identity he cannot reveal. "She had some interesting ideas about German character, history and direction. 'The trouble with the Germans', she said, was that they were geborene Untertanen, born subjects, though Untertan conveys also a connotation of submissive subject. Authority and direction from a master above was all a German wanted in life."

"'A German', she said 'will think he has died a good German if he waits at the curb at a red light, and then crosses on a green one though he knows perfectly well that truck, against the law though it may be, is bearing down upon him to crush him to death.'"

"What embittered her - she was brilliantly bitter - was that this Germany was staking all in a war which might end the very Western civilization to which certain elements in Germany had not only contributed to but had tried to make one with German culture. She thought the present regime cared not a whit about Western civilization and represented the barbarian element which had always lurked below the surface in German history and for whom life only had meaning when it meant glorified war, force, conquest, brutality, and grinding down a weaker foe, especially if he were a Slav. She blasted away about the German's utter lack of political sense, his servility towards authority, his cowardly refusal to think for himself" (Shirer, Berlin Diary, May 11, 1940).

Actually, this sounds so much like Shirer's endlessly repeated views that I believe he simply made up this alleged interview, just as he did when covering stories as a young reporter for Chicago newspapers. Who would ever check on an anonymous informant, in a distant country which was then at war with America?

Similarly, writing from Danzig on September 18, 1939, he gives an 'eye witness' account of Polish cavalry charging German armour and being mowed down, their horses and men still lying where they fell (Shirer, Berlin Diary, 1941:159). This is an item which made it into world war 2 propaganda history, allegedly demonstrating Polish heroism but the inadequacy of their arms. In point of fact, it never actually happened; it was just propaganda presented as history in American newsreels of the time. This raises some fundamental questions about Shirer's reliability as a reporter.

France was lost in 1940 because "In the first place the French, as though drugged, had no will to fight, even when their soil was invaded by their most hated enemy. There was a complete collapse of French society and of the French soul. Secondly, there was either treachery or criminal negligence in the High Command and among the high officers in the field. Among large masses of troops Communist propaganda had won the day, and its message was 'Don't fight'. Never were the masses so betrayed" (Shirer, Berlin Diary, 1941:325).
In short, France was insufficiently militarist, as presumably were Poland, Czechoslovakia, Norway, and Holland. Besides that, there were traitors and defeatists everywhere in the high command. Despite Shirer’s early enthusiasm for the Weimar years, he later never lost an opportunity to revile Germans for being authoritarian, servile and brutal - all the things which 'good' Americans and Britons are not. An evil spirit apparently runs in German culture. Shirer had no interest and no facility in deciphering what fascism is all about and who supports it. It is all the outgrowth of what he calls 'Germanism'.

In essence, Shirer was an arm chair boob explaining to other boobs the strategies and events about which he knows next to nothing. If events hadn't been so tragic his account would be down right humorous.

*The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich* is a large book (circa 1,600 pages) and provides more than just Shirer's personal reminiscences. It presents some specifics of the development of German fascism and the forces behind it. It provides some details of events of the time (1933-1945), some of which are little known. It is possibly the most influential account of the Nazi regime to date and sold some 3 million copies between 1959 and 1968. But I have difficulty in deciding whether Shirer's accounts of these developments are generally accurate or simply advance his own views.

For instance, Shirer tells us that virtually all Austrians welcomed the Nazis into their country in 1938, forgetting to mention that the Austrian working class had been crushed in savage fighting in Vienna four years previously and that Austria had been living under quasi-Nazi rule since 1932 when her own dictator, Engelbert Dolfuss, had come to power.

Shirer does not tell us that 'plucky little Poland' had evolved its own military dictatorship during the 1930s and that after General Pilzudski died in 1935 it had veered increasingly towards fascism. Following the Munich pact it even invaded Czechoslovakia in 1939 to seize the coal rich region of Teschen. It was not the inoffensive little nation brutally invaded by German troops which it had been made out to be.

Shirer is very pro-British in the way he demands others to sacrifice themselves in order to defend Anglo-American power. Great Britain and America emerge as the knights on white horses which defeat the Nazis in the end and bring peace and justice to the world. Fade to black as the credits roll by.

As for the Germans, "It is not without significance for an understanding of the Germans, even the most respectable Germans under Hitler, that such a distinguished, internationally known firm as I.G. Farben, whose directors were honored as being among the leading businessmen of Germany, God-fearing men all, should deliberately choose this death camp [Auschwitz] as a suitable place for profitable operations" (Shirer, 1959:878).

Shirer claims that, in addition to his years of 'first hand interviews with Nazi leaders', he has perused the 465 tons of Nazi war records seized by American forces at the end of world war 2. His first hand interviews' often turn out to be based on 'sources he cannot reveal' mixed with insights more suitable for the Hedda Hoppers and Louella Parsons of his day. As for the Nazi war records: if we estimate 200 pages per pound this gives something like 18,5 million pages of records to survey. In addition are some 400 published books, including various multi-volume works, such as the 42 volume *The Nuremberg Trial of the Major War Criminals* and the 15 volume *Trials of War Criminals before the Nuremberg Military Tribunals*. This is an awful lot of material to peruse and summarize in preparation for a book. A phenomenal ability undoubtedly.
It would be ludicrous if Shirer's book were not still cited as a primary account of a central fact in modern history.

After years of terror, mass imprisonment and secret police surveillance, the non-Nazi elements in Germany were cowed into submission. What does Shirer expect the German population to do; to throw themselves before the Nazi storm troops in protest? Does he believe that Nazi Germany was a state in which public protest was both feasible and effective? It was neither; protests would simply have led to the imprisonment of additional thousands of protesters.

And what did Shirer himself do during these developments? Did he follow his own maxims or did he keep quiet and report events as they unfolded?. Despite having the protection of being a reporter for a foreign press, he didn't endanger himself in any way by protesting the events like Kristalnacht.

He tells us that "The overwhelming majority of Germans did not seem to mind that their personal freedom had been taken away, that much of their culture had been destroyed and replaced by a mindless barbarism, or that their life and work had become regimented to a degree never before experienced even by a people accustomed for generations to a great deal of regimentation."

"In the background, to be sure, there lurked the terror of the Gestapo and the fear of the concentration camp for those who got out of line or who had been Communists or Socialists or liberal or too pacifist or who were Jews... Yet the Nazi terror in the early years affected the lives of relatively few Germans. A newly arrived observer was somewhat surprized to see that the people of this country did not seem to feel that they were being cowed and held down by the unscrupulous and brutal dictatorship (Shirer, 1959: 320-321).

How would he know; he never talked to German working people and knew nothing about them.

PART THREE
Chapter 6. The Holocaust Witch Hunts

The Inquisition and 'Conviction' of Kurt Waldheim

At the beginning of the 1930s the world-wide depression struck Austria, shifting its middle class and rural population to the right. In 1932 one Englebert Dolfuss mobilized these forces and became Austria's Chancellor, relying on a home grown right wing militia known as the Heimwehr. It was then, not in 1938, when Austria fell under fascist control. The Heimwehr looked more to fascist Italy than to Germany for guidance while the nation was split between Vienna and a few other cities, which the Social Democrats continued to administer, and the rest of the country controlled by Dolfuss. At the beginning of 1934 Dolfuss moved to take over control of Vienna but was temporarily checked by armed working class resistance in a week of bloody fighting. Ultimately Dolfus won.

A broad spectrum of middle class Austrian Jews found it quite possible to continue their lives under Heimwehr fascism, a handful even joined it. The suppression of the Austrian working class and its organizations did not overly concern them. To some western historians this period is considered, if not fully democratic, merely authoritarian. Dolfuss was killed in a failed Nazi coup some time later and his place taken by a chancellor cut from the same cloth, Kurt von Schuschnigg. Austria continued to stumble on through a fascist autocracy in an economic depression.

This all changed in mid 1938 when Hitler sent his army into Austria, unopposed, to join it with Germany. It was generally known that Hitler had
managed to pull Germany out of the depths of its depression and Austrians hoped that he would do the same for them. This partly accounts for the cheering throngs of Austrians who greeted his arrival in Vienna. Any working class opposition to fascism had long since been crushed. It was then and only then that Jews became a target for attack. A considerable portion of Austria’s 160,000 Jews began to emigrate to the west.

Austria became a part of Nazi Germany and its troops joined with it in the invasion of the Soviet Union in the summer of 1941. It contributed a substantial armed forces in that effort, ultimately loosing some 400,000 dead in that conflict and in the allied bombings of Austria. It was during the war period that Austria's remaining Jewish population was taken into various concentration camps where some 30,000 to 40,000 perished. According to current Jewish Holocaust revivalists this was the crime which can never be forgiven and which must never be forgotten. If Austria had simply oppressed its own working class and invaded the Soviet Union these would have been minor peccadillos.

After the war Austria was partitioned by the victorious powers, but in conferences between the US and the Soviet Union both agreed to treat Austria mainly as a victim of Nazi aggression rather than as a partner with it.

Beginning in 1947 the Austrian government consisted of a working alliance between the conservative People's Party, whose founders included both Simon Weisenthal and Kurt Waldheim, and the predominant Social Democrats. The nation itself was committed by treaty to a neutral stand between the Great Powers. The Social Democrats were the leading party for almost 40 years thereafter and during the 1970s were led by a Jewish Social Democrat named Bruno Kreisky, who became Austria's chancellor.

During the previous war Austrian forces had been deployed in the Soviet Union and in the Balkans, where Kurt Waldheim served as a young army lieutenant and later as a low ranking intelligence officer. Despite at least three later boards of investigation carefully looking into his role there, none of them could come up with any evidence that Waldheim had participated in war crimes in any way.

The most damning charge found by these commissions was that Waldheim must have known about the policy of reprisals and liquidation carried out by the German army there 'and did nothing to stop them'. How he might have done that is unstated. In addition, he was charged with not publicizing his role in the Balkans with sufficient vigor while later serving as the UN's Secretary-General. Not much of a charge but one which Jewish organizations in the US converted into a finding of 'guilty of war crimes'.

Kurt Waldheim had served in the German army during world war 2 in the notoriously influential position of lieutenant and never rose above that rank. He was seriously wounded and removed from active duty in around 1943 but later served in an ancillary capacity until the end of the war. After the war he helped found the conservative (Austrian) People's Party, along with Simon Weisenthal. Waldheim's family were long established conservative Catholics. He joined the Austrian diplomatic service in 1945 and shortly thereafter was posted as legation chief and later Ambassador to various capitals, including Canada, during the 1950s and 1960s. He became the Austrian Foreign Minister and was Austria’s delegate to the United Nations during the later 1960s. In 1972 he was the candidate of both America and the Soviet Union to become its Secretary-General. As a conservative diplomat from a small, western oriented but officially neutralist state, he seems to have fit the bill for mutual acceptability.
Waldheim's career as UN Secretary-General (1972-1982) seems to have been unexceptionable in that he did nothing to rock the boat - his was neither a particularly good nor a particularly bad administration. However, during his career third world countries briefly came into prominence and this, coupled with the odium into which the US had fallen through its war in Viet Nam, allowed them a greater say in events than had previously or subsequently been the case. The most damning charge against Waldheim was that he permitted the General Assembly of the UN to pass a motion in 1975 condemning Israel for its crimes against the Palestinian people, a motion which equated Zionism with racism. Saying so openly in the UN was viewed as tantamount to unbridled anti-Semitism. It was then that Jewish organizations, especially in America, set out to punish Waldheim and drag his name through the mud. Allied with that was an effort to derogate UN actions past and present. The unstated theme of this attack was that the UN had gotten into the hands of its member states, states which were immature and given to demagogic actions, and that the organization should be returned to the direction of a half dozen Great Powers, particularly that of the US.

It is uncertain when preparations by Jewish groups for slandering Waldheim's reputation actually began, presumably in the later 1970s. By 1980 they had the support of a number of US politicians. In that year US Representative Stephen J. Solarz, a Democrat from Brooklyn, was already sending letters of inquiry to the C.I.A. requesting any information they had on Kurt Waldheim. When Waldheim decided to run for the Presidency of Austria in 1986, his enemies determined to charge him with past war crimes. At this time a series of 'chance discoveries' were revealed to the public. There then followed a series of charges and denunciations. This account is merely a small sample selected from more than 300 newspaper articles on the matter, which themselves are merely the tip of the iceberg. As the charges developed they came to include the work of 'specialist' historians, archival 'experts', various professional liars and document fabricators, a wide assortment of perpetually outraged public moralists, executive-secretaries of Jewish organizations, and Holocaust revivalists in general. It would require a book to document the entire Waldheim caper and all those involved so the following are just a few of the highlights of the campaign.

In the mid 1980s Waldheim decided to campaign for the Presidency of Austria on the conservative ticket, running under the slogan 'A man that the world trusts'. This was when the Jewish campaign against him took off. He was dogged by external charges about 'Nazism witnessing a rebirth in Austria.'

Organized world Jewry weren't enthused about Waldheim's recent predecessor either - Chancellor Bruno Kriesky, an Austrian Jew, a principled socialist and a survivor of the Austrian concentration camps. Why not? Because he treated emerging Israeli reaction with the odium it deserved, calling Menachem Begin a life-long terrorist and Israeli military campaigns as an unending oppression of the Palestinian people. He also noted that there had been Jewish fascists in the recent past and that the forces in power in Israel seemed to have moved in that direction. Kriesky's comments created bitter resentment among the Jewish right, who didn't quite know how to respond to him. Kriesky probably didn't think much of Waldheim either but fortunately for Waldheim's campaign Kriesky had died some years before the election.

Let us consider the campaign against Waldheim for what it says about current Nazi war crimes hunters. It demonstrates that no one in the world is above Jewish slanders and prosecution.
The caper was initiated by the 'discovery' in 1984/85 of a photograph of Waldheim in army uniform taken during the previous war. This just happened to be 'discovered' in the shop window of small antique store by a Jewish visitor while window shopping in Vienna. Handy. After the intervening 40 years Waldheim is not really recognizable but the store owner confirmed that it was him. He was selling it for a nominal price.

Copies of this photograph were then transmitted to leading newspapers in America with the shocked 'discovery' that Waldheim had served in the German army during world war 2 when it was engaged in anti-Jewish atrocities. (This would be comparable to finding a photo of a US politician who had served in the Viet Nam war.) Waldheim's photo was immediately wholesaled by the New York Times, then under the editorship of A.M. Rosenthal, and picked up by other newspapers in North America and Europe. After this almost everyone who was connected with the emerging 'war crimes hunt' got into the act.

All this was taking place during the Reagan and Bush No. 1 presidencies, then involved in war making in Central America. It may be only coincidental but Israel at the time was still smarting from world reaction to the fact that it had overseen the massacres of Palestinians at Shatilla and Sabra refugee camps in Beirut, some years earlier.

One of the speakers at a PEN conference of world writers in New York in 1986 was former Chancellor Bruno Kreisky, an Austrian Jew who was the leader of the Austrian Social Democratic party. He had become a stern critic of Israel while Austrian Chancellor (1980-1985) and now rebuked its Likud government in no uncertain terms, calling Menachem Begin a 'semi-fascist'.

"... US writer Cynthia Ozick savagely attacked Kreisky for 'embracing' Palestine Liberation Organization leader Yasser Arafat and later Libyan leader Mouammad Gaddafi. 'How do you justify yourself?' she shouted. Kreisky, citing only his record in offering assistance to Jews leaving the Soviet Union, offered to have a press conference later 'without limitation'" (Globe and Mail, January 18/86). This got nowhere.

By early 1986 the Holocaust revival campaigns were already well under way with a host of Jewish organizations, leaders and enthusiasts discovering anti-Semitism wherever they looked. Kurt Waldheim was then running for the presidency of Austria (a largely symbolic office). One of the early organizations to get in on the charges against Waldheim was the World Jewish Congress, an outfit then headed by Canadian billionaire Edgar Bronfman, son of the leading Canadian booze baron of Seagrams Inc. Edgar had spent world war 2 as a youth boffing shicksas and dreaming about killing Germans, a sentiment he apparently retained into his adult life. He was engaged in a crusade of Jewish retribution and was ready to utilize his wealth and connections in this cause.

The pattern of this campaign was for some individual or group to level charges against Waldheim, then for a host of others to chime in with their own claims against him, supported by very spurious 'evidence' or none at all. As soon as Waldheim replied to one set of charges he was accused of 'denial' and lying and a host of additional charges against him issued forth from the witch hunters. When some set of charges against him was disproved by investigating panels the witch hunters simply acted as if these findings did not exist and continued slandering Waldheim with the old, disproved, charges. There seemed to be an infinity of Jewish and allied researchers collecting 'evidence' against Waldheim who were all given coverage in the North American press.
There was a landslide of charges - that he had participated in the deportation of Greek Jews, had been involved in killings of Yugoslav partizans, had directed the execution of British commandos, had been part of various war crimes in Russia, etc. etc. All of these were traipsed through the press and repeated by travelling lecturers so that Waldheim was charged, tried and publicly convicted without any sustainable evidence ever being offered.

All this came as an embarrassment for Simon Weisenthal, still resident in Austria, and then renowned as the original 'Nazi hunter'. He was honored by having a major Holocaust revival center in America named after him. However, he had been a co-founder of the Austrian Peoples Party in the later 1940s along with Kurt Waldheim and had known him ever since. But he didn't know and didn't believe that the charges against Waldheim could be correct. However, after a good deal of arm twisting by his American counterparts he did finally agree to urge Waldheim not to seek the Austrian Presidency. For a man who allegedly 'fearlessly tracked down' 3,000 Nazis in the course of his investigations, it is surprising that he wouldn't have known of Waldheim's alleged background.

At least one of Wiesenthal's American supporters, Marvin Hier, the director of the Simon Wiesenthal Center for Holocaust Studies in Los Angeles, felt that he was letting down his side by not jumping on the bandwagon.

Let me cite a very limited pastiche of extracts from articles appearing in the North American press on the Waldheim case.

Rudolf Kirschslager, a former judge and the then President of Austria noted that ".... the documents offered no substantiation for other charges, such as that Mr. Waldheim took part in war crimes or knew about the deportation of Greek Jews to Nazi death camps. The documents were made available by the United Nations and the World Jewish Congress'... Mr Kirschslager, a former judge, said that on the strength of the documents made available to Austria from the archives of the United Nations War Crimes Commission, 'I would not dare to file an indictment in a regular court against Mr.Waldheim.'" Although he noted that because of Waldheim's role in the military apparatus he should have known about the reprisals leveled at Greek partizans.

Kirschslager was then loudly denounced as a defender of Nazi war criminals and later barred from any dealings with American diplomats (New York Times, April 23/86).

Waldheim's son, Gerhard Waldheim, a 38 year old graduate of the Harvard Business School and a banker in Austria, had taken a temporary leave of absence and was helping to defend his father's reputation. He had hired a Washington public relations firm and "... met with journalists, historians, and officials from the Administration, the United Nations and Jewish groups. He testified today before a Congressional committee."

"We're not professionals at this game,' he said in an interview. 'Unlike the World Jewish Congress, we don't have the resources to conduct a manhunt'... 'He is pitted against the World Jewish Congress, which has issued more than a dozen strongly worded press releases, along with photo-copies of hundreds of German war documents that call Mr Waldheim a Nazi and a liar."

"Officials of the World Jewish Congress have denied charges by Kurt Waldheim and others that they have manipulated press coverage by releasing only a few documents at a time, have drawn unwarranted conclusions and have presented old information in new forms."
"....Elan Steinberg, executive director of the World Jewish Congress [said] 'It's not as if Waldheim were simply an auto mechanic hiding out in Cleveland'" (New York Times, May 19, 1986).

I'm not sure if he was referring to one John Demjanuk, a former Ukrainian target of the Holocaust hunters who had been stripped of his American citizenship and sent to Israel for a war crimes trial by prosecutors in the US Office of Special Investigations but later had the case against him overturned by an American Appellate court after being sentenced to death for war crimes in Israel.

William Safire is a senior newspaper commentator who made a name for himself during the 1960s to 1970s by recruiting his colleagues to write for the C.I.A. and peddling that agency's line in the American press. He now writes editorial pieces for the New York Times. In one of these he weaves together charges against Kurt Waldheim and Gore Vidal. Vidal, who had taken a swipe at Norman Podhoretz and his wife Midge Decter ("the driving spirit behind the 'Committee of the Free World'"), both militant Zionists and right-wing Americans. Apparently Vidal had called them Israeli fifth columnist, which Safire considers to be an outrageous anti-semitic smear. He should know something about smears since they are the stuff of his columns.

Safire writes "For nearly a decade, with a secret Nazi heading the UN, the lie was propagated that 'Zionism is racism'; now from the pen of a best-selling American novelist we have the lie that for Jewish Americans Zionism is treason... The imputation of disloyalty to the fiercely pro-American Podhoretzes and all 'pro-Israel lobbyists' is a mistake... Revoke your Jew-baiting 'fifth column' libel, Mr. Vidal. It is unworthy of one who presumes to be 'America's current biographer" (New York Times, May 19, 1986).

We find Waldheim's name is now being dragged into the charge of mongering, quite irrelevantly, merely as a term of abuse. Podhoretz and his wife have by now become contemporary versions of Roy Cohn, of Senator Joe McCarthy fame.

A month later, writing in the Los Angeles Times (June 11/86) William Pfaff notes that Mr. Podhoretz (who edits Commentary for the American Jewish Committee) has been traipsing around America trying to rally writers and intellectuals to denounce Mr. Vidal but could get only 6 out of 90 writers he approached to do so, ".... which one fears may be interpreted by him as additional evidence of anti-Semitism among American intellectuals." Pfaff mentions that he has a personal interest in this matter since he was denounced by Podhoretz as "anti-Semitic because of things I wrote in this column about Israel's conduct during the siege of Beirut in 1982." He was also attacked by Midge Decter about critical things he had written on America's role in Central America.

Pfaff notes that "Jews did suffer terribly during world war 2, but that does not relieve Israel from criticism observers have for it and any other state, especially not when it is on such warm terms with America and so dependant on American aid. Leveling such criticism does not constitute anti-semitism regardless of what persons like Mr. Podhoretz claim (Globe and Mail, May 29/30/31, 1986).

John Fraser, one of the more level-headed Canadian journalists, was one of the few reporters anywhere who was not swept along by the charges against Mr. Waldheim. He writes that Waldheim's presidential campaign had been well ahead in the race for the Austrian Presidency - he would be the first Conservative candidate to win in a generation - but his campaign was now losing momentum. "Last week he held a large and mostly successful rally in central Vienna during which he was subjected to short bursts of vociferous heckling, courtesy of a small group of protesters led by yet another outsider, a West German anti-Nazi
campaigner Beate Klarsfeld... But it should be remembered that Austria has elected a Jewish Chancellor in the past, in the redoubtable form of Bruno Kreisky. The country is not in any way headed toward fascism" (Globe and Mail, May 29, 1986).

Fraser writes of Simon Wiesenthal, a man who has been pursuing Nazis and bringing them to trial for 40 years through "A conviction coolly pursued by systematic scrutiny of all available documentation, global sleuthing, moral pressure, adroit deployment of publicity and - perhaps most important - by the image of one man refusing to forget or in any way compromise the memory of a catastrophe in human affairs." "In February however, he was caught out on a limb when the World Jewish Congress accused the former secretary-general of the United Nations, Kurt Waldheim, of much more active involvement in the Nazi regime then he had ever admitted" (Globe and Mail, May 29, 1986).

The WJC and subsequent investigations by journalists and researchers (often working under the aegis of the WJC) held that ".... contrary to Mr. Waldheim's version of events, he had not been discharged from the German Army in 1943 to lead a quiet life of a law student in Vienna. Right up almost to the end he had been on active duty in areas - particularly in Greece where Nazi brutality had been an everyday event." "When these charges were first made many journalists mistakenly assumed that the evidence had come from [Wiesenthal's] Jewish Documentation Center. Instead, its director was soon in the news seemingly supporting Mr.Waldheim's initial claims that the charges were baseless and the product of a smear campaign. Mr. Weisenthal speaking up for Mr Waldheim was as newsworthy as the original charges."

Weisenthal, under strong American Jewish pressure, later dropped his support for Waldheim but continued to hold that he was no war criminal. "But most of his ire had been vented on the WJC for stirring up anti-Semitism in Austria. In fact, Mr. Weisenthal was reported to be under pressure right from the beginning to help Mr. Waldheim out of his difficulty and the pressure came from several officials of the conservative People's Party, with which Mr. Weisenthal has long been associated.' "In any case, Mr. Wiesenthal and WJC secretary-general Israel Singer are engaged in a savage word-slinging match. Mr Singer had been widely quoted on television and in a magazine interview as saying that if Austrians elected Mr. Waldheim they are 'asking for remorseless scrutiny and contempt.'" Strangely, Austrians were somewhat angered by such threats (Globe and Mail, May 31/86).

In the same issue the Globe and Mail reports that the secretary-general of the World Jewish Congress said that the "US government would be guilty of 'silence in the face of evil' if it does not ban Kurt Waldheim for his actions in the German army during the Second world war." Israel Singer said there is no excuse for the Justice Department's delay in announcing such a ban which was proposed by the Office of Special Investigations, the US agency that investigates war crimes' and which then was under Jewish control (Vancouver Sun, June 5, 1986).

Edgar Bronfman, the then current head of the World Jewish Congress, berates Waldheim for not admitting to all the things which the Congress has accused him of, including being a Nazi war criminal (New York Times, June 4,1986).

The New York Times reports that Rabbi Marvin Hier (a former 200% supporter of President Nixon and for continuation of the war in Viet Nam), currently the dean of the Los Angeles Simon Wiesenthal Center for Holocaust Studies, has had a talk with French Prime minister Jacques Chirac and informed him that Waldheim
had given false evidence about his involvement in World War 2. He had informed Mr. Chirac that a special report compiled on the matter by French investigators in the 1970s suggests that Waldheim had been on military duty longer than he admits to (New York Times, June 5/86).

The above mentioned report reveals that Waldheim had served in the Balkans for some time after 1942 (Globe and Mail, June 5/86). So what?

"Justice Minister [of Israel] Yitzhak Modai said yesterday Israel does not have enough evidence to indict Kurt Waldheim but that information will be sought from the US Government about the former UN Secretary-General. Mr Modai told reporters that Israel lacks proof to charge Mr. Waldheim, even for indirect involvement in war crimes. 'I don't think we have enough evidence to ask the Government to bring him to trial at this point.'... Mr. Modai appeared to retreat from a statement he made May 22 when he said Israeli investigators had sufficient evidence to indict Mr. Waldheim as an accessory to war crimes even though there was no proof of his personal involvement in atrocities" (New York Times, June 6, 1986). Maybe they were planning to indict him for being a German soldier during World War 2.

Waldheim's son, Gerhard Waldheim, publishes an article which defends his father, saying that all past investigations have failed to show that he was a Nazi and that Simon Weisenthal himself has said that "there is absolutely no evidence the man was involved in war crimes." He notes that his father and uncle had demonstrated against the impending Anschluss [in 1938] and that tales of him being a Nazi are simply a myth being spread by his detractors. That his grandparents had been deprived of their jobs and titles for being anti-Nazi and that the family was pressured into leaving their hometown because of this and lived an uncertain existence for long afterward. Waldheim's role in the Balkans was mainly in Trieste, where he served as a translator with the Italians. That during the period when he is charged with overseeing the deportation of Jews from Salonika he was, demonstrably, not there. Finally, charges that he was involved in reprisals against Yugoslav partisans stems from the coerced testimony of a German prisoner of the Yugoslavs who gave false testimony in order to save his own life. He notes that the Yugoslav authorities had never pursued these allegations.

"Not one charge against Mr. Waldheim has stuck for the simple reason he was not a Nazi, was not a 'senior intelligence officer', did not participate in the shameful slaughter of Jews or civilians or partisans or anything remotely connected with 'war crimes' (Globe and Mail, June 9, 1986).

Appearing on the same page as Gerhard Waldheim's article is a piece by one Menachem Rosensaft, a lawyer and chairman of the International Network of Children of Jewish Holocaust Survivors. In a piece entitled 'He is Not Free of Guilt' Mr. Rosensaft notes that the Holocaust was not carried out by the perpetrators alone but with the support of the entire German-Austrian nation.

"Thus whether or not he was a war criminal, he certainly was a Nazi .... both by his actions and by his failure to protest even a single atrocity - endorsed all the reprehensible polices of the Hitler regime. As a result, he is no more a desirable member of society than were Mengele or Eichmann."

"Who was responsible for the annihilation of millions of Jews? Who murdered my grandparents, my five and a half year old brother, my aunts, my cousins? Surely, not only those men and women who were present at Auschwitz, Treblinka and Bergen-Belsen and their immediate superiors. Who bears the responsibility for the 'final solution of the Jewish question'? Surely not only those who
conceived and implemented it. Surely their comrades, their friends back home, and all those who cheered Adolf Hitler on and allowed his Government to function were also guilty."

Rosensaft ends with, "Kurt Waldheim and everyone else who participated in any way in implementing the Nazi ideology are collectively responsible for the Third Reich's crimes against humanity. In matters of historical responsibility no one is only a little guilty" (Globe and Mail, June 9/86).

So, collective racial responsibility exists for crimes carried out by others. Is that the kind of thing Rosensaft teaches descendants of holocaust survivors? Will he also teach them that the Jews everywhere 'are not just a little guilty' of war crimes against the Palestinian people?

Waldheim's election and the aftermath

To everyone's shock and dismay Austria then elected Waldheim as President (a largely ceremonial position) in 1986 by a 53% majority. The Austrian population may have had enough of the hate mongering leveled against them while the Social Democrats may have seemed to be acting as puppets for hostile external forces. Although a number of leading Social Democratic governmental figures resigned in protest over Waldheim's election it did not save them from being tarred with the broad racist brush being applied by individuals like Edgar Bronfman. Bronfman and his World Jewish Congress charged Austrians as a whole as being anti-Semites, as being a nation of mass murders and co-conspirators with Waldheim. This was his view from the outset.

Throughout the first half of Waldheim's Presidency the World Jewish Congress endlessly repeated past, still undocumented, charges while it discovered 'new archival evidence' showing that Waldheim was a 'war criminal'.

Under a heading of 'Austrian presidential vote result a nightmare for Jews, Israel says', "Kurt Waldheim has won the Austrian presidential election by 53 per cent of the vote." I suspect that a part of that vote was a rejection of the hate mongering leveled against him and Austria. Although a life long socialist, had I been an Austrian watching that international campaign I would have been tempted to vote for Waldheim simply as a protest.

"As the first results (of the Austrian election) were issued, Israeli Deputy Foreign Minister Roni Milo said on Israeli radio 'The fact that Mr. Waldheim will be elected is like a nightmare to every Jew and every Israeli...' The Waldheim case is active and open around the world and in a world where there are murders and torturers as leaders, there is now a President who is an unrepentant Nazi, World Jewish Congress executive director Elan Steinberg said in New York" (New York Times, June 9/86).

This is an example of so many Jewish charges - no evidence other than lurid claims and fabrications which are then endlessly repeated by every commentator. This then takes on the quality of the 'proof' tendered.

"The Soviet Union today harshly denounced Washington and 'Zionist circles' for waging a 'campaign of personal hostile attacks' against Mr. Waldheim... It is noteworthy that the US Administration and Zionist circles resorted to flagrant interference in the pre-election struggle and launched a campaign of personal hostile attacks against Mr. Waldheim in an attempt to influence the outcome of the presidential elections. Tass also said that 'The war in which 20 million Soviet lives were lost, remains a dominant memory in the country, and it would have been difficult for Soviet leaders to concede that they supported a man whose behavior had been in the least questionable. .....'"
"The Tass commentary implied that the accusations against Mr. Waldheim had been pressed by the United States and Israel in retaliation for his stance at the United Nations, as part of a broader campaign to discredit that world body..." The entire hostile campaign which pursued definite aims was based on accusations that during World War 2 Waldheim had served with the German Army, which he himself did not deny, and had allegedly participated in 'punitive operations' in the Balkans' Tass said. 'It is now becoming increasingly clear that the true causes of the hostile campaign against Mr. Waldheim are not connected with his past', the commentary said, charging that the United States sheltered thousands of Nazi war criminals" (New York Times, June 9/86).

In a related New York Times article of the same day, Burton Levinson, national chairman of the (anti)Defamation League said "The Austrian people have made their choice, which in a democracy was theirs to make, but now they must accept the consequences of that choice. We call on the United States Government and all governments which uphold morality and justice [?] to refuse to receive Kurt Waldheim pending the outcome of a thorough and unhampered investigation of his Nazi record" (Vancouver Sun, June 9/86). This is about what one would expect from an outfit which had supported McCarthyist witch hunts in the past.

The Canadian Jewish Congress demanded that Austrian president Kurt Waldheim be barred from Canada. In a telegram signed by Dorothy Reitman, president of the Congress, sent to External Affairs Minister Joe Clark, she said that "Waldheim's presence amongst us would constitute an insult to the victims of Nazism and those who fought against it and indeed would be morally repugnant to all Canadians.... He was involved in savagery as a member of Nazi occupation forces of Yugoslavia and Greece where thousands of Jews were sent to their destruction." The C.J.C. seems to be in the business of manufacturing 'moral repugnance'.

Foreign Minister Clark rejected this appeal and sent a 'carefully worded' note of congratulation to Mr. Waldheim on his electoral victory (Vancouver Sun, June 11/86).

One Jim Cox, writing in the Cox News Service distributed by the New York Times, tells us that "The sins that made possible the Holocaust were not just the depravity of Hitler and his storm troops but the pusillanimity of every person who looked the other way."

"Those were not just Germans. Churchill and Roosevelt knew more than they let on. Those who tried to alert Americans found few listeners. In all the occupied countries - France in particular - were willing collaborators who offered up Jews as sacrifices for their own protection .... No monstrosity in modern history compares with Hitler's genocide against the Jews. Millions of Germans and Austrians lifted not a finger in protest, Waldheim of course, among them. Because so many of his countrymen sinned similarly, they seem tolerant of his complaisance. Their anger is directed not at the unspeakable crime against the Jews but at those Jewish organizations that insist it be remembered" (New York Times, June 12/86).

One might ask about the other 40 million people who died during World War 2, including 8 million Germans, civilians and others murdered by virtually every side. There are many other unspeakable crimes of that era which have gone unaddressed. What would Mr. Cox do if he found himself in a situation as prevailed in Nazi Germany? Would he courageously resist the Nazis? Somehow I very much doubt it.

Waldheim told reporters that his campaign had been totally devoid of any appeals to anti-semitism. He also accepted a proposal that a commission of
historians be established to investigate all charges about his war record. "I welcome all efforts in this regard because they can only help me in clarifying the situation', Mr. Waldheim said of the proposal for a panel of military historians to study his war years in Greece and the Balkans. The proposal was made this week by Simon Wiesenthal, the Nazi-hunter" (Globe and Mail, June 20/86).

In Canada, McGill law professor Irwin Cotler said that Canada 'knew' that Mr. Waldheim was a war criminal or that there was prima facie evidence that he was a war criminal. Since nothing of the sort had been yet established, all such charges are simply that, orchestrated charges. One wonders what kind of law students Cotler is turning out at McGill.

He went on to say that "The Canadian Government was therefore approving the credentials of Mr. Waldheim (in 1958) when it knew and had information in its possession that he was a war criminal' Mr, Cotler told reporters (Globe and Mail, June 23/86). Cotler had long been engaged in a campaign to either free or find out what happened to Raoul Wallenberg, the hero who allegedly saved so many Jews but who was imprisoned by Stalin in his gulags. He was the spokesman of a long term anti-Soviet, hate campaign. Cotler later became the 'Minister of Justice' in the 'Liberal' government of Paul Martin; therefore it would be unwise to call him a lying reactionary and a professional hate monger.

In a letter to the editor, Michael Carroll of the University of Western Ontario writes that "Michele Landsberg attributes the United Nations passage of its 'Zionism is racism' resolutions in 1975 to Soviet anti-Semitism and the machinations' of 'ex-Nazi' Kurt Waldheim' (Dreadful Words And Dreadful Silences Cast Shadow At UN - May 17). "As usual when this resolution is discussed, the substantive issue overlooked is 'Is Israel a racist state'? Sociologists define a racist state as one characterized by state approved discrimination based upon race, religion or ethnicity. Israel is racist because discrimination is legal and wide spread." Carroll alludes to the Jewish National Fund which reserves some 90% of the land of Israel exclusively for Jews (Globe and Mail, July 9/86).

That letter may serve to get him listed as an anti-Semite on some Canadian Jewish watch list or hauled before a Canadian court as a disseminator of 'false news'.

Under a headline reading 'Waldheim sworn in among jeers, cheers' we read that "As Mr. Waldheim entered the building [the Hofburg Palace] US Rabbi Avraham Weiss, in concentration camp garb, and West German Nazi-hunter Beale Klarsfeld held up a banner reading, 'No to the War Criminal President.' In the crowd of mainly elderly people one man said, 'When we criticize them for calling our president a war criminal we're branded as anti-Semitic' (New York Times, July 9/86). This is presumably an example of the anti-semitism prevalent in Austria.

Israeli and Yugoslav diplomats did not attend and the Israeli parliament marked the day with a special screening of the nine hour television offering of 'Shoah', based on interviews with survivors of the Holocaust.

Under a headline reading 'Waldheim Sworn In; Protests Few', we read that six persons protested Waldheim's swearing in. "The leader of the protest was Rabbi Avraham Weiss of the Hebrew Institute of Riverdale in New York, who is on the third day of a hunger strike. 'We stand before the presidential palace' the rabbi shouted in English toward a group of Waldheim supporters, 'to tell Mr. Waldheim that the voice of moral conscience will haunt him wherever he goes." They then marched to a larger demonstration within Vienna to the accompaniment of alleged anti-Semitic slurs.
The Austrian ambassador to the US writes an Op.Ed. piece in the New York Times (June 10/86). He responds to a claim that the election of Kurt Waldheim as President of Austria 'amounts to an act of symbolic amnesty for the Holocaust'.

"Nothing could be further from the truth! The Austrian people elected Mr. Waldheim not because of his alleged wartime past but because they were convinced that the accusations against him were not true. Documents so far produced by the World Jewish Congress, as well as those from other sources, have provided no evidence that President-elect Waldheim was involved in war crimes."

In response to Bronfman's charge that there had never been "a whole hearted denazification in Austria", the Austrian ambassador replied that the country was indeed denazified, and Nazi influence effectively eliminated. This was done under the supervision of the Allied powers, the United States among them. More than 100,000 former Nazis were removed from public office, thousands were imprisoned, 43 death sentences were pronounced, 30 persons were executed. Nazi activities were banned by law and criminally prosecuted."

He goes on to note that in addition to the 55,000 Jews who died in Austria, some 35,000 non-Jews also fell in the anti-Nazi resistance. That was in addition to the 400,000 Austrians who died during world war 2, not to speak of the suffering endured by millions of others. "That is quite enough for Austrians to reject any sentimentality about the Nazi period" (New York Times, September 11/86).

However, I am afraid that the ambassador misses the main point. As Israel sinks ever deeper into racism, reaction and militarism its supporters abroad require an ever greater commitment from their members. The real purpose of the holocaust revival is to persuade others of the unique suffering of Jews and to bind Jews ever tighter in support of Israel.

The World Jewish Congress releases translations of what it alleges were Yugoslav government documents gathered in 1947 which supposedly 'prove' that Mr. Waldheim was responsible for orders to German troops to kill civilians and burn settlements." Mr. Waldheim was a lieutenant throughout the war and it would seem that he would not be in a position to order troops to do anything like that.

"A spokesman for the [Jewish] Congress, Elan Steinberg, said the latest document was given to the organization by a 'non-governmental source' in Belgrade, who obtained it from government archives" (New York Times, November 12/86). Ah, more irrefutable evidence. Like the Bulgarian connection behind the plot of a right-wing Turkish terrorist to kill the pope.

"An official Israeli inquiry has found little evidence Austrian President Kurt Waldheim committed Nazi war crimes against Jews, the Jerusalem Post reported today... [It] said a justice ministry probe concluded there could be grounds for suspecting Waldheim of abetting Nazi war crimes but not crimes against Jews. Israeli officials confirmed the report was finished but said a decision has yet to be made on whether to make it public" (New York Times, November 24/86). Suspecting, eh?

"An official Israeli inquiry has found little [i.e. 'no'] evidence that Austrian President Kurt Waldheim committed Nazi war crimes against Jews, the Jerusalem Post reported today." The Jerusalem Post said that the inquiry ordered in [the previous] April by Simon Peres, who was then prime minister, found that evidence even of general war crimes was not enough for a hypothetical extradition request for Mr. Waldheim to stand trial."

Cabinet minister Yitzhak Modai, "...justice minister when the inquiry began, said in [the previous] May that Israel had sufficient evidence to put Mr. Waldheim of
trial for war crimes. He later acknowledged that most of the evidence he had seen came from newspaper reports quoting Israeli residents, who said they had witnessed Mr. Waldheim's involvement in war crimes."

This rather remarkable finding by a panel of Israeli historians received only the scantiest attention in North American newspapers and was dismissed by the World Jewish Congress. They simply treat the findings as if the investigation had never existed; they simply repeat their initial charges. A number of prominent Israelis are taken aback and act as if they had been betrayed by this historians' panel. (Globe and Mail, April 14/87)

"The Jerusalem Post newspaper admitted yesterday that it published a fake letter [allegedly] from Austrian Foreign Minister Alois Mock to British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, suggesting the resignation of Mr. Waldheim. The newspaper has determined that the document, which it published in February, was a fabrication. Editor Ari Rath has expressed regret at this publication" (New York Times, April 28/87).

The Canadian Jewish Congress on Sunday, suggested that Mr. Waldheim should not stand for election in Austria and went on to say, 'Let Austria decide whether it is a civilized country or the dirty anti-Semitic dog that they so far have been'" (Globe and Mail, May 10/86).

"In a letter to Mr Bronfman, a copy of which was released to the Globe and Mail, Mr. Herndl, the Austrian ambassador to Canada, said 'You are aware', he wrote to Mr. Bronfman, 'perhaps to a higher degree than anyone else, that all the investigations, including those conducted by Israeli authorities...have come to the conclusion that our Federal President is not guilty of any war crime. You would seem to prefer to ignore this evidence, and instead continue to insult the Austrian people in a summary fashion" (Globe and Mail, May 10/86).

Bronfman replied by urging the European Community not to admit Austria into its ranks as long as Waldheim is the Austrian president (Globe and Mail, May 10/86).

In a letter to the editor, one Herbert Wolf writes "Regrettably Edgar Bronfman's baseless comments about the people of Austria are an insult, especially to the thousands of Austrians who opposed the Nazi regime and as a result ended up in concentration camps, many of them paying with their lives for their political beliefs. Without denying that anti-Semitism hasn't been wiped out in Austria, it is clearly unjustified to condemn an entire nation for what happened half a century ago. It also needs to be pointed out that only a tiny fraction of the war-time population was directly responsible for the criminal acts against humanity committed during the Nazi years" (Globe and Mail, May 20/86).

However one Rose Ehrenworth, in a letter to the Globe and Mail editor on May 31/86, supports the general thrust of Bronfman's slanders and points out that Austria was not an occupied nation but one which collaborated with Nazi Germany during world war 2. "Many Austrians willingly staffed Nazi concentration camps as well as the SS. And after the war the Allies did not require these Nazis to account for their evil deeds. Had the Austrians wanted to redeem their tainted image they could have rejected Kurt Waldheim instead of electing him president." Another member of the Moral Majority heard from.

On December 1/86, Bronfman says in Hamburg, "No one in the world, and not in Germany either, likes to live with an ugly past... There's a feeling in Germany 'We've atoned enough, we have to get on with life.' I can understand this feeling but I can't approve of it."
Bronfman continues "Chancellor Kohl feels that since he was too young to participate in the war that he is not responsible for the acts which were committed then. He probably thinks 'I don't want to bear this cross', Bronfman said. The fact is, Germany must bear this cross" (Globe and Mail, December 1/86). Presumably in perpetuity.

The American Department of Justice today placed Kurt Waldheim on a list of people (some 40,000) which bars him from entering the US. This was demanded by certain Jewish organizations in that country. "The evidence collected, 'a Justice Department spokesman said at a news conference,' established a prima facie case that Kurt Waldheim assisted or otherwise participated in the persecution of persons because of race, religion, national origin, or political opinion'... A Justice Department official said that the broad outlines of the case against Mr. Waldheim had been discovered (?) last year in the National Archives in Washington by the department and the World Jewish Congress, which conducted its own inquiry. In addition, more detailed information was found last year when Neal Sher, director of the Office of Special Investigation, went to Yugoslavia to examine archives there." (Italics mine) (New York Times, April 28/87)

Mr. Sher is the government official engaged in tracking down 'Nazis' in America, and was deeply involved in railroading one Mr. Demjanuk into deportation from the US to a trial in Israel. He is a leading example of Jewish hate mongers who have taken over key offices in America and are using them to pursue their own group's agenda. It should be remembered that all this investigating takes place some four to five years after Israel's murderous deeds in Lebanon, in which it is still fighting and killing.

The New York Times of April 29/87 reported that "In a statement read by Chancellor Franz Vranitsky [the Austrian socialist leader] after a three hour Cabinet meeting the Government called the American procedure 'beyond grasp and therefore incomprehensible.'

"Mr. Waldheim is the first head of state to be barred from the US under legislation earlier placed on the law books by a former member of the House of Representative, Elizabeth Holtzman, now the District Attorney for Brooklyn (Globe and Mail, May 5/87).

The Austrian government intends to set up a historical commission to examine allegations about President Waldheim's past. "The idea of [another] commission to examine allegations against Mr. Waldheim drew support from veteran Nazi hunter Simon Weisenthal, who said it would have to be an international panel, but was rejected as pointless by a top Austrian historian" (New York Times, May 8/87).

Kurt Waldheim directs his lawyers to sue Edgar Bronfman for slander in claiming that Waldheim was 'part of the Nazi killing machine'. "At a news conference tonight, Mr. Bronfman, an industrialist... said he refused to take Mr. Waldheim's suit seriously. 'I'll cross that bridge over the Danube when we get to it; he said... I don't take him seriously as a human being... 'The evidence about his misdeeds and of his lying about his past is so obvious that it's almost a crime against humanity to have very much to do with this man as an individual', added Mr. Bronfman'(Vancouver Sun, May 15/87).

Bringing a slander suit against Bronfman is a poor decision by Waldheim since it is patently impossible to bring a Jewish billionaire, who also is head of a major Jewish organization in America, to trial no matter what his crime is.

Three Austrian government appointees who researched Kurt Waldheim's Second world war record in Yugoslavia said they had found no evidence he was involved in atrocities. "They said the documents provided' no indications of Mr.
Waldheim's participation in actions of retribution in the fight against partisans or in measures against Jews, prisoners of war or deserters" (Vancouver Sun, May 27/87).

Israel Singer, now Secretary-General of the World Jewish Congress, was among those who in March of 1986 revealed Waldheim's alleged Nazi past. In addressing a meeting of the National Council of Jewish Women in Canada he noted that the irony of the situation was that the primary evidence of Waldheim's alleged guilt as a war criminal was to be found in the UN War Crimes Commission archives themselves. "He said it is outrageous that member states of the UN would not check the organization's own files before Waldheim was elected secretary-general in 1972."

"Sometimes shouting and gesticulating wildly, Singer spoke of how 'for 2,000 years it was open season on the Jews.' However, with the creation of the state of Israel and armed forces to defend it, Jews' now have the capability to respond to terror with terror and will continue to do so." No doubt they will.

"He urged the delegates to learn from terrorists - not from their ideology or methods but from 'their total commitment, the mad completeness with which they've given themselves over to... I want my children to be terrorists - not blowing up buses, not maiming children - but in terms of the commitment terrorists have made.' Singer pointed to his yarmulka, the traditional cap worn by orthodox Jews, and said 'This is the sign of the guerrilla'"(New York Times, June 18/87).

The Uzi submachine gun and the Yarmulka are to be the marks of those committed to Jewish Justice?

Waldheim reports that he had been accepted to pay an official visit to the Pope of Rome, John Paul II. "Several Jewish organizations [in the US] expressed outrage yesterday at the Pope's plan to receive Mr. Waldheim. Several likened the proposed visit with the Pope to his meeting in 1982 with Yasser Arafat, the Palestine Liberation Organization chairman, and warned that it could strain Roman Catholic-Jewish relations', said Rabbi Gilbert Klaperman, the president of the Synagogue Council of America." Other statements in opposition to the visit were issued by the American Jewish Congress, B'nai Brith International, the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations and the Union of American Hebrew congregations" (Globe and Mail, June 26/87). There were also loud protests in Israel.

A private meeting between Waldheim and the Pope takes place on June 26/87, accompanied by denunciations from Jewish groups around the world. Prime minister Yitzak Shamir (the former Stern gang terrorist) said in Jerusalem that the meeting 'caused us great anguish', adding 'We might have expected better of the Vatican.' Tory Prime minister Brian Mulroney also said that 'Waldheim is not welcome in Canada and will not be invited to visit'" (New York Times, June 26/87).

The Pope welcomed Mr. Waldheim and spoke of his past services for peace in the UN. Indeed, they meet two more times over the course of the following days. "Prime minister Yitzak Shamir of Israel today described the visit 'an outrageous act' saying 'It could be interpreted as a justification for crimes of which Waldheim is accused.'"

A small group of Jews protested at the Vatican. "Rabbi Avi Weiss of the Bronx, who came to Rome to protest the visit, lead a prayer after declaring 'The Vatican desecrates the soul of the six million Jews killed by the Nazis, so we will sanctify their souls by praying.' On August 6/87 the New York Times reports that the Pope
has agreed to meet with representatives of American Jews about his reception of Kurt Waldheim. "Elan Steinberg, executive director of the World Jewish Congress, said the Jewish representatives at the Vatican meeting would want to convey their anguish and pain as well as their shock and dismay at the papal audience June 25 with Mr. Waldheim."

Ronald Lauder, the right-wing Republican billionaire and a US ambassador to Austria reported that his relations with Austrians were quite warm until he boycotted Waldheim’s swearing in and became a target of the 'vicious' Austrian press, which charged him with complicity in getting Mr. Waldheim barred from entering the US. He notes various cases where politicians have shown anti-Semitic attitudes and remained in office afterwards. "Mr. Lauder says he makes it a habit to ask Austrians of the appropriate age whether they were on Hero Square to welcome Hitler's arrival in 1938. 'I've never found one person who was there', he said. Mr. Lauder attributes the fundamental reason for this to be envy. The word 'envy' would be the best word by which I could describe them. They feel envy for anyone who is successful. They feel that the Jewish people have always been successful'" (New York Times, January 12, 1988).

Envy of the financially incapable accounts for anti-Semitism, suggests the inheritor of a billion dollars from his mother's face cream business.

In a document newly discovered last year by Robert Herzstein, while working for the World Jewish Congress, discloses that Waldheim had known of and criticized the German reprisal policy in Yugoslavia. Herzstein holds "that the charge that Mr. Waldheim ordered the execution of prisoners was 'a politically motivated fabrication' by the Yugoslavs designed to embarrass the Austrians in key post war talks." However he held that there is enough 'evidence' to charge Waldheim as an accessory in the commission of war crimes. 'They framed the right guy', Mr Herzstein said in an interview."He is pushing his forthcoming book entitled Waldheim, The Missing Years (Globe and Mail, February 9/88). The World Jewish Congress - right!

In a report headlined 'Waldheim knew of atrocities but not involved, panel says', the Globe and Mail notes the following. After almost two years of effort a panel of senior military historians drawn from Switzerland, West Germany, United States, Israel, Belgium and Britain, plus a consultant from Greece, have mainly cleared Mr. Waldheim of any charges of war crimes. Manfred Messerschmidt, the deputy chair of the commission, noted that "Waldheim's assertion, repeated on January 28 at our commission, that he had no idea about the fate awaiting the Jews, is not believable." However" the report did not find Waldheim morally culpable."

Waldheim said "To deduce that knowledge constitutes some kind of crime is simply not correct"(New York Times, February 9 /88).

The Times had another angle on this, however; it focuses on a minor element of the original charge, that as an officer Waldheim must have known that atrocities were being committed, even if he did not participate in them. The charge suggests 'Why didn't Lieutenant Waldheim save the Jews if he suspected they were being killed? One might ask that of virtually every American soldier who served in Viet Nam and every Israeli soldier who served in the West Bank and in Lebanon. They also knew that crimes against humanity were being carried out by their side so why didn't they stop them. Ridiculous?"

"The Israeli member of the [investigating] panel, Yehuda L. Wallach of the University of Tel Aviv, said the panel found that Mr. Waldheim had been in no position to give orders as a lieutenant in the Balkans and so was not directly
guilty." This was the second panel of historical experts which had absolved Waldheim of war crimes.

However a few days later both "Mr. Wallach and Manfred Messerschmidt of West Germany defended their report but disputed Mr. Waldheim’s contention that he was 'cleared' (Globe and Mail, February 10/88). Once again, those leveling charges against Waldheim refuse to accept the findings and go on retailing their charges as if there had never been an investigation. What with forged documents, spurious accounts and assorted 'expert testimonies', they will not take no for an answer (New York Times, February 11/88).

"The Yugoslav press agency reported today that a document said to link President Kurt Waldheim of Austria to Nazi war crimes was a fake and that a forgery investigation was under way. 'The document was purported to be a 1942 telegram advising that a Lieutenant Kurt Waldheim requested the deportation of more than 4,000 Yugoslav civilians during world war 2. The West German magazine Der Spiegel published the document February 1 and said it had been provided by a Yugoslav historian.'

"The [Yugoslav] press agency, Tanyug, said that a Yugoslav commission of historians, archivists and other experts had concluded that 'the telegram is not an authentic document and that there is a founded suspicion that a forgery is in question'."

A typewriting expert concluded that the machine used to type the telegram was not available before 1949. The telegram was first made public by a Yugoslav historian Dusan Plenca and Danko Vasovic, a Belgrade journalist who worked with him. Were similar sources used by the World Jewish Congress in their accounts of Waldheim's participation in deportations? Is it conceivable that they had a hand in fabricating this material? (Globe and Mail, February 13/88)

In an Op.Ed. piece entitled 'Austrians fail to grasp emperor has no clothes', Adrian Peracchi tells us that "...Israeli Foreign Minister Shimon Peres told the Knesset that Israel would not send an ambassador to Vienna until Waldheim resigned. 'The latent anti-Semitism that continues to run under the surface of Austrian society has bubbled to the surface like a particularly corrosive acid during the Waldheim controversy. Veiled and explicit references to Jews and to Israel in connection with Waldheim's trouble pepper conversations with ordinary Austrians in the streets and cafes of this capital'" (Globe and Mail, April, 29/88).

Is it now anti-Semitic to defend yourself against false charges? Apparently the answer is 'Yes'.

Elsewhere the New York Times noted that, "Documents alleged to link Austrian President Kurt Waldheim to Croatia Fascists have been stolen, the newspaper Vecernje Novosti, said yesterday. It quoted historian Vladimir Dedijer, the official biographer of Yugoslavia's Marshal Tito, as saying the documents were stolen from his flat. Novosti quoted Mr. Dedijer as saying that the documents dealt with links between Mr. Waldheim and Maks Luburic, the commander of the Jasenovac concentration camp where thousands of Yugoslavs died" (New York Times, February 23/88). Sure, sure.

A.M. Rosenthal, the former editor of the New York Times and an increasingly venomous hate monger, writes in his weekly editorial "Austria Can Keep Waldheim". He tells his readers that Austrians are mainly all neo-Nazis and that their country welcomed Hitler and supported him in 1938 "with glee and profit." He conjures up images of Jews being forced to scrub the streets in Vienna after the Nazi takeover - an unforgivable crime. Now they have elected Mr. Waldheim, 'a charged and 'convicted ' war criminal' - in Rosenthal's view.
"But already it is being forgotten that the great powers of the world, including the Soviet Union and the United States, gave this man the most prestigious and important job in international diplomacy, the post of Secretary-General of the United Nations." This all bespeaks a sinister cover up of Mr. Waldheim's crimes by forces yet uncovered. The main crime apparently being that Waldheim is a German-Austrian who lived during the Nazi era. Rosenthal ends by saying that Austria and Waldheim deserve each other and that both should be treated with utter contempt. This is in keeping with Rosenthal's general outlook on the world, and his contempt for the great majority of people in the world. (New York Times, March 8/88)

Great Britain's Margaret Thatcher also had authorized an inquiry into the deaths of six British commandos who were taken prisoner and killed in the Balkans during World War 2, with the intention of discerning Mr. Waldheim's involvement in the case, if any.

"The Foreign Office and the Defense Ministry have assigned senior ministers and large staffs to the inquiry. In addition, related allegations that Mr. Waldheim may have allowed Soviet spying while serving as Secretary-General of the United Nations from 1972 to 1982 are receiving serious attention." One Greville Janner, a Labour member of parliament and Mr. Rhodes James, a Tory MP are to play key roles in the investigation. Mrs. Thatcher is deeply concerned about Freedom and Democracy fifty years ago, if not today.

Mr. James' crusade "stems from the fact that he was Waldheim's personal assistant at the United Nations and that when the World Jewish Congress charges against him appeared he had assured others that Waldheim had an 'absolutely honorable' record in the German army. He was shocked into rethinking his previous allegiance through being sent photocopies of documents allegedly detailing Mr. Waldheim's service in Salonika during the war.

There seems to be a basic witch hunting technique in operation here. When one set of charges are disproved new charges and new evidence immediately arise. Even if the original ones are confounded, the inquisitors simply pursue the original charges and refuse to accept the contradicting evidence.

More than a year after investigation started, the British Defence Ministry reported that it could find no evidence that Waldheim had had anything to do with interrogating British prisoners of war or was responsible for the execution of British commandos in Greece during World War 2 (New York Times, October 19/89). "The report commissioned last year after charges by Members of Parliament that the British Government had known more about Mr. Waldheim's wartime activities than it acknowledged..." In Vienna, Mr. Waldheim's office replied that it simply confirms what the President had previously said.

Not to be thwarted by mere facts an American-Jewish historical researcher immediately claimed that this report documented exactly the opposite of what it clearly said. "Elan Steiberg, executive director of the World Jewish Congress in New York, said 'Kurt Waldheim's big lie that no British commandos were interrogated at his World War 2 German Army headquarters had finally been put to rest'." The gall is really incredible.

"Neal Sher, director of the United States Justice Department Office of Special Investigations, was critical of the report. He said in a telephone interview today that it would have no effect on the department's decision of barring Mr. Waldheim from returning to the United States. 'To say that he had no involvement is preposterous, clearly absurd. Mr. Sher said 'there is no doubt in my mind that under Nuremberg standards a prosecutor could hold Waldheim responsible on
many scores. Whether he'd be acquitted or convicted, only a duly constituted tribunal could access." Mr. Sher is a closet Joe McCarthy, with the powers of life or death over some of his targets. (Globe and Mail, June 22/89)

In a letter-to-the-editor. David Matas, the long time legal counsel for B'nai Brith, charges the Austrian Ambassador to Canada, one Kurt Herndl, as being a willing apologist for Kurt Waldheim. Herndl has 'insultingly' challenged Matas' claims about Waldheim's guilt, "... saying that after so much investigation there is still no evidence for such charges." Instead, Matas holds that, "The evidence against Mr. Waldheim can fill and has, indeed, filled books. I will point out the remarks of two members of the Commission of Historians appointed by the Austrian government to consider the allegations against Mr. Waldheim. Yehuda Wallach and Manfred Messerschmidt of the commission said that claims that the commission found Mr. Waldheim not guilty of war crimes stand 'in marked contrast' to the findings of the commission." (In fact they don't.)

"It is perhaps not surprising that an Austrian ambassador would parrot the self-serving excuses, denials, alibis and obfuscations of an accused war criminal when the accused is President of Austria. The behavior of the ambassador remains, nonetheless, dismaying" (Globe and Mail, July 2/88). This follows the established maximum that when confounded by facts simply repeat your charges and add as much personal venom as feasible.

Waldheim withdraws his slander suit against Edgar Bronfman of the World Jewish Congress. Bronfman had called Waldheim "part and parcel of the Nazi killing machine" during an address delivered in Budapest on May 5, 1987. "If Mr. Waldheim had continued legal proceedings against Mr. Bronfman, there was virtually no chance for court action in Austria - Mr. Bronfman refused to appear in an Austrian court" (Globe and Mail, July 11/88).

"An Israeli Nazi-hunter heading for talks with Austrian President Kurt Waldheim, said yesterday that he had found no proof that Mr. Waldheim was responsible for the deportation or execution of Jews during the Second world war... 'In all my studies and investigations I found no evidence that during his service in the Nazi army, Waldheim personally had anything to do with the deportation or extermination of Jews'. Mr. Tuvia Friedman, head of the Haifa Documentation Center, said before flying to Vienna."

However, he holds that East Germany and Austria should accept paying fuller reparations to survivors of the Holocaust. The World Jewish Congress and B'nai Brith fails to mention Friedman. (New York Times, November 30/ 89)

In a further example of simply restating past, unproven, charges, the World Jewish Congress reveals that C.I.A. files of 42 years ago knew that Waldheim was an intelligence officer in Yugoslavia during world war 2. "The executive director of the World Jewish Congress, Elan Steinberg, said, 'What you have here is not only evidence that the C.I.A. knew but a document showing that the C.I.A. knew and in fact, has known for 40 years that that was a big lie... Mr. Steinberg said the Congress received a copy of the document from contacts in Europe." Well, so what?

Back "In 1980, responding to inquiries about Mr. Waldheim from Representative Stephen J. Solarz, Democrat of Brooklyn, the C.I.A. wrote, 'We have no intelligence in detail on Waldheim's military service.' The letter then said the agency's investigation had found that Mr. Waldheim was wounded in the leg in 1941 and discharged from military duties..." (Globe and Mail, November 30/86; New York Times, February 14/90).
Mr. Solarz's inquiry suggests that he may long have been part of the plot to defame Waldheim.

East Germany had previously held that its people themselves had been victims of the Nazis and were not responsible for the crimes committed by the Nazis. They now agreed to be held accountable for crimes committed against the Jews during the previous era. This will be viewed by many as their acceptance of guilt for the Holocaust.

"Another new document has been discovered linking Austrian President Kurt Waldheim to a German army operation called Case Axis that sent tens of thousands of Italian soldiers to slave labor camps, the World Jewish Congress said yesterday. Mr. Waldheim who served in Greece during the Second world war, has previously denied any involvement in the deportation of Italian soldiers. The WJC said an order from the German General Staff in Greece to the top German officers attached to the Italian 11th Army in Athens bears Mr. Waldheim's signature" (Globe and Mail, April 30/90).

This is a follow up to the second series of 'archival finds' dealing with Mr. Waldheim. They have come to cover an endless variety of charges, from personally ordering executions to having a general knowledge of what was going on. What these documents actually say, as opposed to what it is claimed they say, whether they are real or fabricated, is open to considerable debate. Many of the charges against Waldheim have since been found to be spurious. All that we know for sure is that the World Jewish Congress has been out to get Waldheim and that they have the resources, agents, talents and money to arrange any variety of findings. They are acting with the support of many Jews in North America and with the backing of the North American mass media. The practice is to charge Waldheim with every conceivable sort of crime and to keep repeating the charges even after they have been proven to be false, or fabricated - and to rely on the public's inability to remember what has been proven or disproven. This is all presented with high decibel outrage and self-righteous moralizing.

In a report headed 'Letter proves Waldheim was a Nazi, officials say', the Globe and Mail passes on yet another 'archival finding' by the World Jewish Congress, backed this time by the US Department of Justice. In a letter of support for Mr. Waldheim's scholarship at Vienna's Consular Academy, "the Austrian Chamber of Commerce described him as 'a convinced Nazi for years'... it is said." This runs counter to all previous evidence about Waldheim.

A US graduate student in Vienna, one Richard Mitten, found the document in archives at the Consular Academy and provided it to the World Jewish Congress, which gave it to the US Justice Department. "It shows the big lie as to Waldheim's claim that he was not a Nazi supporter'... Neal Sher, chief war crimes prosecutor at the Justice Department, told the New York Times." We will later discuss Neal Sher's own veracity and his role in US war crimes tribunals.

"In 1986 the Justice Department [had] found evidence that Mr. Waldheim has persecuted Jews, Greeks and Yugoslavs after he joined the German army." What they meant by that was that Waldheim had been a lieutenant in the German army in a region where war crimes had been committed. The overwhelming weight of the evidence suggests that while Waldheim was a German army officer he was never a Nazi but an Austrian nationalist. This still appears to be Simon Weisenthal's view. (Vancouver Sun, May 25/92)

In 1992, one Thomas Klestil, of the conservative People's Party, won the second and final round of elections for Austrian President by 57 percent of the vote - the biggest margin of victory since the Second world war. Apparently many
of the 16% who had supported the right wing Freedom Party opted for Klestil in the second round.

We should note that all the charges against Waldheim, though never proven, have stuck to him throughout his presidency.

One suspects that Waldheim was mainly a handy target to raise accounts of the Holocaust again - that and to belabor the United Nations. For a number of years it gave American Jews a safe target to attack, it incorporated some of them into the emergent Holocaust revival campaign and underscored both the past sufferings of Jews and their current ability to charge and disparage almost anyone on the face of the earth. Finally, Waldheim completed his term as President and stepped down in 1992.

The campaign by the World Jewish Congress was ultimately successful. They achieved this simply by the endless repetition of unproven and disproved charges forwarded by the endless range of 'experts' and testifiers at their disposal. After a while virtually all of the world's press and media and even western governments bought this propaganda campaign.

Ronald Lauder, Felix Bloch and the Austrian Embassy

Ronald Lauder is the son and heir to the Estee Lauder cosmetics fortune, an American-Jewish billionaire who is also a very right wing Republican. He had been, in some sense, in government as a Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense since the Reagan administration because he had raised some four million dollars for Reagan's campaign. Lauder was later appointed as the American Ambassador to Austria (1986-1987). It was a purely political appointment which he himself must have chosen. It soon turned out that Lauder was cast in the mould of the late Senator Joe McCarthy in that he was soon investigating insubordination and subversive attitudes amongst the diplomatic staff in Vienna.

He fastened on to the senior US diplomat on station, one Felix Bloch. Block had been on consular service for 31 years and was "born into a Jewish family in Vienna that fled Hitler, but was raised a Presbyterian on the East Side of Manhattan, a graduate, among other good schools, of P.S. 6" (Vancouver Sun, May 24, 1990). Block was accused of being friendly with the Austrian Foreign Minister, Alois Mock, a former head of the Austrian conservative People's Party and someone who had publicly defended Waldheim during his inquisition. They had even been friends while students at a university in Bologna run by Johns Hopkins University some years earlier.

"The World Jewish Congress accused Mr. Block of working with Mr. Mock behind the back of the former American Ambassador, Ronald Lauder, on the Waldheim matter" (New York Times, July 25, 1989). Henry Kamm reported that according to one senior official there, "'He [Block] felt the embassy was engaged in Austria-baiting", the former official said of Bloch'" (New York Times, August 2 1989).

Lauder claimed that he then fired Block but State Department officials say that they simply recalled him and that Lauder's charges had nothing to do with that decision. When this was put to Lauder in a television interview by Ted Koppel, Lauder replied "Well, the most important thing is I fired him. I wanted to get rid of him because of insubordination... Before, we saw pictures of the Foreign Minister, Alois Mock. He and Felix Block went to school together. They knew each other. They spoke literally every day. And there were many times when I spoke to
Felix Bloch and I said 'Don't discuss this', to find out that he did discuss it...I knew there was something the matter with Felix Bloch."

Said Koppel: "I've spoken to some of the people who were in charge of the European division of the State Department at the time that Felix Bloch was serving under you. They say, to put it rather bluntly, that you were inexperienced and excitable. I've heard these people say that you were a laughingstock as Ambassador over there.


Such a question is tantamount to blood libel for some and one letter to the editor of the New York Times claimed that Koppel had defamed Lauder, who had born up stoically under the "anti-American and anti-Semitic sentiments he received while serving in Vienna" (New York Times, August 21, 1989).

By this time Bloch was defending himself against charges that he had been spying for the Soviets in Vienna. The press trundled out an alleged call girl whom Block was supposed to have frequented and they also floated an unsubstantiated claim about him being seen in Paris handing a briefcase to a Soviet agent. "That incident was recreated in an increasingly popular practice called "simulation" [i.e the fabrication of rumors into television acts then peddled as 'news'] on ABC News in its first broadcast on the espionage case on Friday" (New York Times July 26, 1989).

By this time unrevealed sources were leaking information that Bloch had been under surveillance for a long time and that he was suspected of being in contact with an extremely shadowy Soviet spy. However, when the C.I.A. was detailed to watch for the transfer of a critical bag in a restaurant it failed to see anything. Block was relieved of his duties and the F.B.I. began watching his whereabouts around the clock, as did television crews. At one point in the summer of 1989 a body of hostile citizens followed Block around and one man, claiming to be a former Viet Nam war veteran, berated him for betraying his country and then hit him on the side of his head. The police didn't intervene (New York Times, August 11, 1989). All these charges made the rounds of the press circuit but no hard evidence was available and no arrests were ever made. This 'evidence' presumably came from a Soviet defector who had long been providing the American authorities with spies to hunt. All these charges evaporated eventually.

By this time Lauder was using his money to finance his candidacy to run for Mayor of New York. Trying to gain the candidacy of the Republican ticket he proposed the mandatory drug testing of all teachers and the abolition of rent control in the city - for starters. Possibly the whole Bloch affair revolved around Lauder's election bid. However Lauder didn't win a slot on the Republican municipal ticket, which instead was taken overwhelmingly by Rudolph Guliani. Undaunted Lauder then landed the mayoral candidacy for the Conservative party, a tiny, ultra reactionary sect then on the ballot. When the election was called he won something like 5,000 votes out of the circa two million cast in the city. I am unsure what happened to Lauder after that but one can be certain that he didn't slip into well deserved obscurity.

By the following spring the Bloch case had blown over in he US, but it had resulted in the destruction of Block's career. However the "lessons" to be drawn from this case of McCarthyism was still being retailed in the distant provinces. In a two page article in the Vancouver Sun (May 24, 1990), one David Wise, a New York Times reporter, offered up an overview filled with all the spy movie images which the reporter could dredge up. All of the rumors, innuendos, unsubstantiated charges which had been made against Bloch are raised again - as
if they had actually been proven and were not simply the product of one right-wing American's fantasy. Wise is outraged that Block had not been arrested and charged with anything. Once one has been charged for witch craft, the victim is invariably convicted.

At the beginning of this witch sniffing campaign the commentator Tom Wicker had written a summation of the pursuit and defamation of Owen Lattimore, a once widely admired Chinese scholar who had counseled against America supporting Chiang Kai Shek during the later 1940s. Lattimore had been dragged through the Senate Internal Security Committee controlled by Senator McCarthy and branded as a Communist sympathizer and a traitor. Anyone opposed to American military involvement abroad was clearly both.

Although Wicker nowhere mentions Mr. Bloch and the charges against him, the parallels were clear. "Owen Lattimore himself made the point that I repeat, on his behalf and on behalf of all victims of such political smears. 'The sure way to destroy freedom of speech and the free expression of ideas and views is to attach to that freedom the penalty of abuse and vilification'" (New York Times, July 25, 1989)

The Wallenberg Caper
Following charges that all of the western democracies were co-responsible for the Holocaust by not saving the Jews of Europe and not permitting their free entry into safe countries when it was still possible, a case of one actual saviour was trotted out. He was Raoul Wallenberg, a 32 year old member of a wealthy Swedish banking family who went to Hungary in 1944 as the Swedish consul under the aegis of the American government and the World Jewish Congress to save Hungary's Jews from annihilation. It turned out he was of distant Jewish ancestry, which made him all the more desirable as a saviour. This was preeminently an American campaign led by Jewish American organizers, although some Canadians did get in on the act.

It started with resurrecting the Holocaust in Hungary, beginning with the German role in this crime but rapidly shifting to a vilification of the Soviet Union for the imprisonment of Wallenberg in 1945, where he died two years later.

This account naturally by-passed any recognition of the host of non-Jewish victims during the preceding 25 years at the hands of the Horthy regime. Indeed, the story even passed over the notorious deal made between the Jewish leadership in Hungary in 1944, who arranged for their own and their families safe passage out of the country in exchange for their cooperation in the rounding up of the other Hungarian Jews. The obvious fact, however, was that it was the Soviet army's rapid advance which liberated Hungary's surviving Jews in early 1945.

The World Jewish Congress and other Jewish organizations had been pressing the case of Raoul Wallenberg since the mid 1970s and during Ronald Reagan's years in office. Wallenberg's star rose and he was (posthumously) accorded American citizenship by a special act of Congress. Reagan said that "The citizenship action will facilitate the State Department's inquiries into Mr Wallenberg's fate" (Globe and Mail, January 16/86).

One may note that the thrust had changed from the fate of the Hungarian Jews to the actions of past Soviet governments in imprisoning their savior. Reagan suggested it was a case "of Biblical proportions", although he didn't say what portions of the Bible he had in mind.

Wallenberg is said to have 'saved' some 10,000 (to 200,000) Jews in late 1944, simply by issuing them Swedish protection, before they were rounded up
for deportation to death camps. The lesson to be taken from this, suitable for grade school readers, is that all that saving the Jews required was for someone in minimal authority but with the courage to stand up to the Nazis. If it was that easy one wonders why Wallenberg didn't save all the Jews?

A.M. Rosenthal, the editor-in-chief of the New York Times, helped convert the Wallenberg case into a crusade against both the Germans and Soviets. He writes, "In 1944, Raoul Wallenberg, a young Swede of 32, was asked by American representatives to go to Budapest, there to risk his life every day by trying to snatch Hungarian Jews from the Nazis. German soldiers and Hungarian Fascists were rounding them up to send to slaughter camps."

"Wallenberg came from a good family and had a fine education, but there was nothing about him that spoke of the man he was to become in Budapest - a man who by force of his own will did rescue thousands of Jews."

"He used only diplomatic status, a little money contributed by American Jews and a stunningly indomitable will. He hid Jews in houses from which he hung Swedish flags. He marched into knots of Nazi kidnappers crying 'Ich bin Wallenberg', as if that would make them fall back. Sometimes it did" (New York Times, November 25, 1988).

That, in summation, is the Wallenberg story, as transmitted by the American press. An example of triumph of the will by a wealthy Swede who stared down murderous Nazis and their allied forces and saves thousands Jews through the simple courage to stand up to oppressors. It is also to Wallenberg's credit that he was sent to Hungary at the request of the American government and the World Jewish Congress. American audiences should eat it up.

Rosenthal then goes on to tell his readers of how Wallenberg was seized by the Russians after they had taken Budapest and conveyed to a Soviet prison camp (presumably because of their inherent opposition to all that is decent in human society). In 1957 a Soviet spokesperson noted that Wallenberg had died in prison in 1947. "From that day to this the Soviet Government has added no further information", says Rosenthal. However Wallenberg allegedly lives on for decades after his imprisonment; Rosenthal offers a brief overview of his sightings, as reported by assorted Soviet defectors and others. He charges the then Soviet leader, Mikhail Gorbachev, with the responsibility to permit an 'international' tribunal to investigate the fate of Wallenberg. Rosenthal repeats this demand in another editorial (New York Times, April 9, 1987). However, after the collapse of the Soviet Union a few years later, the case of Wallenberg is shuffled off the pages of the press as new enemies of humanity and Americanism arise which the public must be trained to hate.

Wallenberg is followed by a forgotten Portuguese saviour of Jews during world war 2, one Aristides de Souza Mendes, who as consul-general of Portugal in Bordeaux issued visas in 1940 and credited with saving some 10,000 Jewish refugees. Because of this Mr. Mendes was stripped of his post and barred from practicing law in Portugal, where he died in poverty in 1954. A combined Canadian Jewish Congress and Portuguese Canadian committee paid their respects to Mr. Mendes, saying that he is "very much the equivalent of Wallenberg" (Globe and Mail, November 12, 1986).

At about the same time another saviour of the Jews is uncovered in the person of a former Japanese diplomat assigned to East European capitals in 1939 and 1940. He too had provided exit passes valid for travel to Japan to Jews for almost a year. It is uncertain how many Jews he saved but numbers of survivors around the world remembered his aid at the most critical time of their lives.
This Japanese diplomat also was dismissed from his post and ordered home. Even after the end of the war his name was not rescued from the obscurity into which it had fallen. He died in poverty some twenty years after the end of World War 2. Neither of these individuals was wealthy, of distant Jewish ancestry, nor had the support of the American government and major Jewish organizations.

On January 23, 1988 the *Globe and Mail* reports that "Montreal human rights activist Irwin Cotler told reporters yesterday that he has assembled new 'incontrovertible' evidence that the Swedish diplomat did not die of a heart attack in his cell at Lubianka prison in July 1947, contrary to what Soviet authorities repeatedly maintained." Cotler was then chairman of a 12 member delegation that had been invited to the Soviet Union to discuss human rights. "...the Soviet authorities might be ready to listen to arguments in favor of Mr. Wallenberg's release Professor Cotler explained." Cotler claims that he has obtained more than twenty first hand testimonies, "corroborated and oathed", attesting to the survival of Mr. Wallenberg as late as November 1987. "If it is not compelling, it is up to the Soviet Union to rebut it", he says " (*Globe and Mail*, January 23, 1989). While they are at it they can also pursue the release of Anastasia, the last surviving daughter of the Romanovs.

On August 3, 1988 the *New York Times* reports a string of Wallenberg sightings by Russian emigres and a Swedish film producer planning a film on him. This might seem like the last stage of a propaganda campaign, where the propagandist falls for his own story. But probably not; probably they know from the start that what they are peddling is a pack of lies.

This follows on Wallenberg having been given Canadian citizenship by an act of Parliament.

On February 17/'89 the *Globe and Mail* reports that a commission 'of prominent citizens' continues to investigate the fate of Raoul Wallenberg, who is now held to have saved some 100,000 Hungarian Jews from the Holocaust. The commission is comprised of Elie Wiesel, the Romanian-American professional holocausteer, Gideon Hausner, the Israeli lawyer who prosecutes German war criminals, Samuel Pisar, a French lawyer and concentration camp survivor who does the same, a Per Anger, a Swedish diplomat who worked with Raoul Wallenberg, and Professor Irwin Cotler, a Canadian law professor and Holocaust revivalist. The commission is to be joined by one Michael Schlenov, a Soviet historian sympathetic to their mission.

"I don't think we have a lot of time', said David Matas, a lawyer for B'nai B'rith who will be the counsel for the international commission. 'Wallenberg is very old, if he's still alive. We owe him speedy investigation. Alive or dead, we need a complete accounting of his fate.' ...But there is no guarantee that glasnost will continue indefinitely, so the commission wants to move quickly" (*Globe and Mail*, February 17/89).

Wallenberg's remaining kin arrive in the Soviet Union to investigate his fate. One Soviet diplomat says, "'There has been an exchange of letters with his family; inviting them to look for themselves at the documents that prove the fact of his death' Mr. Kovalev told a news conference. The attempts to find other testimony or evidence that he is not dead have produced no results" (*Globe and Mail*, September 1, 1989).

Wallenberg's half sister, a Mrs. Nina Lagergren, holds that Wallenberg's personal affects have recently been conveyed to her. "'They only prove that the Soviet's have been lying to us all these years when they said they had no more
information on Raoul, and it only strengthens our belief that he is alive today', she said. (New York Times, October 17, 1989).

By this time the Wallenberg campaign has been going on for some ten years in the US, led largely by Jewish activists and in Canada by Irwin Cotler. They have managed to turn the focus from the destruction of Hungarian Jews by the Nazis and Hungarian Fascists into an assault on the Soviet Union, whose forces actually saved the majority of Jews who were saved in Hungary.

One of the last facets of the Wallenberg story emerged near the end of 1989. Two Dutch authors, Gerard Aalders and Cees Wiebes, reported in a book that two of Wallenberg's cousins, Marcus and Jacob Wallenberg, who headed Stockholm's Enskilda Bank, formed one of Sweden's richest and most influential dynasties. The bank, founded in 1856, played a central role in Sweden's industrialization before and after the war. The authors hold that these two bankers acted as frontmen to disguise foreign subsidiaries of German companies. They allegedly also disposed of the gold, jewels, stock and art seized from Jews and others during world war 2. The Wallenberg bank, by far the largest financial concern in Sweden, even today, have holdings in many of the major concerns of that country. (Globe and Mail, September 16, 1991)

Aalders and Wiebes suggest that these connections, as well as the fact that Raoul Wallenberg was associated with and funded by American authorities in 1944, may account for his arrest by the Soviets. One Per Anger, who served with the Swedish legation in Budapest in 1944 and a prominent Wallenberg advocate, called the theory 'Fantastic speculation' (Vancouver Sun, November 7, 1989). Irwin Cotler was still pursuing the Wallenberg file in late 1992, after the collapse of the Soviet Union.

In 1996 the World Jewish Congress discovers an archival document from Henry Morgenthau, the Jewish-American banker who in 1944 was the US Treasury Secretary. In this document Morgenthau accuses the Wallenberg's Enskilda bank as engaged in funnelling Nazi funds into assorted western purchases and for deposits abroad (Vancouver Sun, May 22/96). This may be true; however no one should be surprized if researchers for organizations like the World Jewish Congress plant forged documents and reports into the files they are investigating.

December 2000, the Russian government, acting under western pressure, formally rehabilitates Wallenberg (Vancouver Sun, December 23/2000). Possibly this will bring to an end a twenty year long campaign of vilifying the former Soviet Union.

The Kastner Case. An Unmentionable Bit of Jewish History

To go back a bit, in 1964 a University of BC instructor, Rudolph Vrba, wrote a quite unreliable personal account (I Cannot Forgive, 1964) which is filled with a catalogue of concentration camp sufferings - mass murders, torturers, sadistic camp commanders and others which the hero endured and always managed to survive. Like so many other such accounts the author is a one-in-a-million survivor. There is the obligatory compliment of SS and concentration camp guards performing their unspeakable acts crowding each chapter in the style of the more florid American world war 2 propaganda movies.

Vrba escapes from a concentration camp in early 1944 and carries the tale of what awaits Hungarian Jewry to a Papal Nuncio in that country and then to the Hungarian Jewish leadership. Ordinary Hungarian Jews apparently know nothing about the death camps and initially don't believe him. One may ask, it they didn't know why would one expect ordinary Germans to know of such facts?
Vrba (a Slovakian Jew) reports meetings with emissaries of Dr. Rudolph Kastner, head of the Jewish Rescue Committee in Hungary. Unknown to Vrba, Kastner and his immediate associates have developed a special relationship with Adolph Eichmann and have exchanged their aid for helping in the deportation of some 400,000 Hungarian Jews for their own survival. They will take 1,648 Jews of their own choice out of Hungary to a neutral country in late 1944. Adolph Eichmann hopes to send the Hungarian Jews to Auschwitz without resistance. This definitely was not part of the Wallenberg story as told in the 1980s.

Kastner and his associates do their work and the bulk of Hungary's Jews leave on trains thinking they are going to resettlement regions when they are bound for extermination camps. This occurs with considerable ease and with incredible speed. It still seems improbable that 400-500,000 Jews could be swept up, concentrated and shipped off to death camps, there to be annihilated in the barely three months available. Kastner and his crowd get away, first to Switzerland and then to Israel.

Some nine years later an aged Jew in Jerusalem is charged with libel by distributing an indictment of Rudolph Kastner, then an editor of an Israeli Hungarian language newspaper, which claimed that he had aided the German annihilation of Hungarian Jews. After an almost two year-long trial this charge is proved to be substantially correct and the libel charge invalidated. According to Vrba's citation of the judge's findings, he said that,

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

"The Nazis could not have misled the masses of Jews so conclusively, had they not spread their false information through Jewish channels. The Jews of the ghettos would not have trusted the Nazi or Hungarian rulers; but they had trust in their Jewish leaders. Eichmann and others used this known fact as part of their calculated plan to mislead the Jews. They were able to deport the Jews to their extermination with the help of Jewish leaders." This was part of an Israeli judge's statement at conclusion of Kastner case cited in Rudolph Vrba and Allan Bestic. (I Cannot Forgive, 1964:258-59)

A later appeal absolved Kastner of guilt but he was assassinated outside his Jerusalem home in March of 1957.

Wallenberg did save various thousands of Hungarian Jews from deportation and for that he deserves to be honored. However, among those who now honor him nothing is ever said about the 300,000 Soviet soldiers who died to liberate Hungary from its fascist yoke, and whose actions saved not just some but most of those Hungarian Jews who were saved.

Chapter 7. Hunting War Criminals in America

The Demjanuk Case  The one that got away

The case of John Demjanuk is quite exceptional in that after a period of successful persecution, carried out both by Jewish organizations and an arm of the American Federal government, which managed to have Demjanuk denaturalized and deported to Israel for trial, he was saved by the intervention of a US superior court. That court demanded his return to the US and that the Israeli charges against him be dropped. By then Demjanuk had been sentenced to be
hung by an Israeli court. Demjanuk is one of the few targets who 'escaped' the witch hunters. The aftermath of this case witnessed the departure of Neal Sher, the chief persecutor for the US Office of Special Investigations (into war crimes) who had operated impervious to criticism until that time. A brief outline of the case is as follows.

Demjanuk emigrated to the United States from the Ukraine shortly after the end of World War 2. He worked for thirty years in auto plants in the Cleveland area until his retirement in the early 1970s. It was only then, in his early sixties, that Jewish groups in the United States 'discovered' that he had been the infamous 'Ivan the Terrible' who had guarded and terrorized Jewish prisoners at Treblinka concentration camp during World War 2. In 1977 they began 'exposing' him to the wrath of his neighbours and initiating prosecution by the US government. The US Office of Special Investigations (Department of Justice), under the direction of the notorious Neal Sher, proceeded to try Mr. Demjanuk for alleged war crimes. By 1981 there was a long trial presided over by Federal District judge Frank Battisti in which an Immigration and Naturalization Service document expert testified that a German identification card for Mr. Demjanuk was authentic and not a forgery. This document, however, indicated that Demjanuk could not have been where his persecutors claim he had been.

Despite this, after about five years of further efforts American federal authorities had Demjanuk denaturalized and deported to Israel for trial. He was charged with operating the gas chamber at Treblinka concentration camp, but some very loose standards of proof were presented in his case, standards which would never had stood up in any real US court. However since his case was dealt with by the US Office of Special Investigations such judicial standards were not applied. These kinds of procedures have become chillingly common in both Canada and the US.

Mr. Demjanuk was delivered to Israel in early 1986; his trial there lasted from early 1987 until February 18, 1988. It was the first war crimes trial to be held in Israel since that of Adolph Eichmann in the early 1960s and quickly grew into something of a circus. The trial was held in a converted Jerusalem movie theatre and Demjanuk was apparently held to be guilty from the outset - the trial served mainly to refresh Israeli memories of the Holocaust. There was nation-wide coverage of the trial throughout its proceedings.

Witnesses who couldn't even remember where they currently lived or what the names of their grandchildren were provided detailed reminiscences about Demjanuk's doings at Treblinka forty-five years earlier. In one cross examination Mr. O'Connor, the defense lawyer, asked one of the eye witness-survivors how he had traveled to America previously to give evidence against Mr. Demjanuk. His reply, which elicited a shocked response from the audience, was that he had travelled there by train.

Cross examination brought out that witnesses had been coached in identifying Demjanuk by the Israeli police investigators. Some of investigators had even worked up scripts in which the witnesses staggered in shocked recognition of Demjanuk in the courtroom before they gave their evidence. They showed pictures of their relatives murdered at Treblinka and revealed horrendous crimes previously unheard of. The defense counsel had to cross-examine them with the greatest tact since the presiding judges recurrently intervened to halt his questioning.

Document experts testified to the forgery or to the authenticity of Demjanuk's identify papers as a Treblinka guard; one British authority, the author of 26
forensic texts on signature analysis, held that Demjanuk's identify card was probably forged. This brought conflicting testimony by another expert. Residing judge Dov Levin told a US document's expert who testified that a commandant's signature on Mr. Demjanuk's identify card was not authentic, "that her findings could not be trusted" (Globe and Mail, August 14/87).

A German prosecutor of war criminals associated with the camp where Demjanuk had allegedly trained gave a week-long presentation to the court. But another war crimes investigator with almost 25 years of research and trial experience said that she had never heard of Ivan Demjanuk before this case. The national radio service broadcast verbatim coverage of the entire trial while Israeli television ran the nine hour Holocaust revival documentary 'Shoah' to an Israeli public. Apparently quite a few Israelis hadn't thought much about the Holocaust recently.

Near the beginning of the trial "...[Israeli] Justice Minister, Avraham Sharir, told army radio that the main purpose of the trial was to remind young and increasingly forgetful Israelis about a terrible past..." Demjanuk's lawyer accused Israel of toying with Demjanuk's life. "He is just a teaching aid in what will be a six month history lesson", the defence lawyer said... It accuses him of cutting off noses and ears, and delighting in the humiliation of Jews who were about to die, and it accused him of operating the diesel engines that gassed 850,000 Jews at Treblinka between June 1942 and August 1943' (Vancouver Sun, February 21/87). Supposedly only some 60 of the 850,000 Jews who had passed through Treblinka managed to survive, of whom about a dozen were then still alive. Luckily five of them resided in Israel and even if they had unreliable memories about most things they allegedly could remember the faces and actions of camp guards forty-five years earlier.

Just a few of the questions raised during the fifteen month long trial: For instance, it was shown that Mr. Demjanuk was now three inches shorter than noted in his German identify card - but that could be explained away by natural shrinkage through aging as could the changes in his physiognomy. It was held, through earlier reminiscences collected from prisoners at Treblinka, that 'Ivan the Terrible' had been killed in a prisoner uprising in 1943. That was dismissed as a case of wishful thinking and the confused memories of those involved. Nor did the time lines of Demjanuk's activities during world war 2 accord with his alleged presence at Treblinka. Such details were simply dismissed by the court, which grew increasingly hostile to the interrogations and challenges raised by Demjanuk's lawyers.

A lengthy front page report in the New York Times entitled 'Treblinka Trial Becomes an Israeli Obsession', notes that the closed circuit television coverage and radio broadcast of the trial is being watched and listened to almost everywhere in Israel. Classes of schoolchildren in Jerusalem are taken to the trial, hundreds line up each day to be part of the audience, high school students expatiate on how they have a duty to witness the trial so that they can inform future generations of events as they heard them described in the first person. However, "For all its educational value some liberal Israeli experts on the Holocaust are disturbed by the Demjanuk trial. They argue that it feeds a certain Israeli self-perception as 'victim'. This they contend feeds a certain tendency in Israeli society to feel that the world owes it something, that Israel does not have to feel accountable for its actions, as others countries do, because of what was done to the Jews in world war II" (New York Times, March 13/87).
The trial was accompanied by daily, nation-wide, press coverage with a fulsome recapitulation of the conditions at Treblinka. Indeed, it seems that the trial and the coverage was more to do with the Nazi's death camps than with Mr. Demjanuk's role in them. The Israeli prosecutors' attitude, if one may presume to guess their private thoughts, seems to have been 'With so many Jews killed someone has to be held accountable and why should we worry about the fate of one Ukrainian collaborator who would have been executed if he had remained in the Soviet Union.'

Demjanuk's lawyer held that the case is being run as a show trial "....because this trial is being broadcast live on radio and television... Lawyer Yoram Sheftel said the heavy news coverage of the trial has tainted the credibility of witnesses testifying against Mr. Demjanuk... These witnesses knew exactly what was being said in court before they testified because the trial was broadcast live on television and radio,' Mr Sheftel said. This violates the fundamental rights of the accused. The basic rules of court procedure have not been abided by" (Globe and Mail, February 10/88).

At the end of the trial Mr. Demjanuk's wife, daughter and son rose in court and called the prosecution liars. There was a three judge panel to decide the case. Demjanuk was quickly found guilty as charged and sentenced to be hanged.

After the end of the trial Demjanuk's lawyer, Yoram Sheftel, applied for a hearing of new evidence found in testimony given to the US Justice Department in 1979, which he said would clear his client. His evidence was that at least six other camp guards looked like Mr. Demjanuk and that this cast doubt on the identification of the five Israeli witnesses. Moreover, twelve additional eye witnesses had failed to identify Demjanuk. There was also sworn testimony that he had been a guard at another concentration camp - "a disconcerting ability to be in two places at the same time," his lawyer held.

On March 20, 1988, Mr. Demjanuk's son-in-law addressed a rally of three thousand supporters in Toronto and claimed that the new evidence exonerated Demjanuk. On April 16, 1988 Associated Press noted that "Many observers argue that the case against Mr. Demjanuk has not been proved beyond a shadow of a doubt, despite the tearful insistence of the five Treblinka survivors that the defendant is Ivan... About 250,000 spectators attended the trial's 106 sessions, which the Government held in a converted movie theatre... Two defence witnesses walked off the stand in the middle of cross examination, one saying that [he had been] threatened by a lawsuit if he continued to testify. Other defence experts were discredited, including one who retracted her testimony and another who tried to commit suicide after her credentials were questioned" (Globe and Mail, April 16/88). It was noted that even if Demjanuk should win acquittal in Israel he still would not be permitted to return to the US since he had been stripped of his citizenship and could be sent to the Soviet Union for disposition.

Two days later he was convicted by the three judge panel. They took ten hours to read the 450 page verdict convicting Demjanuk of crimes against the Jewish people. "The ruling explained why the court believed the testimony and identification made by the Treblinka survivors .... Despite the many years that have passed since world war 2, all the horrific scenes they witnessed are as 'a fire imprisoned in their bones, etched deep in their memories', the judges said. These witnesses live their experience constantly. They will never forget'" (New York Times, April 19/88). The trouble was that they 'remembered' all kinds of things which couldn't have happened to them.
A presiding judge said that "'He was the chief hangman, who with his own hands, cruelly killed tens of thousands of people.' Judge Zvi Tai said after hearing final pleas from the two sides, 'We sentence him to die.' Judge Tai's words set off a spontaneous outburst of applause and singing in the packed Jerusalem courthouse" (Globe and Mail, April 26/88).

"Hundreds of weeping spectators - many of them relatives of Jews lost in the Nazi genocide, a handful of them survivors of it - burst into rhythmic applause when the sentence was announced, chanting 'Death, death, death'. 'The people of Israel live' they sang in a celebration that continued after the three-judge panel left the courtroom in the converted movie theater ... He [judge Tai] went on, 'A thousand deaths cannot compensate for what happened but at least we have judged one of the angels of death. The human hand is unable to measure a punishment equal to the charges' (New York Times, April 26/88). Mr. Demjanuk continued to insist on his innocence. His lawyers filed an appeal of the decision to the Supreme Court of Israel.

Prime minister Yitzak Shamir, the former Jewish terrorist, said that "'...every Jew feels a certain degree of satisfaction'. Israeli newspapers welcomed the court's verdict and said it was a reminder that thousands of Nazi war criminals were free in Western democracies" (Globe and Mail, April 20/88). Millions, if you count those born after the war.

Six months after Demjanuk's conviction and a week before his appeal hearing his defense lawyer, Dov Eitan, committed suicide by leaping from a fifteen story building in Jerusalem. "Mr. Eitan's wife, Miriam, said she had no idea why he did this. Asked whether the Demjanuk appeal might be connected, she added 'It could be, but I just don't know. I'll tell you this; my husband never wanted to set foot in Germany. He took the case because he thought there was an injustice here.' ... The socialist paper al-Hamishmar, describing him as 'an intellectual and a supporter of justice in Israel,' said that in an interview three months ago he had conveyed his deep dejection over 'the denial of legal rights to Palestinians in the occupied territories" (Globe and Mail, December 1/88).

The next day at Eitan's funeral an alleged holocaust survivor hurled a container of acid into the face of Demjanuk's remaining lawyer, Yoram Sheftel. He was reported in satisfactory condition in a Jerusalem hospital recovering from damage to his eyes. "Israelis have voiced resentment that Jewish lawyers would defend a suspected Nazi war criminal. Mr. Demjanuk, 68, was sentenced to death in April for atrocities against Jews at Treblinka death camp in Poland during the Second Word War " (Globe and Mail, December 2/88)

It might be noted that throughout the Demjanuk trial the Prime Minster of Israel was Yitzak Shamir. He had succeeded an equally extremist Menachem Begin who stepped down shortly after the Beirut massacres became known world wide. No one would consider bringing such Israelis to trial for war crimes.

In February of 1990 the Israeli Supreme Court agreed to hear new evidence presented by Yoram Sheftel, of Polish and German witnesses to prove that Mr. Demjanuk was not Ivan the Terrible.

In late December 1991, Demjanuk's lawyer accused prosecutors and judges in both Israel and the US as being part of a "cold blooded plot" to conceal evidence that would prove his client innocent.

"Five [Israeli] justices heard Sheftel's account of new evidence he submitted in August but which he claimed US officials and prosecutors had withheld from the defence since 1978" (Vancouver Sun, December 24/91).
At the Supreme Court hearing, Demjanuk's defence attorney held that there were 80 pieces of evidence that indicated that his client was not the Ivan the Terrible of Treblinka. The Israeli Supreme Court was to decide whether Demjanuk was to be freed from his conviction as a war criminal or not. Evidence had been building up for a case of mistaken identity and an overly zealous prosecution by the original court. One commentator noted that "If Demjanuk is acquitted, questions will be asked about the implications of persisting with the pursuit of Nazi war criminals when proof is so hard to come by and when mistakes take so heavy an emotional toll."

"The evidence against Demjanuk was based on identifications made by five Jewish camp survivors, said Sheftel [the defense attorney] But he said their identification had probably been tainted by senility or poor memory. Demjanuk has always proclaimed his innocence, saying he was a prisoner of war in Poland at the time he was accused of being Ivan the Terrible" (Vancouver Sun, June 2/92).

After six months of hearings in the Supreme Court of Israel, the presiding judge Aharon Barak held that if the prosecution did not have reliable evidence that Demjanuk had been a guard at Treblinka then he had no case. New evidence had indicated that Demjanuk had been a guard at another concentration camp. The prosecuting attorney, Michael Shaked, held that it was immaterial where Demjanuk had been a guard. "The prosecutor said that as long as the victim in both cases was the Jewish people, the crime was genocide and the site was Nazi-occupied land, it did not matter whether the crime took place in Treblinka or Sobidor" (Globe and Mail, June 8/92). *If this was the case then the all the year-long evidence previously given, the eye-witnesses to his acts at Treblinka, the alleged documents detailing his presence there, must be totally false - if he was in fact not there.*

The judge noted that Demjanuk may have been at another concentration camp but his role there was not touched upon by the prosecution's evidence. To this the prosecutor replied "*The guard is the direct servant of Satan. All he does is kill Jews throughout the times he is there*" (Vancouver Sun, June 8/92).

However things were also beginning to happen in the US. "The [Israeli] confrontation followed a decision on Friday by the the US 6th Circuit Appeals Court in Cincinnati to reopen Mr. Demjanuk's extradition case because of new evidence that Ivan of Treblinka may have been another man named Ivan Marchenko." Demjanuk's lawyer held that "...the decision of the Cincinnati federal appeals court to reopen Mr. Demjanuk's extradition case showed that it had doubts about Israel's prosecution... To my opinion, it is clear expression of dissatisfaction of the American courts with the way the Demjanuk case is being handled in Israel" (Globe and Mail, June 8/92).

Later in 1992 a panel of three American Appeals Court judges issued an order quashing Mr. Demjanuk's previous denaturalization and deportation proceedings and demanded his return to the United States. They held that the case made by the US Office of Special Investigations (Department of Justice) was tainted and demanded that Israel return Mr. Demjanuk to the United States. It was an amazing challenge to which Israel, even more amazingly, submitted. There were obviously some powerful forces in contention here which have not been revealed in news accounts.

After some foot dragging the Israeli courts agree to release Demjanuk, although they did not admit to any culpability in his prosecution. I believe that his conviction was not even quashed. But the man accused of 'unspeakable crimes', as having 'personally carried out many of the 870,000 killings at
Treblinka’, as being the Satanic 'Ivan the Terrible' is released and sent back to the US. Mr. Demjanuk, who has then been under investigation and trial for the previous fifteen years, faded into obscurity.

Shortly after this the Jewish chief prosecutor for the US Office of Special Investigations (into war crimes) resigns his post. Neal Sher notes his general satisfaction with the job he had long been doing and says that his resignation has nothing to do with the outcome of the Demjanuk case or his role in it. He had been the leading US government prosecutor in that case. His services are quickly acquired by a major American-Jewish lobby group. None of this gets much newspaper coverage. The general public probably continues to believe that Mr. Demjanuk was Ivan the Terrible and guilty of all the crimes he was charged with, who has escaped his fate only through a pettifogging concern for facts. Nevertheless, it was an astounding turnabout.


PART FOUR
Chapter 8. Canadian Case Studies

The Keegstra Trials

The 'discovery' and assorted trials of James Keegstra served as a pot boiler to keep the troops happily occupied while other projects could be gotten up to speed. They lasted from 1982 to 1986, with appeals stretching to 1996. As with other Holocaust crusades of the time it served to direct public attention from the murder and brutalization of the Palestinian population by the Israelis. World war 2 and the Holocaust tales are far more appealing on television, 60 years after the fact, than what was happening currently. The Good and the Evil are always so neatly defined and the victories so convincingly achieved.

What was of central importance in the Keegstra case was to get a newly passed law, section 281.2, against the willful promotion of hatred toward an identifiable group, legally enforced in a high profile case. Once this succeeded, witch hunters could use it against other targets.

The long and short of the matter is that James Keegstra was a middle aged high school teacher in a southern Alberta village (Eckville) who apparently was teaching materials which Jewish activists considered to be, and indeed were, anti-semitic. A horrendous crime whose 'discovery' and legal pursuit filled the pages of Canadian newspapers and journals for the better part of four years. What was extraordinary was that this view could have been disseminated for years without anyone confronting it. It allegedly showed once again how deeply tainted with anti-Semitism Canada was.

Keegstra was a 'born again' fundamentalist Christian, so nothing is particularly surprising about his beliefs. He also apparently was a vice president of the Federal Social Credit party who presumably had the support of many of that outfit's spokespersons (Vancouver Sun, May 4/83), Keegstra naturally was an anti-communist, seeing the Soviet Union as a work of the devil and as the enemy incarnate of western civilization.

The anti-Keegstra crusade began when a few Eckville parents wrote to the regional school board in 1982 and complained about the teacher's treatment of Jews in his history class. He was investigated and dismissed from his teaching position and his teaching certificate was revoked in December of 1982. "After Keegstra's firing, which was upheld by the Alberta Court of Queen's Bench, provincial attorney-general Neil Crawford appointed a six-member RCMP investigation team to determine if a criminal charge should be laid" (Vancouver Sun, September 7/85). Keegstra was charged with the dissemination of hatred against an identifiable group in January 1983, his trial began in early 1985 and the decision of guilty came down in July of that year.

There apparently weren't any Jewish school-aged children in the village where Keegstra taught but one of the children's mothers became alarmed at the accounts her child brought home with her school lessons. She conveyed her concerns to a Jewish organization on the Prairies and the campaign was on. Whether this was all a set up or not is debatable but it is clear that Keegstra was telling his students that Jews had been behind many of the disastrous events of the 20th century and that the Jewish holocaust was much exaggerated. At least that was what emerged when the smoke cleared and hundreds if not thousands of newspaper articles had filled the press about this case.

Keegstra's actions were unimaginably horrendous and worthy of a long prison term, even if Keegstra, a native-born Canadian, could be denaturalized and
deported. It should be noted that Alberta at the time was under the control of a right-wing conservative regime headed by one Ralph Klein, who had replaced a more progressive Conservative Provincial government headed Peter Lougheed. Klein was a Jewish drunk and loud mouth, an Alberta Firster and a hot-line radio commentator who had previously made a name for himself during a national oil crisis by telling the Federal government which eyed Alberta's oil resources to go 'freeze in the dark'. This won Klein so much support in Alberta that he was able to seize the leadership of the provincial Conservative party and place himself in power. It may be noted that Alberta sees itself as a region endowed by a benevolent fate with oil, a province which is constantly being robbed of its income by grasping federal governments. Alberta is an incomprehensible northern extension of the American bible belt.

In any case, what seemed to enrage the Jewish organizations was that no criminal charges had initially been laid against Keegstra. His former students, however, seemed to dismiss his lessons. They went in one ear and out the other, as with so much else that was taught in their high school. On being questioned most of them could not remember what Keegstra had said about Jews or anything else. Quite typical.

Already by May 1983 some of Eckville's recent high school graduates were being 'reeducated' by Jewish holocaust revival organizations. In that month six former Eckville students attended a Holocaust memorial symposium given at the University of BC, their way paid for by the B'nai Brith Maccabee Lodge of Vancouver. They were accompanied by the teacher who took over their classes after Keegstra's dismissal. At the Vancouver symposium Lola and Max Apfelbaum told "stories of a dog that killed a half dozen people in a day, an escape from Auschwitz and a chance to kill Nazi soldiers". Vera Slyomovies "described a female commandant who rode through her camp on a white horse while whipping all the prisoners who walked instead of ran to their work" and so on and so forth. These and other eye witnessed accounts were addressed to some 500 high school students in the audience at the eighth annual symposium on the holocaust held at the University of BC. The Eckville students were duly apologetic and promised to spread this account when they returned home (Vancouver Sun, May 27/83).

During Keegstra's trial for disseminating hatred against Jews his former students were interrogated in court. We are told of one student, a Donna Gefile, who gained a passing grade in her high school social studies course despite the fact that she handed in an 'anti-semitic' essay. Indeed, "The main prosecution evidence has been class notebooks belonging to about 20 former social studies students covering five school years" (Vancouver Sun, June 19/85). Investigating the notebooks of former students for evidence of illegal thought is rather chilling.

Other former students, now under the spotlight and encouraged to come clean, revealed that they had been taught odious facts which they had since come to totally reject. Some of their class notes suggested that the holocaust was a propaganda hoax, a gross exaggeration intended to gain political support for Jews. The students traipsed up to the witness stand and revealed the terrible misinformation to which their young minds had been subjected (Globe and Mail, April 12, 13/85). To top it off, one former student, a Lorene Baxter, told that she was taught that "cannibalism and mutilation were among the acts perpetrated by evil Jews in history" (Vancouver Sun, May 3/85). Doug Christie, Keegstra's lawyer, noted that these charges were inconsistent with her testimony of the previous June. But nothing came of it. Most of the testifiers were presented by an outraged crown prosecution as if their testimony was given before the Nuremberg tribunal.
During that trial Keegstra acted as the main witness for himself, spending some 26 of the trial's 62 days in the witness stand giving testimony (Vancouver Sun, September 7/85).

We never do get to know what Keegstra actually taught; it seems to be a mixed bag of 8th century Khazars, eighteenth century Illuminati mystics, a dipping into Talmudic texts and accounts of an alleged conspiracy to rule the world by certain "materialistic and atheistic Jews". One Globe and Mail headline cries that "Keegstra version of history clashes with accepted view" (Globe and Mail, April 22/85). Monstrous. Some of Keegstra's former students claimed that they had repeated Keegstra's theories merely to get better grades. (Globe and Mail, May 7/85). What a bunch of sheep.

How was his tale materially different from the host of Holocaust revival lessons, now often mandatory in classrooms, which revolve around anti-German hate mongering? If Keegstra had just stuck with the centrality of the Anglo-American role in civilizing the world, and focused on the place of the Judeo-Christian tradition in this enterprise, he would have been on safe ground. No one would have objected. He could have offered the kind of history which so many of us had shoved down our throats during the 1940s and 1950s. Quite as silly and offensive as anything which Keegstra disseminated.

Various pieces of Canadian legislation, both old and newly created, make it a crime to disseminate 'false information'. What constitutes 'false information' is ultimately anything which a judge says it is.

To add high philosophizing to the judicial proceedings, one Gordon Fairweather, a former Tory MP and head of the Canadian Human Rights Commission, holds that hauling hate mongers before courts simply gives them a platform from which to spread their propaganda. "Such trials do more damage in the sense of giving a hateful bigot like Ernst Zundel the platform he likes." Fairweather favored strengthening prohibitions against the dissemination of hate literature (Globe and Mail, April 22/85). You can believe whatever you like, just don't say it to anyone.

A brief extract from letters to the editor seem to sum up the responses to this crusade. One Joseph Katz, Emeritus Professor of Education at the University of British Columbia writes to decry a position taken by the Globe and Mail: "(Your)...position is that the courts should not be in the business of punishing people for opinions, however hateful... The essential weakness of the editorial - as of all civil libertarians - is that freedom of speech is limitless unless it does physical violence to persons or property. These are the arguments of the rank materialist, who fails to take into account the spiritual dimensions of man and the psychological and sociological damage that can be wreaked on men, women and children and society in general... The Keegstras and Zundels of this world are prepared to use freedom of speech to destroy free societies. Unfortunately these misguided and misinformed individuals are aided and abetted by those who have unwittingly succumbed to the mind-numbing materialism of our age" (Globe and Mail, July 31/85). That from a professor of education.

The result of the trial was that Keegstra was fined $5,000 rather than being jailed for two years. A series of letters-to-the-editor appeared across the country applauding the court's action; however, three Jewish commentators held that the punishment was insufficiently severe. Helen Smolack of the Canadian Holocaust Remembrance Association writes that "The Jewish people, indeed the whole free world - have learned through bitter experience that if demagoguery is not challenged, those consequences are sure to appear." Howard Shapray, a Jewish
lawyer from Vancouver writes "I am concerned that the inordinately light fine leveled on Mr. Keegstra effectively vitiates the legislation by creating ... a precedent establishing that one may, with relative impunity, vitiate laws fundamental to the maintenance of tolerance in a democratic society." While David Matas, the lawyer for B'nai Brith's (anti) Defamation League holds that the hate propaganda law breached by Mr. Keegstra does not require the specification of provable injuries sustained by one party, since these are entailed in the act of propagating hatred (Globe and Mail, August 1/85). This of course does not apply to people like himself.

No longer permitted to teach in Alberta, Keegstra later took a job as a part time mechanic in a local garage. One of his former students, one Steven Lecerf, remarked that events had confirmed what Keegstra had said about the forces which rule our society and that his lot had fallen out about as he had predicted (Globe and Mail, April 13/85).

In late 1986 the ABC network issued a two hour television drama, "Evil in Clear River", revolving around the Keegstra case. It has Hollywood lovely Lindsay Wagner as a small town mother who discovers her child has been taught material which may be anti-semitic and versions of world events 'that are shockingly inaccurate' - presumably meaning they don't accord with television history. The teacher concerned is also the mayor of the village and few in town are much interested. "She continues to nervously investigate and discovers that the students - including her son - are lapping up Suyak's [the teacher's] revisionist views of history and in the process becoming strongly anti-Semitic" (Vancouver Sun, January 11/88).

It turns into a one woman against the entire town crusade. The teacher is inevitably taken to court and expeditiously convicted under the Canadian 'dissemination of hate' law, which allegedly is the envy of American dispensers of justice. The film maker, a former Canadian now in Hollywood, noted in a follow-up interview that "Canada comes out as a country that knows how to deal with neo-Nazis", he said, "and the United States doesn't" (Vancouver Sun, January 11/88). Wonderful!

By this time the Keegstra case was getting rather long in the tooth and some of the crusaders are eager to be off to hunt fresher targets. However Keegstra launched an appeal against his conviction and triggered yet another series of court hearings.

In early 1987 Keegstra's appeal comes before the Alberta Court of Appeal. The challenge was that the section of the Criminal Code (section 319) is held to have violated the freedom of speech protected by the Canadian Charter of Rights The response from assorted lawyers was, in effect, 'there are limits to the right of freedom of speech'. Quite amazingly, in 1988 the Appeal Court of Alberta sets aside Keegstra's previous conviction, finding that the law under which he was tried was itself unconstitutional.

This raises storm signals in the judicial realms and in December of 1990 the Supreme Court of Canada overturns the Alberta Court of Appeal, holding that the law used is constitutional. The following March, 1991, the Alberta Court of Appeal quashes Keegstra's conviction but orders a new trial. "The Canadian Jewish Congress said yesterday that retrying Mr. Keegstra is vital. 'It is only proper that the anti-hate provisions of the Criminal Code be invoked in this case and that it be pursued to its ultimate resolution', said national president Les Scheininger" (Globe and Mail, April 26/91).
In April of that year the Alberta Attorney General, Ken Rostad, announces a new trial, which begins in March of 1992. There is a great deal of wrangling about who will sit on the jury but ultimately the second trial gets under way. Many of the previous witnesses and student papers are once more dredged up and given another hearing. This time around the press focuses on the 'proto-Nazi' aspects of Keegstra's teaching, as revealed in student notes.

One Dick Hoeksema, the teacher who replaced Keegstra, expatiated on how many of the students had 'neo-Nazi' ideas after being taught by Keegstra. How true this was and how different it is from the views of other students taught by other teachers in small-town Alberta, is anyone's guess. In any case, Canada's newspapers are once again filled with reports from Keegstra's second trial, along with the requisite philosophizing about freedom and responsibility.

In his second trial Keegstra dispensed with his previous council, Doug Christie, and led his own defence. This involved few challenges to the charges against him but long monologues on his pet fantasies - about Judeo-Bolshevik conspiracies to take over the world, the evils of usury, and the atheistic menace to western Christian society. He ended with the proposition that "His previously good reputation,' he said, had been destroyed by a 'vicious and malicious media, owned by Jewish bankers" (Vancouver Sun, June 26/92). There's no doubt that his removal from school teaching was long overdue but would his conviction on disseminating hatred protect Canadian freedoms in any way? I very much doubt it.

On July 10, 1992, the jury in the second trial finds Keegstra again guilty of disseminating hatred against Jews and he is fined $3,000 by Queen's Court Justice Arthur Lutz. The crown prosecuting attorney, one George Combe, sought a stiffer sentence, a long jail term, "...to deter others who might imitate Keegstra." Sol Littman, the Canadian director of the Simon Weisenthal Centre for Holocaust Studies in Toronto, held that "The Crown is to be commended for their prosecution of a very difficult case... The jury's verdict speaks for the good sense of the Canadian common people and indicates that hate mongering and bizarre conspiracy theories are not acceptable to the general public" (Globe and Mail, July 11/92). Irving Abella of the Canadian Jewish Congress, Stephan Scheinberg of the League of Human Rights [?] of the B'nai Brith and other defenders of right thought chime in their support for the conviction.

One Harvey Kane, the national executive director of the Jewish Defence League of Canada, a terrorist organization which had been broken up in America but still operated in Canada, held that the court ruling was a disgrace and that Keegstra should have been jailed. (The J.D.L is a lot more scary and dangerous than Keegstra.) Kane tells reporters that "This man has been getting away with murder, the educational system has let him get away with it, and the only way this thing is going to end is if the man is given a prison sentence... It's not right. It's not justice what we have here, and the judiciary that we have here just makes me ashamed to be an Albertan (Vancouver Sun, July 23/92).

This should be the end of the story, except that the Alberta Court of Appeal threw out Keegstra’s second conviction, again over the issue of the constitutionality of the law under which he was convicted. However in February of 1996 the Supreme Court of Canada stepped in and in a rapid 9 to 0 ruling upheld the constitutionality of the anti-hate law and reinstated Keegstra's conviction. "Rubin Friedman of B'nai Brith Canada welcomed the swift hearing and judgement... It's a strong message. It's clear, unequivocal - the law is
constitutional, people can be charged under it, people can be convicted under it', said Friedman" (*Vancouver Sun*, February 29/96).

So be forewarned all ye who would seek to spread false information and unaccepted interpretations of history.

**Ernest Zundel and Holocaust Denial**

The charge against Ernest Zundel was basically a 'thought crime'. There was no imputation that he had anything to do with the Holocaust, since he was then an infant, no claim that his parents were Nazis - his father was a pacifist and a medical orderly during the war. One sister was a Christian missionary, a brother a lawyer in America. Ernest Zundel was born in 1940 in a peasant village in the Black Forest region of Germany where his ancestors had lived for over 300 years. He had come to Canada as a very young man in 1958 because Canada had no peacetime conscription. Why had he become an anti-Zionist?

"'The absolute God's honest truth is that it was a reaction to the incessant anti-German propaganda stereotyping of the Germans', he says...Mr.Zundel says that he hits at Zionism because Zionists hit at Germany. 'Zionism is Jewish Nazism'" (*Globe and Mail*, December 6/83) That is a rather strange thing for an alleged German neo-Nazi to say.

Zundel became obsessed with the subject and started a modest publishing house dealing with the matter. He lost his wife and job in the process but rose to national notoriety through charges levelled against him because of these activities. For a number of years throughout the 1980s and 1990s his name and the prosecutions against him filled the pages of national newspapers in Canada.

As the trials progressed Zundel did apparently become a neo-Nazi, although a rather sentimental and embattled one. He began associating with fringe quasi-fascist groups, giving his almost universal critics a chance to expatiate about neo-Nasties rising to influence again. He always struck me as a rather ludicrous, isolated figure, fundamentally wrong, but whose suppression would and did cost Canadians losses in their rights to think and publish whatever they would. It remained largely a Canadian caper.

Zundel's trials soon came to center on the issue of 'free speech' and the right of Canadians to pursue what arguments they wished. This was not a particularly enviable defence for Doug Christie, Zundel's lawyer, to take since, as everyone knows there is very little free speech in Canada when the interests of powerful others are offended. Still, it was a case in defence of what allegedly constitutes 'a right' in Canada.

Zundel initially worked in Toronto as a commercial artist and in the 1970s began to write and distribute booklets such as 'Did 6 Million Really Die?', challenging the claim of the Jewish Holocaust. It was through this that he came to the attention of Jewish action groups, such as Sabina Citron's Toronto-based Canadian Holocaust Remembrance Association. Zundel, who in late 1983 was still unknown to newspaper readers, was charged with 'spreading false information', a crime under the Canadian Criminal Code, especially if what you have to say offends powerful others.

Madam Citron said that her Holocaust association was formed in 1978 "...to protect Jewish rights and to ensure that racists and neo-Nazis never again gain a legal foothold in Canada" (*Globe and Mail*, December 20/83). Zundel was ordered to stand trial in December of that year. "On May 31, a large demonstration made up of five Jewish groups met in Toronto and marched on Mr. Zundel's home. They called him a Nazi and hate monger. 'They were saying they wanted me dead' said
Mr. Zundel" (Globe and Mail, December 6/83). The Holocaust Remembrance Association was successful in having Zundel's mailing privileges revoked in 1981 but these were later reinstated.

The previous year "Famed Nazi hunter Simon Wiesenthal wrote to Canada's Solicitor General Robert Kaplan, 'As you know, Europe is swept by an anti-Jewish wave. [once again] We are deluged with publications ... that call up race hatred and neo-Nazism. Right now we came across leaflets and circular letters that are despatched in Toronto, Ontario. The sender is a certain Ernst Zundel ..." (Globe and Mail, December 6/83). So the fat was in the fire. Zundel was brought to trial in early 1985 on two counts of 'knowingly spreading false news that was likely to cause harm to racial or social tolerance.' None of the countless Hollywood war flicks which do this could ever be charged with this crime of course.

This was the beginning of charges which ultimately would go on for almost twenty years. The incessant activity and determination of Jewish groups to see that their targets are punished for whatever crimes they are charged with puzzled me initially. However on reflection it may make sense; their charges require continual repetition for the public to become aware of them. They can only squeeze the full measure of retribution out of those who are their targets by constant repetition.

In Zundel's initial trial all the stops were pulled out and a roster of all the horrors of concentration camps was given full play. There was a visit to Auschwitz by fifty survivors. 'I saw it with my own eyes', said Vera Kreighel, an Israeli citizen. 'They took little children out of the wombs of mothers and threw them into a fire. It was terrifying. I remember the shrieking of those poor women... How can I forget it. It is inside us, it is rooted inside. It was hell' (Vancouver Sun, February/85). One might wonder why the victimizers bothered to extract 'the living little children' from their mothers wombs if they were to be exterminated. Just another example of their bestiality, I suppose.

At Zundel's trial a group of members of the Jewish Defence League attacked some of Zundel's supporters and four were arrested. "At a press conference yesterday, JDL director Meir Halevi said the bail conditions of the charged members include a flagrantly unfair order that they not come within 1,000 feet of Toronto's courthouse during the Zundel trial. He said that bail conditions and the fact that only JDL members were arrested show the authorities are biased. He said, 'JDL members are under orders to smash Nazis in self defence.' The best defence is a rabid offense, as far as the Jewish Defence League is concerned.

While all this was going on a Vancouver Standing Committee on the Holocaust staged their 11th symposium to an audience of 500 highschool students. "I was there, says survivor of Holocaust experience", reads a newspaper headline. Mounted by various colleges and the University of BC the symposium was addressed by a concentration camp survivor, one Vera Slyomovics. "The students listened, many with tears in their eyes, as Skyomovics told them of '...the unbelievable cries of anguish and despair' on the cattle-car journey to Auschwitz" (Globe and Mail, February 22/85. In cattle cars ,eh!

At Zundel's trial one Polish survivor told of a road prisoners called Golgotha Way "because every step was soaked with human blood"; also that the cream of Polish society was imprisoned there. He also described the work from 5 am till nightfall, the half-cup of soup made from cabbage and manure, and the teeming armies of lice which infested the prisoners. Somehow he, a child, managed to survive all this for five years (Globe and Mail, January 26/85).
Another witness testified that he often saw the black and grey smoke coming from the crematoria where the Jewish dead were burned after they were gassed. "It wasn't that they were belching like a factory all the time. It was the odor of burning flesh. The flames were changing colors from yellow to deep red at various times." Doug Christie, Zundel's lawyer, suggested that it was impossible that smoke would come from a crematorium consuming bodies. In answer Arnold Friedman said, "If you're talking about crematoria in Toronto and crematoria in Auschwitz, those are two different things. In Birkenau smoke came out of the chimney."

He also testified to seeing thousands of boys being herded into the crematoria. However on fuller questioning he retracted his claims to being an eyewitness. "Mr. Friedman's sudden indecision in the face of Mr. Christie's forceful questioning touched off an almost perceptible shock wave in the courtroom" (Globe and Mail, January 1984).

Rudolf Vrba, the author of 'I Cannot Forgive', a rather doctored account of his experiences at Auschwitz and his escape to inform Hungary's Jewry of the death camps, told the court of how the dead were dragged out of the 'cattle cars' in which they arrived and tossed into dump trucks by parties of prisoners. And of how one Dr. Mengele was usually present to make a selection between those who were to be kept alive and who were to be gassed. Vrba is one of those memorialists who always seem to be present at every important event and always has the low down when anything of importance happens. He even claimed, elsewhere, that he kept an approximate count of all who were gassed, which ran into the millions (Vancouver Sun, January 22/85).

A Dennis Urstein told of being a member of a party which pulled the victims bodies out of the gas chamber using hooked, wooden staves. His testimony did have the stamp of real experience to it. "Mr. Urstein said the chamber reeked of urine, feces and a pickle smell, and the victims had foam on their mouths." He turned Doug Christie's questions back at him with a quiet contempt, or so it is reported (Globe and Mail, January 29/85). Throughout the months of this trial the Globe and Mail is filled with outraged responses, indicating that the trial is working as intended. One Jack Aaron claims that the neo-Nazis are just waiting for all the survivors to die off before they dismiss the accounts of the extermination camps. "Were it not for this trial in which the truth was heard out of the mouths of the survivors, those who refuse to learn would have continued their attempts to minimize. That this is no longer possible is, next to the punishment of the guilty, the lasting achievement of this exemplary trial" (Globe and Mail, February 16/85). That apparently was a major factor behind the decision to hold such a show trial.

For the defence, one professor Gary Botting from Alberta notes that "'The truth, as it becomes known through history, is often quite different from what really happened,' Professor Botting said. Consequently, he testified, all sides of an issue must be scrupulously examined in arriving at a decision." That was a position not acceptable to the prosecution.

Zundel himself appeared on the witness stand and described that the stereotyping of Germans was brought home to him on a visit to Dachau in 1963, where the visitors' book was filled with 'outpourings of hatred against Germans' (Globe and Mail, February 16/85). He should have mentioned that most of the prisoners at Dachau were German (not Jewish) opponents of the Nazis. In any case, his experiences during the 1970s led him to question claims about the Holocaust.
Yet another witness for Zundel recounted the following: "Earlier yesterday, an elderly man from Chicago broke down in tears on the witness stand as he told of being identified and tried as a war criminal in 1980, even though he could prove he was not."

"Frank Walus testified that 11 'eye witnesses' identified him as the SS General who killed dozens of Jews and Poles in front of their eyes. An Illinois court ordered that he be deported to Israel."

"However, at the time the atrocities had taken place, Mr. Walrus was being forced by the Germans to work on a farm - a fact he was ultimately able to prove to a US Appeal Court with documentary evidence."

"But this came only after three years of persecution by the courts, the American media, and some Chicagoans who took the law into their own hands, he said."

"If I wouldn't have any evidence, proof, that I never was a war criminal, probably they would deport me to Israel and hang me up", said Mr. Walus, formerly a lineworker at General Motors Corp."

"Every Chicago television station ran news bulletins at 15 minute intervals when he was first identified by Nazi-hunter Simon Wiesenthal and charged, Mr.Walus said. Then came the beatings. "I was beaten by all kinds of different people, mostly Poles. I was 10 to 15 times beaten. Also beaten by some Jewish people." He said he had two heart attacks and still owes much of his $120,000 legal costs" for his defence.

"Mr Christie told District court Judge Hugh Locke the testimony was relevant because it shows how the Zionist-dominated media tries anyone who is accused of a crime which involved the word 'Nazi'. This same 'mass hysteria' has surrounded Mr. Zundel's activities, he said" (Globe and Mail, February 15/85).

Since Mr. Wiesenthal's Nazi hunting targets often prove to be the wrong persons, one wonders how many of the 3,000 individuals he had successfully persecuted previously were also innocent of the charges.

Zundel's lawyer pointed out that "'A controversial article questioning the Holocaust doesn't contain a single abusive reference to Jews and should be freely available unless Canadians are keen on state mind control', a Vancouver journalist testified yesterday at the Ernst Zundel trial. That is what Doug Collins, a right-wing world war 2 veteran writing for the Vancouver press said about the trial. 'Mr. Zundel's crime, if he has committed one, is similar to Martin Luther's crime when he denounced the Pope', Mr Collins said. 'What we're talking about here is heresy. And Mr. Zundel is a heretic'. Mr. Collins said 'there is no topic that scares a journalist into self-censorship more swiftly. Any journalist who explores revisionist thought on the Holocaust is accused of being anti-Semitic or of producing hate literature...' And they always get a prompt visit from someone representing the Jewish community', he added" (Globe and Mail, February 19/85).

At the end of the trial Judge Hugh Locke told the jury that there was '"Little doubt the Holocaust existed.' Zundel's lawyer said. 'The truth can always withstand questioning', but that 'Whenever somebody tries to shield what is considered truth from scrutiny, it is time for society to become suspicious"'(Globe and Mail, February 26/85).

In an article headed 'Jewish community torn by Zundel trial', the Globe and Mail notes that, "Supporters of the prosecution have little time for the faint of heart. 'The prime shrinking violets are the Jewish community leaders,' says Sabina Citron, head of the Canadian Holocaust Remembrance Association, the group that spawned the charges. 'We have some bad leaders. I don't even consider them
leaders. This is Nazi hate propaganda and we don't have to tolerate it. The people who are afraid to expose Mr. Zundel have the 'galut' mentality,' she said, using a Hebrew term applied to Jews who blindly comply with any demand or bow to persecution." "Another Holocaust Remembrance official [a Mrs Smolack] said the association used to be a part of the Canadian Jewish Congress but was forced to secede because of the discomfort caused by its activist stance. The community leaders (a self-perpetuating group hanging on for dear life) were hoping the revisionists would just go away. 'Mrs. Citron said the showdown came in 1978, when the CJC leaders ordered the activists to cool down or leave, she says. They left' (Globe and Mail, February 28/85).

So historical revisionism is now a crime in Canada. Does that mean that accepted historical accounts of native people in Canada written 60 or 70 years ago cannot be publicly challenged?

On March 1, 1985, after a seven week trial, Zundel is found guilty after a nine hour deliberation by the jury. "'The charge hangs on the question of whether he had an honest belief in what he was publishing,' said Jacques Kornberg, a University of Toronto professor who teaches a course on the Holocaust. 'My guess, based on knowing the kind of propaganda he [Mr. Zundel] has written is that he honestly believes there is a secret Jewish government.'... The archaic Criminal Code section 177 has been used only three times in the 118 years since Confederation and resulted in only one conviction... It was the only charge they [the Holocaust Remembrance Association] could launch privately. Because it was an indictable offence, the Crown was obliged to take it over in the public interest. ... Yet even this situation is preferable to the one that exists in the United States. where the First Amendment would have precluded Mr. Zundel ever being put on trial, legal experts say." In any case, he was adjudged guilty of 'spreading false information' (Globe and Mail, March 1/85).

Zundel notifies the court of his intent to appeal his conviction. A regional council meeting of B'nai Brith is held; "....representatives of provincial, federal and municipal governments repeatedly called for the deportation of Mr. Zundel and applauded the court's decision as a triumph of justice." In this they were preceded by former Solicitor-General Robert Kaplan, who also favoured Zundel's deportation (Globe and Mail, March 4/85).

On March 7/85 the Globe and Mail carries another full page article entitled 'The legal war on Holocaust revisionists', claiming that the historical revision of the Holocaust is at the center of a new wave of anti-Semitism and racism sweeping the West. It notes some of the court cases launched by Jewish organizations and individuals around the world against historical revisionism.

On March 11/85 MacLeans magazine runs a seven page article on 'The Holocaust Trial' which is the expectable collage of a Jewish heroine, Sabina Citron, a survivor of Auschwitz who brought the charges against Zundel. Zundel's evil consisted of questioning claims about the Holocaust. Assorted commentators such as Sol Littman and Irving Cotler hold that the presiding judge did not act strongly enough and should have declared the Holocaust a fact at the beginning of the trial. There are also general charges that Canada has been unconscionably lax in refusing to try and deport hundreds or thousands of 2nd world war criminals. It also takes a swipe at Doug Christie or at any lawyer who would work to defend historical revisionism. An indefensible thought crime.

On March 26 Judge Locke sentenced Zundel to fifteen months in jail and an additional three years on probation for 'disseminating false news.' He also ordered that he have nothing to do with publishing anything during that period.
Locke dismissed Christie's appeal to the right to free speech and expatiated at length on the horrors of Nazism and the subhuman monsters who led it, holding that for Zundel "Rehabilitation is a near impossibility" (Globe and Mail, March 26/85).

In the concluding paragraphs of an editorial in the Globe and Mail, the editors say, in part, "Judge Locke says Section 177 does not prohibit 'legitimate debate among Canadian citizens...' The concepts of legitimate debate and free speech are contradictory."

It remarks that "What is false, what is legitimate, what is right, what is moral in a free society can be determined only by the constant play of unfettered debate. The affronts and dangers of an Ernst Zundel must be confronted in the court of public opinion, daily - not in the court of official truth, where freedom quickly falls to the insistence on order, and the Big Lie and Big Truth eventually emerge" (Globe and Mail, March 27/85). Remarkable.

The calls for Zundel's deportation mount, especially from David Matas and from the Canadian Jewish Congress. Irwin Cotler, a professor of law and a Holocaust revivalist, says that Zundel should be deported to Germany, which is on the verge of passing a law which would make it illegal to question the Holocaust. Now all that is needed is to make it illegal to criticize the state of Israel. On April 29, 1985, Zundel is ordered deported from Canada, a decision which he will appeal. (Globe and Mail, April 30/85)

Zundel's varied appeals will drag on for almost 15 more years, whose twists and turns are impossible to follow in a brief overview. The initial appeal of his conviction will turn on the 'right' to free speech in Canada, a 'right' which the reviewing judge will quickly shoot down.

In the spring of the following year a book entitled The Zundel Trial. The Media and Public Opinion in Canada notes the potential anti-Semitism among the less well educated. It finds that the Canadian public and the public media were insufficiently supportive of those charging Zundel and notes that in their questionnaire "27 percent of Canadians gave openly prejudiced answers and a further 38 percent gave 'don't know' answers which the authors see as breeding ground for prejudice. Only 35 percent of those who answered gave acceptable levels of support for Jews. Their findings are said to have uncovered the continuing basis of anti-Semitism in Canada. (Globe and Mail, May 24/86)

In late July Zundel attempts to address audiences in BC but no hotel or conference site will rent him a hall. One of the Victoria 'community leaders' involved in blocking Zundel's speech said "Our members feel this is a victory. It's nice to see business making a moral stand, said Hanny Turner of the Vancouver Island Human Rights Coalition. The coalition joined forces this week with the Victoria Labor Council and Jewish groups to protest the planned speech by Zundel" (Vancouver Sun, July 29/89). All this is strongly reminiscent of how Communists and 'fellow travellers' were treated 40 years earlier.

A Vancouver Sun article of August 15, 1986, entitled 'Hate literature law criticized', notes the ongoing Canadian Law Reform Commission holds that the specific act under which Zundel was convicted is notably all-inclusive. It dates from 1275 A.D. and is rarely used in Canada today. Instead, they propose new laws aimed at those who formulate hatred of (certain) identifiable social groups. They recognize that their view will be criticized by those wanting sweeping new powers to protect 'visible minorities' in Canada.

On Aug 21/86 Ontario's Chief Justice refused to let the Canadian Civil Liberties Association join in an appeal by Zundel against his conviction for spreading false
news (Vancouver Sun, August 22/86). The Appeal is to be heard in November of that year.

In an unrelated case, which nevertheless bears upon similar matters, "An Ontario Supreme Court judge has ruled that truth is no defence in a lawyer's hearing for contempt of court." In a court action against one Harry Kopyo, who had said, after a protracted attempt to have R.C.M.P officers charged with past wrong doings, that Canadian courts 'are warped in favor of protecting the police'. Ontario Supreme Court Judge Robert Montgomery held that "It would not be for the public good to allow the defence of truth in such contempt cases." Judge Montgomery also concluded that the Crown would not have to prove that Kopyo had intended by his statements to bring the administration of justice into disrepute" (Vancouver Sun, October 2/86). It seems to me that nothing brings the administration of justice into disrepute as the actions of such judges themselves.

The Globe and Mail reporter Kirk Makin worries about the publicity which Zundel obtained during the trial. He quotes Irving Abella, author of 'None Is Too Many', a history of anti-Semitism in Canada before and during world war 2, as saying "that many people who originally opposed the trial have since changed their minds. It did publicize the extremes of these people, but it brought it into the open. One dares not ignore it - it is at one's own risk" (Globe and Mail, January 24/67). The anti-Semitism of a handful of marginal individuals is the burning issue of the day.

On the same day the Globe and Mail reports that the Ontario Court of appeal has granted Zundel a new trial on the original charges, holding that the previous judge had committed a serious error in instructing the jury. It nevertheless held that the old common law crime of 'issuing false news and information' is not a violation of free speech and is perfectly legal in Canada. "In its constitutional ruling, the court said freedom of expression is not absolute. 'Spreading false ideas is the antithesis of seeking truth through the free exchange of ideas,' it said... 'Judge Locke [the previous judge] made one of the gravest errors when he intimated to the jury that Mr. Zundel could be convicted if they decided he did not honestly believe his publications,' the court said. In reality, the jury had to decide that he actually knew the pamphlets to be false in order to convict" (Globe and Mail, January 24/87).

Spokespersons for the Jewish community are shocked and outraged. After all the trouble they have gone through! "Ralph Snow, president-elect of B'nai Brith, said the Crown should proceed with some other prosecution, preferably under a different law. If the Crown decided against going that route, it should ask the higher court to quash the order for a new trial." He suggested charging Zundel as Jim Keegstra was, with a violation of section 281.2, which provides the same penalties as section 177 put is directed at 'anyone who, by communicating statements other than in private conversation, willfully promotes hatred against any identifiable group' (Vancouver Sun, February 6/87).

By late March of 1987 the 'spreading false news' decision against Zundel was beginning to spread. Dr. Anthony Hall, of the Department of Native Studies at the University of Regina, demands the removal of books and historical texts from the Regina Public library which allegedly described native people in an unflattering light - as 'savages,' 'filthy' and 'superstitious' - as comparable to Zundel's misrepresentation of the holocaust. One Mary Pitawanakwat, a leading Native educationalist in Regina, said that the 'dehumanizing' of Indians in history texts helped to 'justify the process by which their land was taken from them'. "Such justifications have for generations been reflected in the positions of various
executive and judicial rulings on Indian land claims issues across Canada... A recent repetition of these arguments, if in a disguised form, was given in 1984 by Mr. Justice Donald Steele, on the Temagami land claims submitted by the Indians of Bear Island." They lost the case so they obviously were discriminated against. (Globe and Mail, April 1/97)

It was necessary to clear the libraries of books which did not fit with current native claims or be adjudged as bearing the same guilt as Mr. Zundel.

In August of that year the Attorney-General of Ontario argues in court to have the province's motion to have Mr. Zundel's appeal quashed. Sabina Citron, who had laid the original charge against Zundel through her Holocaust Remembrance Association, said the the supreme court must decide "whether hate propaganda or spreading false news are permissible in this society.' ... She said there could be no honest discussion of propaganda or hatred of Jews" (Globe and Mail, August 8/87). In that month Doug Christie releases a book entitled 'The Zundel Trial & Free Speech'. It contains the outlines of what would be his defence in Zundel's appeals trial.

A Globe and Mail article on August 26, 1987, by one Nick Russell, who teaches journalism at the University of Regina, holds that the press have an obligation not to print any defense by those accused of spreading false information about the Holocaust. "To the extent that the press had covered Mr. Zundel's claims to that extent they had given him a pulpit - something which must be avoided in future trials. Why should survivors of the Holocaust be put through the anguish of seeing the news media report claims it didn't happen? Why should the young and the impressionable be exposed to this type of propaganda? The media have a moral responsibility here beyond simply reporting. To report what is said is, in this instance, a cop-out, a refusal to take responsibility of giving a fair, accurate, balanced report of what people need to know."

In short, the media have a moral responsibility to treat their audience as children and see to it that they only read what the accepted texts on a subject are. That is about what I would expect from a Regina teacher of journalism.

In mid January 1988 the court again takes up the original charge against Zundel and judge John Pearson orders a ban on all publication about the trial. A group of Mr. Zundel's supporters are kept out of the court room and the jury is selected. We don't really know what the arguments were in this trial because of the publication ban while the trial was going on and a studied silence on the part of the media after it was over. It presumably turned on the issue of the limits on free speech in Canada, what it was acceptable to debate and what counted as 'spreading false news'. The court had previously determined that the charge of 'spreading false information' was a crime in Canada if it could be shown that the person charged actually knew the information to be false. Zundel was again found guilty of the charge and was committed to the Don jail for a term of eight months imprisonment.

He launched a second appeal in the Ontario Court of Appeal. In that hearing the judge "...took official judicial notice of the Holocaust, recognizing it as a historical fact - so the prosecution did not have to prove it happened as it did in the first trial." It only then turned out that Zundel did not write 'Did Six Million Really Die? but had only published it. This account apparently held that the the Holocaust had been grossly exaggerated and that Zionists had forwarded that claim in the interests of extracting financial reparations from post-war Germany. Zundel is once again convicted on May 5th, 1990 and sentenced to nine months in prison. "In its ruling the court said Mr. Zundel submits that he is being punished
for his political beliefs. This is not the case. He is being punished for what he has done” (*Globe and Mail*, February 6/90). What he had done was to publish unacceptable views to the outrage of Jewish organizations.

In November of 1991 Zundel is arrested and tried in a German court for his participation in an allegedly neo-Nazi rally. He is charged on 210 counts of inciting racial hatred and defaming the memory of the dead (*Globe and Mail*, November 7/91). Apparently he was out on bail.

On December 10, 1991, he takes his fight against Section 177 of the Criminal Code, criminalizing the dissemination of false information, to the Supreme Court of Canada. They had agreed to hear his case. His lawyer holds that "the crime is an 'instrument of thought control' that violates freedom of expression guaranteed by the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. (The law) ... is so vaguely worded that it can be used on any pretext to prosecute and persecute anyone in the publishing industry who dares to publish anything controversial and in particular anything that does not have the stamp of officially defined truth". He was supported by the country's major civil liberties organizations which say the law is so broad it threatens to chill legitimate forms of speech. The Ontario government and major Jewish organizations maintain that the law is needed to 'preserve social and racial harmony' (*Globe and Mail*, December 10/91).

This law was first introduced in England in 1275 to protect peers and high public officials from slanderous songsters and has been used only four times in Canada, of which only one case led to a conviction. That was of an Alberta store owner who in 1907 advertised his closing out sale with the words 'Americans not wanted in Canada. "Although the law is supposed to attack deliberate lies, the Canadian Civil Liberties Association argues it could also 'catch within its net normal discussion and expression. In a different political climate then we now enjoy, the provision can become a weapon in the hands of those who wish to stifle expression of minority viewpoints or stories of events which the majority would sooner commit to the dustbin of history'' (*Globe and Mail*, December 10/91)

Amazingly, Zundel's conviction is overturned by the Supreme Court of Canada in August of 1992. They did so in finding the specific law used was in violation of the freedom of speech provisions of the Canadian Charter of Rights. Will wonders never cease!

That decision is immediately followed by outraged demands that the law be rewritten to dispense with the proviso that the disseminator of false information actually know that the information he is dispensing is false. They propose a new law to convict people if what they propose is untrue, as later decided by some court. Jewish spokespersons remark, 'We will see if Canada is the kind of place where one can promote lies'. The Department of Citizenship and Immigration begins a long process of hearings which will ultimately lead to Zundel's deportation from Canada. If they can't get him through the courts they will rely on the political processes of that department.

Somewhat later Zundel accuses Eli Wiesel, a holocaust survivor and a leader in the holocaust revival movement, of promoting hatred towards Germans and seeks his ban from Canada. Wiesel has written endlessly of his experiences in concentration camps and the lessons to be taken from them. He has had his name put forward for the Nobel Peace prize. "Wiesel's 1968 collection of stories, 'Legends of Our Time,' includes the following sentences. 'Every Jew, somewhere in his being, should set apart a zone of hate - healthy, virile hate - for what the German personifies and for what persists in the German. To do otherwise would be a betrayal of the dead'" (*Vancouver Sun*, September 8/92).
Zundel filed a complaint with the OPP [Ontario Provincial Police] Project Hate section, which deals with hate literature. "We want to test now whether the laws of Canada are only always applied against people like myself or also against Jews" he said. The Canadian Jewish Congress' Bernie Farber held that the charges were patently ridiculous and did not warrant a response. Nothing came of them.

On the following day Frank Dimant's, Executive Vice-President of B'nai Brith Canada, letter-to-the -editor appears in the Globe and Mail which damns Zundel and all his cronies for affronting all those who lost relatives in the Holocaust and all those Canadians who died in the Second world war "This harm is not 'likely', it is not 'vague and indefinable' and it does not 'defy assessment'. It is real and cruel". Fortunately however, "This type of publicity serves to show all Canadians that racists and anti-Semites were not eliminated by the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. With more light shed on these people an increasing number of Canadians will realize just how much work is left to be done to combat racism and anti-Semitism in Canada" (Globe and Mail, September 21/92). Canada may still be a cesspool of anti-Semitism but B'nai Brith is dedicated to seeing that the unacceptable will be legally targeted.

In March of 1993 the Ontario Provincial Police decide not to press charges against Zundel for repeating his claim that the holocaust was largely a hoax. Jewish groups are outraged, again. By this time the mass media has become largely uninterested in Zundel and are chasing after fresh demons to punish. The Federal government and the Department of Immigration and Naturalization continues to press for his deportation however.

In mid June of 1996 Zundel, then in his mid fifties, appears in a Federal court to fight a finding by the Canadian Security Intelligence Service that he is not eligible for citizenship because he is a threat to the security of Canada. "Denying Zundel citizenship is the first step in a process to deport him... Zundel compared those hearings to a Star Chamber, a criminal court abolished in England in 1640 for holding proceedings in secret, because the investigation is not public." Zundel's initial application for citizenship was denied some twenty years previously (Vancouver Sun, June 11/96). The idea of the Canadian Security Intelligence Service investigating 'right-wing threats to security' in Canada is like General Pinochet investigating right-wing extremism in Chile.

Amazingly, a Federal Court rules in Mr. Zundel's favor and holds "...that the spy service's civilian watchdog is biased against Zundel and may not review his application for citizenship and make recommendations to cabinet... The review is required by law when someone is deemed a threat... The decision left the citizenship department scrambling to find a workable option [for deportation]" (Vancouver Sun, August 3/96).

Zundel by now has become a continual target for court actions. By fall of 1997 the 'Canadian Human Rights Commission' has been hearing witnesses who hold that Zundel's web site is 'likely to expose Jews to hatred or contempt'. Rene Duval, the lawyer for the Commission, argues that Zundel waived his objection to bias 'by not raising it at the first reasonable opportunity, as he should have'. 'The Zundel matter marks the first time a Canadian human rights tribunal has examined complaints alleging the dissemination of hatred on the Internet. (Vancouver Sun, March 8/99)

After going through various appeal processes, the Supreme Court of Canada refuses to hear Zundel's appeal on his denial of citizenship (Globe and Mail, December 15, 2000). This is just about the end of Mr. Zundel's court challenges in
Canada. After some 17 years of charges against him his pursuers have won and about a year later he is deported back to Germany.

In Germany he is promptly arrested on charges of 'Holocaust denial', which since his last visit there has been made a serious crime. And so ended a long, drawn out witch hunt in which the victim was not innocent but acting within the permissible confines of free speech. Moreover, his pursuers were far more involved in dispensing hate propaganda than he was.

When he was finally deported in 2001 he had spent forty of his sixty odd years in Canada. He didn’t have to be denaturalized because he had been denied the right to become a Canadian citizen. Jewish groups in particular and the Canadian press in general breathed a sigh of relief that this Holocaust denier had finally been gotten out of the country and into the hands of German authorities. They quickly imprisoned and tried him under their own laws against Holocaust denial. Jewish spokespersons expatiated on the lax nature of Canadian justice in that Zundel had not been deported decades previously.

**Malcolm Ross. Punishing another Holocaust Denier**

Beginning in 1985, Moncton, New Brunswick teacher Malcolm Ross was charged with writing several books which disputed the claim that 6 million Jews had died during the Holocaust. A complaint to his school board was launched by one Dr. Julius Israel in the summer of 1985. After more than 13 months of investigation that school board rejected the option of prosecuting or firing him. The local library, which held two of Ross' books, also declined to remove them from its shelves. Two former attorneys-general also refused to prosecute Mr. Ross for his writings. He claimed not to use them in school and that he mainly teaches mathematics. Those who laid the charges are outraged (Globe and Mail, August 13/86).

By January 30/87 the Moncton school board had agreed, under pressure, to reopen its investigation of Ross. A former student of his had complained on a local radio program that she would not want her children taught by him (Globe and Mail, January 30/87). On March 4 of that year the Atlantic Jewish Council requests that the provincial ministry of education fire Ross (Vancouver Sun, March 4/87). A number of letters-to-the-editor vilify Ross over the succeeding months but in December 1987 the serving attorney-general allows him to continue teaching.

By March 11, 1988, newly elected Premier Frank McKenna is on the case, saying that, "We find it absolutely abhorrent that this issue has surfaced again... We haven't addressed the question of how to deal with a teacher who persists in flaunting such beliefs of society''. He more or less vows to get Ross out of the classroom (Globe and Mail, March 11/88). In November of that year the Moncton school board announced that it will reprimand Ross but that he will not be fired. Premier McKenna replied that it is "'unconscionable that a person who is a publicly-paid employee is enunciating beliefs totally contrary to those being taught in the education system'... McKenna said." There are about 1,000 Jews in the entire province.

The Globe and Mail of January 21/89 reports that a New Brunswick judge had angered Jewish groups by ruling that the provincial human rights commission may not hear a complaint against the Moncton school board that employs Malcolm Ross. "The New Brunswick Human Rights Commission was ordered to hold the hearing by the provincial government last year after justice department
officials said there was not enough evidence against Mr. Ross to justify criminal charges" (*Globe and Mail*, January 21/89).

By this time a David Attis who has three children in school (but none in Mr. Ross's school) has complained that Ross "...has made statements that are 'anti-Jewish, racist, bigoted and discriminatory.'" However the judge, one Justice Miller, noted that Ross had testified that he never discussed his political views in the classroom. He was not teaching anti-Semitic mathematics.

"The Canadian Jewish Congress, of which Mr. Attis is former national secretary, expressed 'profound disappointment' at the decision... The ruling did not surprise Julius Israel, a former chemistry professor from New Castle, N.B., who had been trying unsuccessfully for more than a decade to have Mr. Ross prosecuted. He said he felt that he had been 'stabbed in the back' by the Moncton Jewish community, which wanted to take the case before the human rights commission instead of to the police" (*Globe and Mail*, January 21/89).

After delays, charges and counter-charges, Ross' case came before the New Brunswick Court of Appeal in early December 1990. Charges had been laid by David Attis, the father of a Moncton highschool student and a member of the Canadian Jewish Congress. Ross claimed the rights of free speech, held that he wasn't anti-Semitic and said that he had never mentioned his views regarding the Holocaust while teaching in school. The school board also said that there was no evidence that Ross was spreading his views in the classroom (*Vancouver Sun*, December 5/90).

During the hearing before the New Brunswick Human Rights Commission, David Attis told them of the wave of anti-Semitism by 'white supremacists' [?] which his daughter and other Jews in New Brunswick's schools had to endure. Strangely, there had never been any published mention of this. He demanded that Ross be fired from his teaching job. "...Mr Attis, whose children do not attend the junior high school where Mr. Ross teaches, saved his harshest criticism of the instructor and the board that has allowed him to teach mathematics and language. Mr. Attis described Mr. Ross' first book, *Web of Deceit* (1978) as 'the height of obscenity. Perhaps the most anti-Semitic, bigoted piece of material I had ever picked up.'" He claimed that Mr. Ross' presence in Moncton's school system effected the atmosphere everywhere. One rotten apple spoils the barrel, one witch sours all the cream.

Mr. Attis said that he laid the charges after his daughter had been part of a gymnastic display in the school where Mr. Ross teaches. She was trembling and terrified at his mere presence there. (A self-stimulated hysterical, it would seem.) "If that's not discrimination - the fear of a [14 year old] child to enter a District 15 public school building in 1988 - I don't know what is" (*Globe and Mail*, December 6/90). Apparently, both parent and child require psychiatric care.

The Moncton school board said that it had reprimanded Ross in the past and ordered him "not to write any more books or to speak about his writings. The one person board [of the provincial Human Rights Commission] Brain Bruce of the University of New Brunswick, is examining allegations by Mr. Attis that the school board discriminated against Jewish children by employing Mr. Ross. It can order that he be dismissed " (*Globe and Mail*, December 7/1990).

Mr. Attis told the court that he had lost a number of his relatives in the Holocaust and that "If the Jews didn't constantly remind the public of that happened in the Holocaust, then people like Mr. Ross would make it happen all over again" (*Globe and Mail*, December 12/90).
A Manuel Prutschi, national director of the Canadian Jewish Congress, told reporters that Mr. Ross is 'an out and out anti-Semite' and that the Congress had its own lawyers at the hearings.

On December 8, 1990, the Simon Wiesenthal Center of Hollywood brings a travelling show to town featuring photos of all the crimes committed against Jews during the Holocaust. Doug Christie is questioning David Attis about his 12 year long pursuit of Malcolm Ross, which must have started long before his children had ever entered school. "Yesterday, Mr Christie took the attack one step further after Mr. Attis said that every teacher who publicly criticizes minority groups should be fired."

"You must be the most intolerant man in existence', Mr. Christie said. This is amazing."

Mr. Attis said "I indoctrinate my children to be aware of all anti-Semites. We learned a lesson between 1933 and 1945." Maybe that is why they perceive it everywhere. He also said that "...if the District 15 school board had dismissed Mr. Ross after he published 'Web of Deceit' in 1978 the signs of anti-Semitism would never have emerged" (Globe and Mail, December 8/90).

On December 12/90, 15 year old Yona Attis, the prime complainant, took the stand and repeatedly wept because of all the anti-semitism she had survived in Moncton schools. "It's terrible being a Jew in the Moncton school system, she said.' She recounted how she had been harassed for three years by a small group of tormentors at her school, where Ross had never taught. She said she often ran away from classes and wanted to leave school as teachers seemed afraid to deal with anti-Semitic students. She said she finally beat up one of them. During a break in her cross examination a supporter came up to Christie and threatened to punch him out. "The essence of the Attis complaint is that the school board, by continuing to employ Ross, is sending a signal to the community that it's all right to preach racism - there's no punishment" (Globe and Mail, December 13, 15/90).

The following day another Jewish student, one Leigh Lampert, drew a 'frightening portrait of school days' at the school where Ross taught. According to her account the school was pervaded by open anti-Semitism. Sure, sure.

On August 30 of the following year Malcolm Ross loses his teaching job because of his anti-Semitic writings; so ordered by the New Brunswick Human rights Commission. They rule that he may apply for a non-teaching position but that "Even if he gets a non-teaching post, the order states, Mr. Ross will be fired if he 'publishes or writes for the purpose of publication anything that mentions a Jewish or Zionist conspiracy, or attacks followers of the Jewish religion. He would also be fired if he publishes, sells or distributes any of his four books" (Globe and Mail, August 30/81). The New Brunswick Right Thought Commission has spoken..

The next day the Globe and Mail issues an editorial which suggests that the New Brunswick Human Rights Commission had over-stepped its bounds in firing a teacher because of his political views. On September 10, 1991, Michael Elterman, Chairman of the Canadian Jewish Congress, writes a letter to the editor of that newspaper. In part it holds that "The question is: can a public school board employ an anti-Semitic propagandist as a teacher? A provincial human rights board of inquiry found that it cannot. His continuing employment mocks the idea that the teacher be a positive role model, condones bigotry and places Jewish students in an impossible position. The board's decision upheld the right of members of vulnerable [...] minorities to live free of vilification. In our opinion, the decision was reasonable, just and well founded" (Globe and Mail, September 10/91).
On September 17, 1991, the *Globe and Mail* publishes an article on the Ross case by Alan Borovoy, the general counsel for the Canadian Civil Liberties Association. It is not what you might guess it is. In fact it supports the firing of Malcolm Ross for his ideas. In a far stretched kind of reasoning, which includes the proposition whether a member of the Ku Klux Klan would be allowed to teach black children, he holds that a teacher's private views effect his reliability and trustworthiness to teach young children - even if his views don't enter the classroom at all. That from a leading 'spokesman for civil liberties' in Canada.

Mr. Attis had his moment in the sun and then the Holocaust revival crusade moved on. Mr. Ross had to find a living other than in teaching mathematics. Elsewhere, high school students are being bombarded by Holocaust revivalist films and lectures.

**David Irving. British Historian and Holocaust Diminisher**

David Irving is a conservative British historian whose father was a senior officer in the British navy who was shunted into retirement during world war 2 because of his 1940 support for a peace arrangement with Nazi Germany. His son, David, went to all the right schools in Britain and emerged from Oxford as a historian in the late 1950s. His initial books took a somewhat revisionist slant on Churchill and Hitler but earned him a good deal of interest. I read a couple of them and they had something of worth to say. The major figures involved are treated as actual people and not simply as heroic giants or unfathomable monsters. Until the 1970s Irving was an accepted part of British historianship. When he began voicing some doubt as to the Jewish Holocaust he immediately appeared on the 'watch lists' of Jewish organizations as a potential anti-Semite. Innuendos targeting him began appearing and by the 1980s he was held to be a 'Holocaust denier'.

There is undoubtedly a great deal to know about how this came about but I will restrict myself to Irving's later visits to Canada.

In the 1988 trial of Ernest Zundel, he gave testimony for the defence as to the validity of questioning official versions of the Holocaust. But on a Canadian tour the following year Carleton University's history department rescinded an invitation to him to speak on Winston Churchill's role in world war 2. The Royal Canadian Military Institute, in Toronto, also withdrew its invitation to him shortly thereafter. However on March 6/89 Irving addressed a large audience in Toronto, which immediately prompted a scathing attack by Harry Bick, the national chairman of the B'nai B'rith's so-called 'League for Human Rights.' "Mr. Irving has clearly ventured beyond legitimate historical analysis", he said on Friday. 'A denial of the Holocaust is anti-Semitism, pure and simple.' He demanded that Carleton University cancel a speech by Irving on the following day. A number of Carleton professors and members of the administration said that they had not known of Irving's revisionist views when he was invited and demanded that his invitation to speak at the university be rescinded. (*Globe and Mail*, March 6/89)

As an aside we may note what occurred that year in France. On September 18, 1989, the *Globe and Mail* reported that 'Holocaust doubter badly beaten by French youths'. 'French' in this case means French Zionist Jews. It reveals the existence of Jewish Defence League-like groups operating in France. They had smashed in the face and cracked the skull of a 60+ year old professor who denied the Jewish Holocaust.

By this time Irving was on the Department of Immigration's 'watch list' of individuals not permitted to enter Canada - a list which is beyond public control.
and is created by nameless federal bureaucrats who themselves are much influenced by private lobbies. Irving was charged with being a 'Holocaust denier', now a serious thought crime in Canada. However, for whatever reason, Ottawa did allow him to enter Canada to give a series of talks scheduled for October 1992. The organized Jewish 'community' immediately took up the war cry. "Canadian Jewish Congress official Dr. Michael Elterman said, 'Irving's presence here undermines what Canada stands for, which is tolerance and cooperation between people.'" Such tolerance apparently does not extend to thinkers of 'incorrect thoughts'.

"The Simon Wiesenthal Centre for Holocaust Studies [in Toronto] asked Immigration Minister Bernard Valcourt to ban Irving based on his pro-German convictions. He had been convicted of 'defaming Holocaust victims' in Germany, which the Simon Wiedenthal Centre said amounted to a breach of Canada's hate law" (Vancouver Sun, October 15/92). Sol Litman, director of the Simon Wiesenthal Centre of Toronto, said "I'm far from satisfied... I think they are taking a very weak position." The RCMP said it would be keeping Irving under surveillance while he was in Canada.

Irving "... claims the mass killing of Jews during the Second world war was exaggerated and that the gas chambers erected at Auschwitz were a tourist attraction. A person can be barred from entering Canada because of a criminal conviction elsewhere that would also be a crime in Canada" (Vancouver Sun, October 15/92). Holocaust denial or revision is now such a crime.

On the following day it was revealed that Irving had been informed, on October 9, that his entry into Canada would be denied. He had visited Canada some 20 times previously but lobbying by Jewish groups had been persuasive this time. Doug Christie, the Victoria based lawyer, held that Immigration Minister Valcourt had "... caved in to Jewish pressure groups'... 'This is strictly politics', he said." Jewish groups lauded the decision to ban Irving "'It's time that the Holocaust deniers be denied', said Frank Dimant, vice-president of B'nai Brith Canada... Bernie Farber, a Canadian Jewish Congress official said earlier 'This man is a racist. He is an out and out racist and the minister acted with great regard to what is multicultural Canada... This is another bullet in the body of neo-Nazis" (Vancouver Sun, October 16/92). These organizations resort to some rather violent imagery in their furtherance of multi-cultural tolerance.

Irving did manage to get into Canada but was arrested on October 29 when he turned up to give a lecture in Victoria. His lawyer "... accused Ottawa of keeping Irving off his speaking tour for political reasons. He said the government barred Irving because of complaints from the U.S.-based Simon Wiesenthal Center for Holocaust Studies, and in effect silenced someone basically because a pressure group doesn't like his opinion."

Bernie Farber, Ontario executive director of the Canadian Jewish Congress, held that Ottawa had found a new willingness "... to ensure that hate-mongers do not use Canada as a stage from which to spew their venom. Groups like ourselves and other minority groups, 'vulnerable [?] minorities', have been much gratified by this decision. They want to make sure that Canada remains the vibrant democracy it is and does not turn into a cesspool for neo-Nazis" (Vancouver Sun, October 30/92). Irving was jailed pending an Immigration hearing which will lead to his deportation.

The Globe and Mail of October 31, 1992, runs an article entitled 'Holocaust-denier has flip-flopped, researcher says'. It cites comments from a researcher at the Simon Wiesenthal Center for Holocaust Studies, one Aaron Breithart, that
Irving has changed his views of the Holocaust a number of times in the past 20 or so years. Not a particularly dastardly charge against a historian. "On Friday, Irving told reporters in Vancouver there was a holocaust - but far fewer than six million Jews - 'more than 200,000 but less than two or three million' - were killed by the Nazis...' Hundreds of thousands, perhaps even millions of people, died in the Nazi concentration camps', he said, 'of epidemics of typhus, of brutality, of slave labor treatment. But not in gas chambers" (Globe and Mail, October 31/92).

The Globe and Mail reporter says, "It is generally accepted that the Nazis killed six million Jews." Breithart says "Irving has no credibility among historians. He's writing as an ideologist. It is my opinion he is a Nazi apologist. And he's trying to get people interested in him." Aaron Breithart is something less than an eminently well known historian.

Irving said that he had written 25 to 30 books of 'accepted history' but that he had been locked up in prison in Canada for expressing his views. He was given 48 hours to leave the country by the Department of Immigration. He accepted this because if he had been deported he would have forever been barred from entering Canada again.

On November 5 of 1992 Irving is still in Canada after having briefly departed for a few days to Washington State. He is again jailed for the offense of 'misrepresenting himself' when last entering Canada. He was now awaiting a deportation hearing and has posted a $20,000 bail put up by a Canadian supporter. "Marvin Kurz, a lawyer for B'Nai Brith who has been attending the hearing as an observer, said he was disappointed that Irving was released" (Vancouver Sun, November 5/92). On November 14 a senior official of the Department of Immigration, one Ken Thompson, decided that Irving should be deported. "The kangaroo court has had its say. This is the time when the real courts can take over", said Irving," (Globe and Mail, November 14/92).

In mid January of 1993 a looney-left demonstration in front of a Vancouver hotel degenerates into a minor riot because of an address to be given by American white supremacist Tom Metzger. Michael Peters, a director of the Jewish Community Relations Committee, gets into the act by offering Vancouver hotels the services of his group to determine whether anyone they book in the future appears on the Committee's watch lists as a racist or holocaust denier. The previous fall David Irving held a talk at one of the hotels. The Jewish association has a contingency plan to offer an educational program directly at the Victoria hospitality industry. Presumably it is perfectly fitting that an ethnic lobby group should set the parameters of who and who cannot use local hotels. (Vancouver Sun, January 25/ 93)

BC Bookworld's Spring 1994 issue contains a glowing review of a book, David Irving's Hitler, by one Eberhard Jackel, which demonizes David Irving as "more subtle and cunning than revisionism that denies everything". Jackel holds that "Irving's bits of near fact and pseudo-fact have allegedly swelled the flowing river of Holocaust denial." Said David Kirk, the translator of the Jackel book, 'Whatever Irving may once have been, and whatever he may once have wanted his books to say, he has now become the willing darling of neo-Nazi interests" (BC Bookworld, Spring 1994 issue).

There is a hiatus in belaboring David Irving and Jewish action groups have to find other demons to pursue. In March of 2000, assorted groups in Vancouver plan to target one David Icke, a British author who has also been called anti-Semitic by Canadian Jewish and anti-racism organizations. Richard Warman of the Green party held that Icke merges every conspiracy theory he has ever heard of.
He noted that many of Icke's books are banned from Canada under hate literature laws. He is apparently in favour of book burning of items which some subsection of some Federal ministry finds objectionable.

"Harry Abrams of the 'League for Human Rights' [?] of B'nai Brith said he believes Icke is dangerous, because he's able to weave various types of intolerant expression into his psycho-babble". He also criticized Vancouver's Banyen Books for selling tickets to the March 19 workshop [where Icke is supposed to speak]. But Banyen owner Kolin Lynsworth defended Icke, "Just because a person is called anti-Semitic, it doesn't mean he is" (Vancouver Sun, March 11, 2000).

Back in Britain David Irving was having his own troubles. One Deborah Lipstadt, a professor of Modern Jewish and Holocaust Studies, at Emory University in Atlanta Georgia, had published a book in which she described Irving as "an anti-semitic racist, a holocaust denier, and a Nazi sympathizer who had twisted historical truth out of all recognition". Lipstadt was a former advisor to US Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, a Jew who had escaped the Holocaust, came to America and rose to a lofty position under President Clinton. Lipstadt, a thoroughgoing academic reactionary, was raised in a 'traditional Jewish home,' the daughter of German and Polish emigres.

Irving had launched a libel suit against Lipstadt but a ruling by a British High Court had gone against him. He planed to appeal the judge's 'perverse ruling'. In the meantime, his publisher, Wordsworth Editions, said that it was putting his two most recent books on ice. "We wouldn't want to associate ourselves with anybody or any author who was anti-Semitic in any form whatsoever" said Wordsworth's owner. Irving had "maintained during the trial that he had been the victim of a 30 year international campaign to destroy his reputation" (Vancouver Sun, April 12, 2000). And they succeeded, too.

On Deborah Lipstadt. Holocaust Revivalist

The New York Times June 24/88 reports on the doings of Deborah Lipstadt, the daughter of an orthodox Jewish family who had become a professor of Holocaust Studies at an American university and who travels the world giving talks about the Holocaust. Every photograph I have seen of Lipstadt portrays a rather jowly woman with a look of deeply offended contempt on her face. She later wrote a book which called British historian David Irving a Nazi apologist and then won a court case against him in Britain when he sued her for slander.

"Deborah Lipstadt has a kind of scholar's nightmare. She sees books on an imaginary shelf describing the Jewish genocide of world war 2, next to them she sees other books, put there by some well-meaning but misplaced commitment to open debate, denying that the slaughter of the Jews ever took place" (New York Times June, 24/88).

This is an article about a leading American Holocaust Revivalist whose demand is essentially that of the Spanish Inquisition - no debating and no contradictory evidence is to be allowed on her topic, none whatsoever. Anyone who debates the scope, nature, reasons for and consequences of the Holocaust is to be silenced as an odious 'Revisionist'.

"The usual view toward 'revisionists' has been that their presentation of the Holocaust should not be dignified by recognition, in part because that would give importance to ideas widely perceived to be unfounded and motivated by anti-Semitism."

Ms. Lipstadt has taken up the task of answering these revisionists and conveying the correct understanding of the Holocaust to be accepted. "I feel
you've got to expose these people rather than keeping them under wraps." "Her argument is not that the Holocaust revisionists will gain widespread acceptance but rather that they could become part of what she calls 'the 'relativizing' of the Nazis; actions - the trends in some scholarship to see Nazism not as a unique evil, but rather as one of morally dubious forces locked in the titanic and vicious struggle that was world war 2." This is utterly wrong, according to Lipstadt - Nazism must be seen as the uniquely evil force in human history. That is her analysis.

Part of the revisionist lie is that "...they have argued that the Jews 'collaborated' with the Nazis in their own destruction, thus reducing the Nazism guilt." That is an unacceptable fact according to Lipstadt. "This kind of history, in Ms. Lipstadt's view, tends to remove the Holocaust from the realm of a supreme evil and provides the Nazis with some excuses. She worries that eventually, as the last of the Holocaust survivors die off and the event recedes further into the past, some revisionist notions could enter into mainstream history."

"'Children today are the last people who will ever know a Holocaust survivor or eye witness,' she said. 'Starting now and certainly in the future it might be possible for some people to believe falsehoods that it would have been impossible to believe until now' (New York Times, June 24/88).

So, Lipstadt, along with thousands of others, with Jewish organizations to support them, will see to it that the Holocaust is replayed for future generations. A retelling with all the Hollywood morality and without any of the revisionist rethinking, questioning, or muddying of the waters with differing views.

**Doug Collins at the BC Human Right Thought Tribunal**

Doug Collins was born in Britain in 1920, joined the army at the outbreak of world war 2, fought in France and was captured at Dunkirk. He spent the remainder of that war in not too uncomfortable P.O.W. camps in Germany, becoming a hero through his sometimes successful attempts to escape. He was invariably caught and returned to a P.O.W. camp, none the worse for wear.

At the end of the war he returned to Britain and apparently found conditions under the Labour government intolerable, a condition which fueled his life-long antipathy to 'socialism' in any form. He emigrated to Canada in the mid 1950s and by the early 1960s was well ensconced as a reporter-commentator for the Vancouver Sun. For the next quarter century he graced the pages of that newspaper with his increasingly vitriolic and often just childish denunciations of events in British Columbia. Nothing which the New Democratic Party could do was ever right, every example of progressive involvement in public affairs was always denounced as either ineffective or sinister.

There were fabricated stories about the 'sinister' doings of Fishermens' Union leader Homer Stevens, 'an open Communist'; there were endless pieces about the 'Takeover of Simon Fraser University by a handful of radical professors and students' (a decade-long favorite of his) as well as his general denunciations of labour unions and unionized teachers in BC. There were his reports of assorted troublemakers spreading dissent among Native Indian communities in the lower mainland; there was even a series of articles about the misuse of the English punctuation on bus signs in Vancouver. Collins, always an indefatigable opponent of 'socialism', opposed policies being introduced by the Liberal government under Prime minister Pierre Trudeau. Collins was a 100% English reporter whose columns would have been laughable if he had not had dedicated readers.
After his downfall his fellow journalists on the *Vancouver Sun* reminisced how they had been fascinated by Collins’ P.O.W. stories but had found his line increasingly difficult to stomach. By the late 1980s he was definitely on the skids. His rapid decline was aided by his testifying for the rights of people like Ernest Zundel to say and publish what they pleased. Since Jewish organizations were the ones offended, it was a suicidal position for a reporter to take. By 1991 he was out on his ear, trying to make a living writing for assorted small weeklies in the Greater Vancouver area. He apparently still had a readership.

I never seriously read a column by Collins throughout his career, so it may be rather inconsistent of me to cite him as a victim of the right thought thinkers. He was a victim of essentially his own kind. Nevertheless, his downfall may be instructive.

Possibly Collins broke with his employers when he testified at Ernst Zundel's 1985 trial for disseminating hate literature. At that trial he said that "A controversial article questioning the Holocaust doesn't contain a single abusive reference to Jews and should be freely available unless Canadians are keen on state mind control' ... 'Mr. Zundel's crime, if he has committed one, is similar to Martin Luther's crime when he denounced the Pope', Mr Collins said. 'What we're talking about here is heresy. And Mr. Zundel is a heretic.' ... There is no topic that scares a journalist into self-censorship more swiftly. Any journalist who explores revisionist thought on the Holocaust is accused of being anti-Semitic or of producing hate literature. 'And they always get a prompt visit from someone representing the Jewish community', he added" (*Globe and Mail*, February 19/85).

Collins wrote, at various times and in various ways, that he had come to believe that the history of the Holocaust was probably exaggerated, and that the continual harping on the theme was mainly a method of Jews to paint themselves as the principle victims of world war 2. Certainly Collins was no Germanophile.

Things went on like this for a number of years, especially after Collins left the *Vancouver Sun* and began writing for various weekly newspapers. He did broach the topic of an upsurge in Germanophobia and reproached the Holocaust Revival movement for wallowing in it. He also denigrated that Hollywood spectacular of the early 1990s, *Schindler's List*, another Jewish retelling of the Holocaust. He called it *Swindler's List*. That was definitely unacceptable, and hatefully insensitive to boot.

On June 27,1993, *Burnaby Now*, a weekly throw away newspaper noted that councillor Lee Rankin was returning his 'Canadian Commemorative Medal' to the federal government "because it had been dishonored by being issued to *North Shore News* columnist Doug Collins. 'It is evident Mr. Collins endorses the views of Holocaust deniers' said Rankin, noting Parliament's 1991 resolution rejecting any attempt to disseminate knowingly misleading, inaccurate, and false statements about the Holocaust and Nazi persecution of the Jews and other people before and during the Second world war." Another pork chopper climbs aboard the Holocaust bandwagon.

Three years of further set-tos continue until Collins was hauled before a Provincial 'Human Rights Tribunal' investigating charges of his alleged dissemination of hateful false thought. I believe that this was his second brush with similar investigative bodies. This was almost exclusively a British Columbia story.

A combination of Canadian Jewish Congress officials, assorted feminist activists outraged with their former treatment by Collins, Simon Fraser University high
intellects, Human Rights Thought defenders and Human Rights Tribunal Commissionaires along with a bevy of N.D.P. officials, all mount the stump in their denunciations of Collins.

A Mary-Woo Sims, BC's new Human Rights Commission head, is interviewed by Ian Mulgrew for the Vancouver Sun. She is a "leather clad, rat-tail sporting, motorcycle-riding lesbian", notes Mulgrew appreciatively. On January 1 [1997] a new human rights regime had been created in BC - there are now two separate agencies, the Human Rights Commission, which investigates complaints and determines whether a hearing is warranted, and the Human Rights Tribunal, which adjudicates those complaints. Sims is the head of the Tribunal which tries the alleged culprits of hateful gender-oriented, racial and discriminatory speech and homophobia, etc.

"Sims was reared in Hong Kong, and the experience of being an outsider, an alien in her homeland, is central to her world view. Born of mixed race parents - her mother was Chinese and her father Australian, Sims was never fully accepted by either community" (Vancouver Sun, March 22/97).

When she left school in Canada she was confronted with the horrible realization that men were making more money than she was at work. She was invited to join her company's affirmative action program and began trying to increase the number of women in non-traditional jobs. She is a founding member of the 'Women Against Violence/Women Against Rape Crisis Centre' in Vancouver. She started her human rights career as a manager of the Metropolitan Toronto Human Rights Employment Equity Program, and gained national prominence in 1991 by charging the Toronto regional government with discrimination against her sexual orientation (Vancouver Sun, March 22/97). This is the type of bureaucrat who dominated BC under the N.D.P. government.

In the hearings leading up to the Human Rights trial a lawyer for the BC Civil Liberties Association called the code under which Collins was charged "an unacceptable attempt at government censorship because it infringes British Columbians' basic right to express and hear any idea which they believe important." "The landmark human rights hearing began this week after the Canadian Jewish Congress filed a complaint against Collins in 1994 over a column in which he said the movie Schindler's List was Hollywood propaganda produced by Jews whom he called the most powerful influence in Hollywood." The lawyer for the BC Human Rights Commission, Angela Wesmacott, and the lawyer for the BC Attorney-General's office, Lisa Mrozinski, held that "The courts have been unanimous in saying freedom of expression can be prohibited to the extent that someone wants to disseminate hate speech" (Vancouver Sun May 14/97). That's what the BC Human Rights Commissioners held.

A few days later one Ann Bozoian, a former member of the multicultural branch of the education ministry who had had a hand in drafting the 1993 hateful literature law, said that the N.D.P. government was then concerned by newspaper accounts of racism in BC. She said that they were afraid that such accounts might deter immigration from Hong Kong and other regions in Asia, which BC then desired to attract. (Vancouver Sun, May 14/97) These are the kind of women who now dominate the N.D.P.

In the hearings a long debate is touched off about the conflicting claims of free speech and the need to protect minorities from hateful speech. Susan O'Donnel, a Capilano College instructor in human rights law and executive director of the BC Human Rights Coalition, said their activists had demanded a tougher law on hateful speech following an outburst of Ku Klux Klan activity in the early 1990s.
Lawyer Roger McConchie, representing the BC Press Council, held that "There is no such thing as a kinder, gentler censorship law if you accept the proposition that free and open debate is the lifeblood of democracy." "Vancouver Sun senior editor Patricia Graham said she too had been a victim of Collins 'cruel' commentary, but she suggested the anti-hate law would make all kinds of opinion illegal..." (Vancouver Sun, May 20/97).

Throughout the period of Collins' trial the Vancouver newspapers are filled with the daily doings there and the letters-to-the-editor section abounds with letters championing and denouncing Collins, often in a rather purple manner. Newspaper commentators, emigre Chinese, defenders of Human Right Thought, feminists of all stripe, anti-Communists from eastern Europe, N.D.P. supporters and opponents and a fairly broad range of British Columbians add their two cents worth.

On May 27 1997, the Vancouver Sun reporter notes that the hearing "...tests a BC human rights law that critics call unconstitutional and backers call a necessary restraint on hatred." In his column Collins had called Schindler's List 'Hollywood propaganda'. (A vile and odious comment, especially if it is true.) Lawyers for the North Shore News, the BC Press council and the BC Civil Liberties Association called the language of the operative section of the BC Human Rights Act so vague and subjective as to be unconstitutional. The Canadian Jewish Congress and lawyers for the BC Attorney-General and the BC Human Rights Commission defended the law as a "necessary protection from discrimination based on religion or race."

On May 9, 1997 Ian Mulgrew writes an article entitled 'Holocaust revisionists belittle issue', which holds that there were not less but probably more than 6 million Jews killed during world war 2. He cites a long passage of testimony given by Michael Marrus, who had written a book documenting the support given by the Italian Jewish community to Mussolini's fascist regime from the early 1920s to the beginning of the 1940s. Marrus had since become a professor of Holocaust studies at the University of Toronto. "The attempt by Collins and others to belittle the scope of the Holocaust is, in Marrus' opinion, dissembling. 'In Auschwitz, which was the largest of the Nazi death camps, the gas chamber to which visitors go, was indeed reconstructed after the war', Marrus acknowledged. This was never hidden. For a variety of reasons, it was reconstructed in a part of the camp where Jews were for the most part not kept at all, and where the people murdered for the most part were Poles rather than Jews. 'Most of the Jews in that area were murdered in Birkenau, which was about three kilometers away. There were four huge gas chamber-crematoria, one of which was was blown up in an inmate insurrection in October 1944 and the rest of which were blown up by the Germans when they left the camp in January 1945, he explained.'"

"The number of six million, Marrus continued, was first suggested by a non-Jewish organization in the report of the Nuremberg trials - the allied prosecution in 1945 and 1946 of German officers and others deemed to be war criminals. "The evidence, Marrus believes, is about as clear as you'd want for this kind of massacre. 'When you say that six million is sort of a construct that has been propagated by Hollywood, there is an element of truth in it', he said. 'We'll never know exactly how many. Among other things, it depends on whom and how you count.'... 'It is also important to remember', Marrus cautioned, 'that the Nazis declared the murder of Jews a state secret. People were to be punished for talking about it, for keeping records of it, for making mention of it. This meant that in their official documentation they often disguised what was precisely happening
with euphemisms' ... 'Furthermore', he said, 'about half of the Jews murdered in the Holocaust never got to death camps at all. Many were slaughtered in ghettos, or slain by mobile killing units that roamed eastern Europe with the invasion of the Soviet Union in June 1941. Thousands more perished of disease, malnutrition, over-work and beatings in forced labour camps'."

Sol Littman, director of the Simon Wiesenthal Centre [of Toronto] agreed. "'No one has said that figure is written in stone,' Littman fumed. 'Everyone agrees the exact figure cannot be ascertained and that within a million you can argue in one way or another. What we are resisting', Littman said, 'is the attempt by guys like Doug Collins who say, 'Maybe only 300,000 died'. By using figures like that, he's essentially absolving the Nazi regime from the mass murder they participated in because 300,000 could be easily explained through deprivation, people caught in cross-fire, epidemics, that kind of thing. It would not include the deliberate systematic effort to exterminate a people" (Vancouver Sun, May 29/97).

A considerable number of experts testify for the prosecution. They are all for laws which restrict hateful speech and unacceptable views in Canada. The BC Press Council holds that it would have been appropriate for Collins to apologize for several columns he wrote. It also notes that it required the North Shore News, in 1995, "to publish its ruling that Collins misled readers and misrepresented source materials on the number of Jews who were exterminated in the Holocaust...[however] 'The council will not condemn Mr. Collins or the News for exercising their constitutional right of free expression." The misnamed BC Human Rights Tribunal hearing is the first in Canada to hear a human rights complaint against a journalist (Vancouver Sun, May 30/97). The trial continued.

The previous day, on May 29/97 Collins told the Human Rights Tribunal that he does not apologize for his article about Shindler's List. The Canadian Jewish Congress has claimed that he was fomenting hatred in his column about Stephen Speilberg's movie. Collins said that "...Jewish influence in Hollywood and the secular media have produced a flood of unquestioned Holocaust movies and TV shows that amount to hate propaganda against innocent German people." I don't believe there is anything incorrect in that.

A long article in the Vancouver Sun of June 10/97, titled 'The Collins collision', is a verbatim extract of the testimony of one Kathleen Mahony, a University of Alberta law professor, and Mr. Collins lawyer Doug Sutherland. The 'collision' appears to be between the right to free speech and the right of significant minorities to be protected from views they find hateful. "Nowhere in the world, including the United States, is freedom of speech considered to be absolute", said professor Mahony. She also said that Mr. Collins was inviting prosecution when he called Shindler's List 'Jewish propaganda.' "The whole international human rights movement is really based on the foundation that the Holocaust occurred and that the world was cognizant of that and didn't ever want it to happen again. So that was really the impetus that drove the creation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights [a UN statement of 1948] and, in turn, all the other human rights instruments that have developed since that time." She held, that if one goes to the root of that development and holds that the Holocaust really didn't happen one is "...seriously undermining the credibility of the whole international human rights infrastructure" (Vancouver Sun, June 10/97).

And that is how a law professor believes laws are made and rights are established in the world. All human rights laws started as an aftermath of the Holocaust?
On June 27 and July 15, 1997, Paula Brook, a right-wing 'Liberal' writes two 'opinion' pieces for the *Vancouver Sun*. They are filled with the sentiments of some alleged 'Holocaust survivors' who attended the Collins tribunal and are shocked and outraged by Collins' views. We are treated to the comments of someone who claims his entire family was wiped out by the Nazis and the outrage of others at the claims that 'merely 300,000' Jews died in the Holocaust. Brook notes that Warren Kinsella, another right-wing 'Liberal' candidate for a Vancouver riding, is pressing a charge against Collins who he says humanly insulted him in the previous election. Oh, horrors.

There are a few months of quiet in the Collins case and then, on November 12, 1997, the Human Rights Tribunal delivers its verdict.

"The decision, written by tribunal chair Nitya Iyer, upset all the major parties to the case. Iyer upheld the constitutional validity of BC's controversial legislation against hate speech, but ruled that Collins column did not cross the line'... "Iyer found that the column about the Holocaust movie *Schindler's List*, published by the *North Shore News*, was anti-Semitic and likely to make it more acceptable for others to express hatred or contempt against Jewish people. But she concluded it was not sufficiently vitriolic to warrant action under the BC Human Rights Code" (*Vancouver Sun*, November 13/97).

"[The] Human Rights Tribunal decision that dismissed a complaint against former newspaper columnist Doug Collins is a threat to free speech, the BC Civil Liberties Association said Wednesday." The Canadian Jewish Congress, however was pleased that Nita Iyer, a University of BC law professor, upheld the constitutionality of the anti-hate law but complained that in this case Collins should have been convicted. Collins repeated once again, "I don't deny the Holocaust. I never have done so.' However, he repeated that the figure of 6 million dead is 'clap trap.'

Finding BC's. anti-hate law constitutional upset the two parties opposing the trial in the first place. Collins lawyer, Don Sutherland, held that the decision was clearly a loss for freedom of speech in BC. Peter Speck, the publisher of the *North Shore News*, said that he was seeking advice whether to ask for the case to be taken out of the hands of the tribunal and referred to the courts. That tribunal had become a separate court on its own, without any of the protections of established courts. 'I don't think this legislation should be on the books', Speck said. He predicted the decision will likely have a chilling effect on most of the media in BC" (*Vancouver Sun*, November 13/97).

The 'Forum' section of the same issue of the *Vancouver Sun* printed 'verbatim' extracts from Nita Iyer's decision.

Following the tactic of smothering a targeted victim with an unending series of charges and suits, Harry Abrams of the B'nai Brith, filed yet another complaint against Collins in early December of 1997 for a number of articles Collins had written in the past. His complaint claimed that the articles "were likely to cause hatred against groups, including Sikhs, Iranians, Chinese and Japanese. ...Abrams said Tuesday in an interview that he would not have pressed his complaint if the BC Press council had taken a tougher line against Collins in the past" (*Vancouver Sun*, December 8/97).

Abrams' complaint is accepted and the Human Rights Tribunal begins a second series of hearings during 1998. These also focus on Collins' alleged anti-Jewish statements but do not attract the star testifiers the first trial did. It is passed over rather quickly by the Vancouver press.
On July 21/98, the *Vancouver Sun* notes that Collins has offended Attorney-General (not yet Premier) Ujal Dosanjh, an East Indian emigre whose ministry has responsibility for the Human Rights Commission Tribunal. It reports that Collins read a five page statement which called this second set of hearings 'harassment' and challenges the constitutionality of section 7 of the BC Human Rights Act. He then walked out of the courtroom (*Vancouver Sun*, July 21/98).

This second tribunal contains a somewhat different lineup of lawyers and tribunalists than the first did. At the end of a series of hearings, after another five months, they find Collins and the *North Shore News* guilty of using hateful speech. They fine them $2,000. "The chief commissioner of the BC Human Rights Commission, Mary-Woo Sims, applauded the tribunal's decision, saying it affirms the idea that freedom of expression comes with responsibility." 'We do not have the right to yell 'Fire' in a crowded building', she said." (*Vancouver Sun*, February 4/99). (If there is a fire in a crowded building are you supposed to just leave quietly and let those in charge of fire suppression worry about the consequences? 'Yes', the BC Commissioner of Human Right Thought seems to hold.)

The *Vancouver Sun* of February 4, 1999, also presents extracts from presiding Human Rights Tribunalist Tom Patch's ruling on the second Collins 'trial'. He notes particularly that the movie *Schindler's List* was referred to as *Swindler's List*. "In sum, it is my opinion that any reasonable person would perceive discriminatory and biased ideas and statements in the four articles written by Doug Collins, although he does not make overtly anti-Semitic statements, the tone of the articles reveals little regard for Jewish people or their history."

"Mr. Collins perpetuates the stereotypes against Jews especially those which allege wide-spread power and influence ... The ideas and statements contained in the four articles reflect and, in fact, reinforce common anti-Semitic stereotypes. Mr. Collins not only expresses discriminatory attitude but also exposes Jewish people to hatred and contempt." Patch then cites the testimony of one Dr. Francis Henry, an anthropologist who specializes in race relations, and one Dr. Leonidas Hill, a historian of anti-Semitism. God preserve us from academic testifiers!

Dr. Hill testified that "In this case, the columns contain themes that reinforce some of the most virulent forms of anti-Semitism. They convey notions that Jews conspire to manipulate society's most important institutions for their own gain and that, through control of the media, they have perpetrated a massive fraud to exaggerate their suffering during the Holocaust." Those are hateful and illegal propositions to suggest or explore in BC. Mr. Patch ends with, "The context in which the columns were published gives a gloss of respectability to the views they express. In my opinion, the evidence establishes that a reasonable person would conclude that these columns, considered in their historical and social context, are likely to make it more acceptable for others to manifest hatred or contempt against Jewish people" (*Vancouver Sun*, February 4/99).

When you have Right Thought Tribunals headed by people like Patch, citing publicity eager academics expounding their tawdry 'analyses', advancing the charges of an organization like the B'nai Brith - then you have an utterly odious lot.

Collins launched an appeal of his conviction with the BC Supreme Court on April 6/99. He also requested donations from the public to carry through this appeal, the previous five week trial having cost him $200,000. "The court is being asked to award costs against the attorney-general's department and Victoria businessman Harry Abrams who launched the complaint against Collins... BC
Attorney-General Ujal Dosanjh declined to comment on the case Monday, as it is to go before the courts" (Vancouver Sun, April 6/99).

Collins' appeal slowly made its way through the court and in August of 2001 the BC Supreme court refused to hear the case. The B'nai Brith had won the day. The Federal government did not move to denaturalize and deport Collins back to Britain, however.

Doug Collins died on October 19, 2001 at the age of 81. The Vancouver Sun obituary balanced comments from his supporters as well as from his detractors. Neither of them fully got at what was at issue.

All those groups and individuals whom Collins maligned in over thirty years as a columnist for the Vancouver Sun, the left in general, radical students and progressive professors, members of any number of Asian immigrant groups, teachers, nurses and union members, and of course Jews - can probably be forgiven for their delight in Collins' ultimate downfall. But was his punishment due to his years of writing reactionary columns or was it due to something else? His downfall only came about when he crossed the organized Jewish lobby after he published his contempt for Schindler's' List, and for the political promotion of the Holocaust.

The political promotion of the Holocaust may be quite acceptable for those who have grown up with 60 years of anti-German propaganda, they will overlook any historical fallacies entailed. But what of the limitations on what one can and can't hear or read? Do British Columbians really want to have what they can and can't think decided for them by the sorts of people who came forward in the Collins cases? If these forces can mobilize so fully against Doug Collins they can equally well mobilize against anyone else who challenges their claims to determine what is acceptable to question.

Les Bewley and Judicial 'anti-Semitism'

Les Bewley grew up in the East End of Vancouver during the 1930s and went to Britannia high school after the end of that decade. I am unsure how he spent his early adult years but he ultimately became a lawyer and then a magistrate sitting on the lower levels of the BC provincial bench. Sometime in the late 1970's, when he was close to retirement from the bench, he began to write a column of opinion pieces for the Vancouver Sun (then still a newspaper and not yet a rag). He was at times infuriatingly Conservative and altogether personal in the use of his powers as a magistrate - a rottenness which pervades the Canadian judicial system.

Between 1982 and 1985 he challenged the actions of Zionists at home and abroad. This ultimately led to him being replaced as a Sun columnist. Here are some extracts from two of his pieces, which seem essentially correct but which brought a storm of protest from Jewish individuals and groups.

On October 12, 1982, shortly after the Beirut massacres, the Vancouver Sun ran a column by Bewley entitled 'The Butcher of Deir Yassin'. It surveyed the events surrounding the massacre which wiped out most of the civilian population of the Palestinian village of Deir Yassin on April 9, 1948, mainly by the Irgun Zvei Leumi (National Military Organization) led by Menachem Begin, the later Israeli prime minister who oversaw the massacres in Lebanon.

Bewley recounts the Deir Yassin case as told in Dr. Alfred Lillienthal's (The Zionist Connection-What price peace?, 1978) - a Jew much maligned for bringing this bloody event into view again. On April 9, 1948 the Irgun and the Stern Gang (Fighters for the Freedom of Israel) attacked Deir Yasssin when most of the men...
were out at work, many in nearby Jerusalem. According to accounts of the few survivors the attackers acted with unbridled bloodlust. Rifles, pistols, grenades and knives were used to kill some 254 women, children and old men in the village.

"Jacques de Reynier, the Swiss International Red Cross representative, led the first party to reach the village after the slaughter. He reported that he found 150 bodies in a well. In all 254 dead, including 154 women, of whom 35 were pregnant." Accounts of the savagery involved almost defy belief.

"In his book, The Revolt: The story of the Irgun, 1951, and serialized in the New York Post, an unrepentant Begin boasted of his daring exploits, saying that "the military victory at Deir Yassin 'greatly simplified the transformation of the new Israel into an exclusively Jewish state." "He wrote, 'The subsequent tales of Irgun butchery resulted in a maddened stampede ... of Arabs ... fleeing in panic, shouting 'Deir Yassin'."

"It is no wonder that Palestinians and Arabs everywhere still regard Menachem Begin with the same horror as that with which Jews regard Adolf Eichman or the Ugandans and the rest of the world regarded Idi Amin, and why they and others are so ready to hold Begin responsible for the recent massacre of Palestinians in the Sabra and Chatilla refugee camps in Beirut" (Vancouver Sun, October 12/82).

Bewley closes with reference to a letter from the New York Times on December 1948, in which Albert Einstein, Hannah Arendt, Sidney Hook and others hold that the newly founded Freedom party (Herut) in Israel was headed by Menachem Begin and was akin to Fascist parties in its ideology, as witnessed by their behavior at Deir Yassin (Vancouver Sun, October 12/82).

A few days later the letters-to-the-editor page of the Vancouver Sun are filled with denunciations of Bewley's column. Isidor Wolfe, Ruth Pinkus, and Baylah Greenspoon all write outraged replies charging Bewley with an unspecific 'ignorance about events' or engaging in 'simple personal slander.' As an example of the later note a letter by one Murray H. Shapiro: "Les Bewley never ceases to amaze. His boorishness, pettiness and general ranting and ravings don't even come close to matching his utter ignorance of the facts of the Middle East situation."

"As long as Bewley persists in jumping on the Arab bandwagon, which rolls merrily along calling for nothing less than Israel's extermination, then it is he and people like him who are the real obstacles to peace in the Middle East" (Vancouver Sun, October 19/82).

This was a bare month after Israel had arranged for and supervised a massacre of Palestinian men, women and children at the Sabra and Shatilla refugee camps in Beirut, with many times the number of deaths as Deir Yassin.

On July 6, 1985 Bewley writes another column in the Vancouver Sun entitled 'Israeli terrorism invites war'. This is sure to bring a storm of outraged denunciation. He begins with an account of former US president Jimmy Carter's disillusionment with the Israeli representatives at the Camp David peace talks between Egypt and Israel. On President Reagan's accession to power Jewish organizations belabored him for his 20 minute attendance at a German world war 2 military cemetery, which they considered a support for Nazism. "Between 1953 and 1982 the US gave about $25 billion to Israel which helped make it the third or fourth military power in the world and fuelled its attacks upon and its seizure of its neighbour's lands. In 1982 Israel began its [by then] three year old invasion of Lebanon in complete disregard to the resolutions of the UN Security Council
which condemned Israel by a vote of 14 to 0. While in Lebanon it has employed a 'closed fist' policy of destroying, any house or district which offers resistance of any sort."

"No one who watched the televised horror of Israel's armed forces, indiscriminately dive bombing and pouring round after round of artillery and naval shells - some of them phosphorous - into Beirut houses and apartments occupied by non-combatant men, women and children (and then shutting off the water supply so that the flames could not be fought) could have any doubt that this undeclared war was in fact a massacre by terrorists, and by any civilized standard wholesale arson, destruction, maiming and murder." That is how Bewley described Israel in Lebanon.

Bewley continued, "It is simply beyond belief that US presidents and congressmen have not been aware of Israel's repression and dispossession of Arabs and Palestinians from their homes and lands, or that they do not realize that the surest way to securing peace in the Middle East is by turning off some of the taps of this massive flow of aid to Israel. This would, of course, require the courage to risk the displeasure of Israel's lobbyists. On the whole, it might be easier to keep on pretending that it is Israel's neighbours who are the terrorists, and threaten them instead" (Vancouver Sun, July 6/85). That is exactly what the US administration decided to do. Especially after the Israelis had gotten the full fledged support of the Christian fundamentalists in the US.

A letter to the editor by one Mordecai Briemberg, holds that "the supporters of Israel in these ventures are greasing the wheels of those who hold that Jews cannot live together with others in harmony and that the only way to undercut such arguments is for Jews to vocally disassociate themselves with Israeli actions" (Vancouver Sun, July 6/85).

A week later the Vancouver Sun's letters-to-the-editor page is filled with outraged, usually non-sequitur, responses. Writes one William Nicolls, from the Department of Religious Studies at the University of BC, "Les Bewley in the arms of the extreme left? I could hardly believe my eyes when I read the Moscow line on Israel in the July 6 Sun. On no other topic, we can safely assume, would we find Bewley quoting with approval the views of a Marxist intellectual like Mordecai Briemberg, or a representative of the Israeli left, such as the spokesman for Peace Now."

Bewley and Briemberg are obviously anti-Semites and therefor one doesn't have to argue the substance of their claims.

A half page reply comes in from one Mark Silverberg, Executive Director of the Canadian Jewish Congress, Pacific Region. He says that 'Bewley's hypocrisy is overwhelming', had he not noted that the Israeli invasion of Lebanon was called 'Peace in Galilee' and intended to put an end to the sectarian violence which had long been plaguing that country, including the killings of Christians there. He says that Bewley failed to mention the SS members buried at Bitburg cemetery visited by Reagan. [The relevance of that escapes me.] Bewley even failed to mention the secret documents uncovered by Israeli forces in Lebanon that disclosed a fiendish PLO plot to destroy northern Israel.

To round up Silverberg claims that Palestinians have more rights in the occupied West Bank than they do in many Arab countries. He faults Bewley for not decrying the massacres of Palestinians carried out by the Lebanese Christian Forces long before events at Sabra and Shatilla. Silverberg ends with the non-sequitur statement, "But please don't quote Marxists like Mordecai Briemberg and then rationalize it behind the ludicrous veil of 'media objectivity' (as the press
consistently does). "Let's call a spade a spade, shall we" (Vancouver Sun, July 13/85).

It is to be noted that such rebuttals, when they are not restricted to simple name calling, rarely refer to the specifics of an argument. Did nor didn't Israelis do what they are charged with doing, were or weren't the consequences approximately as described?

Similar if shorter letters come in from Estelle Civkin, Evelynne Loomer, J. Herbert, Maxime Gelfant, Alfred Ergas, John Gordon, Bea Goldberg, Peter Land, Jennifer Virtue and others - many claiming to smell the smoke of Nazism in the air. Maybe so, maybe it is the smoke of bodies burning in Lebanon.

To end, a letter from Naomi Frankenburg, who seemingly writes in on any topic currently beguiling Zionists. She says "One must reluctantly admire Les Bewley. He has succeeded in embodying in one article almost every lie and calumny ever invented against Israel. For good measure he has even added new ones of his own. Yasser Arafat or Louis Farrakhan could take his correspondence course, So, indeed, could his Marxist-Leninist friend, Mordecai Briemberg. Anti-Semitism makes strange bedfellows."

"Is it acceptable that a respectable newspaper should publish such a false and vicious attack on one of Canada's allies. We are all aware, of course, that Bewley is dedicated to the spread of hatred, and presumably that sells newspapers. But there is a point beyond which even such a columnist should not be permitted to go. Bewley has passed that point. I ask you, sir, to cease publishing him" (Vancouver Sun, July 13.85).

In other words 'We have determined that such thoughts and comments are unacceptable to us and must cease, forthwith'.

That was about the tenor of all the letters which were published. All that venom expended just for simply outlining what Israel had openly been doing - and would continue to do. They were filled with the usual charges of anti-semitism, Nazi hate mongering, and everything but devouring little Anne Frank, raw and unshriven.

Frankenburg must have had friends in high places because not long after that Bewley's column was pulled from the Sun. He died sometime afterwards, before he could be hauled before the BC Human Right (Thought) Tribunal.

In case you were wondering, the Mordecai Briemberg mentioned above, is a former Rhodes scholar from Alberta who taught in the US and returned to Canada to become the Chairman of the PSA department at Simon Fraser University, before it was purged in 1968 and most of the faculty fired. Briemberg is one of the most sagacious and compelling intellectuals I have ever met.

He is, or at least was, a Marxist, a fact extremely odious to the Jewish right today. But he was certainly not in agreement with Les Bewley on most matters. More relevantly, he is not a Zionist and not a supporter of Israel. That is now the gage on which Jewish organizations measure everyone and everything. Until 2005 Briemberg could be heard co-hosting a Saturday morning round-up of news events on Vancouver Co-op Radio's 'Red Eye' program. His critics are not big enough to latch his shoe laces.

The Luitjens Case

Of the 3,000 "Nazi war criminals" which the renowned Nazi hunter Simon Wiesenthal has alleged to be hiding in Canada, it seems that a majority of them were 'collaborators' with German forces. Consider the following case.
Jacob Luitjens was born in Holland in about 1920, didn't seem to be involved in any particular political activity before World War 2 broke out but in 1944 volunteered to join an Auxiliary Police force called the Landwacht (Land watch) coordinated with the German occupation forces. It seems he was involved in discovering downed allied fliers and in trying to track down Dutch resistance fighters.

Luitjens was involved with this outfit for less than a year and the most serious charge leveled against him was that a Dutch resistance worker lost his life in one of their raids, in which he was not involved. The post-war Dutch trials of collaborators were widely inclusive, handing out forty to fifty thousand sentences of imprisonment and a few hundred death sentences. Many of these had to be imposed in absentia since the parties could not be found.

Luitjens was convicted in 1948 to life imprisonment for collaboration but managed to escape from a Dutch prison camp to reach Paraguay, where he lived and worked for about a dozen years. In 1961 he applied to immigrate to Canada; on applying to enter the country he covered up his collaborationist role, as he did a decade later in his application for Canadian citizenship, a key element in facilitating his later denaturalization and deportation. During the following 25 years he was employed as a Botany instructor at the University of BC, where his work was more than adequate.

In the late 1980s B’nai B’rith Canada had discovered the Luitjens case and was trying to have Holland extradite him to serve his sentence for collaboration. In a hearing which has been proceeding for some time Federal Court justice Frank Collier said he would decide whether the courts have jurisdiction over Luitjens or not. The lawyer representing the war crime section of the Justice department said that a civil charge had been made against Luitjens because no criminal charge in Canada would apply. Luitjens lawyer said that the applicable phrase under which he was charged, that he "be of good character" had been removed from the Immigration Act more than a dozen years earlier and could not be used against his client. The presiding judge said that he would also rule on that. Two days later he ruled on that aspect of the case and Luitjens was committed to a hearing as to whether he would be deported under the old Immigration Act (Vancouver Sun, September 27, Globe and Mail, September 29/88).

On October 5/88 Luitjens' civil trial as to whether he had declared his membership in a collaborationist organization begins. The court hears from two women on how they hid from the Landwacht during the war and how one of them was slapped by Luitjens while she was being questioned. The newspaper report is entitled "Nazi victim identifies Luitjens" (Vancouver Sun, October 8/88). In the same issue of the Vancouver Sun there is a story of how a Dutch reporter 'tracked down' Luitjens to British Columbia and found him living here as a retired professor of botany in 1980. When the reporter became the head of the news desk on his Dutch newspaper he attempted to get Luitjens repatriated to Holland but Canada refused Holland's request and contended that treason was not an extraditable offence in Canada. (Vancouver Sun, October 8/88)

The Luitjens extradition case is followed in the Vancouver Sun by one William Boei, who dips deep into world war 2 antipathies to reconstruct the hatreds and conflicts within Holland then. He comes up with a damning tale of the Dutch Nazis, Luitjens initial imprisonment in Holland, his escape and his life among Mennonites in Paraguay in the early 1950s, and his emigration to Canada in 1961. It follows a script laid out by the Dutch reporter who has been tracking him. (Vancouver Sun, November 19/88)
The *Vancouver Sun* of November 23/88 reports that various Dutch 'survivors' denounced the Landwacht and other collaborationist organizations during World War 2. A lawyer, one Arnold Fradkin, a member of the Federal government's 'Crimes against humanity and War crimes' section of the Department of 'Justice', asked the presiding judge to clear Luitjens for deportation back to Holland. There is a standing warrant against him there for his role in the auxiliary police during World War 2. Another witness brought in from Holland holds he wants to speak for the dead who did not survive to give testimony - but has nothing to say specifically about Luitjens.

On January 11, 1989, Luitjens is preparing to give evidence in his case. Arnold Fradkin, the prosecutor for the Federal government's war crimes unit has finally finished giving evidence (*Vancouver Sun*, January 11/89). On May 10, 1989 the presiding judge, Frank Collier, is told by Luitjens lawyer not to rule on the presumed character of the individual in question. The Crown counsel, who has now become one William Hobson, said that Mr. Luitjens had not been forthcoming in this immigration documents of 1961 in that he had not listed his membership in the Landwacht, and therefore applied under false pretences. Arnold Fradkin, another Crown counsel in the case, said that the federal cabinet cannot strip Mr. Luitjens of his citizenship until a Federal court decides that it should be revoked. Mr. Hobson reminded the court that the Landwacht had cooperated with the Germans in arresting people, some of whom were sent to concentration camps - although none that could be charged specifically against Mr. Luitjens (*Globe and Mail*, May 10/89). The primary war crime with which Luitjens is charged appears to be that his side lost the war.

The Canadian Federal courts initially determined that collaboration was not a crime covered by extradition agreements between the Holland and Canada - which provoked outrage among the B'nai Brith. They then pursued the currently much more practiced method of having their victim 'denaturalized' and deported. Justice Frank Collier will announce his decision on October 21. The ruling is seen by many as a test case for further attempts to denaturalize suspected Nazis living in Canada. "Two Jewish groups, B'nai B'rith and the Simon Wiesenthal Centre, have condemned the judge's delay as 'a moral stain on Canada's judicial system'" (*Vancouver Sun*, October 9/91). Right.

A front-page headline in the *Vancouver Sun* of October 24, 1991 proclaims 'Nazi aide 'must be deported'; "Jewish groups said that Luitjens must be deported to Holland swiftly since it took two and a half years to decide his case. 'The length of time was inordinate and brings the administration of justice into disrepute', said the B'nai B'rith. The Federal Tory 'Justice' minister Kim Campbell notes that the 'ruling could lead to more deportations of Nazi collaborators' while Citizenship minister Gerry Weiner 'said he will seek a cabinet order stripping Luitjen's of his citizenship'." When a witch is uncovered, all of the witch hunters get in on his trial.

"Sol Littman, Canadian representative for the US based Simon Weisenthal Center, said his group is exuberant about the decision, saying that it was "beginning to despair of the ability of Canadian courts to try war criminals" (*Vancouver Sun*, October 24/91).

Luitjens was the first target of a renewed Canadian effort to pursue alleged war criminals, the result of a 1985 commission on war crimes headed by Justice Jules Deschenes (*Vancouver Sun*, October 24/91).

The crown prosecutor, Arnold Fradkin, argued that Luitjens had been a 'classic collaborator' who used the 'classic Nazi defense' made at Nuremberg'
saying that he was just following orders' "Canadian Jewish groups criticized the long delay and urged the federal government to move swiftly to strip Luitjens of his citizenship through an order-in-council and to ensure a quick deportation process." However "Rev. Hans Federau of the First Mennonite Church, where Luitjens and his family have attended services of more than 25 years, said the congregation will continue to be supportive of the elderly botanist" (Vancouver Sun, October 25/91). As of yet no one has claimed that the Mennonites, a distinctly German but rigorously pacifist sect, was anti-Semitic.

Luitjens was stripped of his Canadian citizenship through an order-in-council by the Mulroney government on November 12, 1991. "Michael Elterman, chairman of the Pacific Region of the Canadian Jewish Congress, said it was fitting the long awaited ruling came down on the anniversary of the beginning of Nazi persecution of Jews in Germany." Kristallnacht had occurred some five and a half years after the Nazi seizure of power, until then they were merely sending Communists, socialists and other opponents to concentration camps.

Luitjens lawyer said that he intended to appeal the section of the Citizenship Act which holds that the Immigration Department rulings cannot be appealed.

In early December of 1991 David Giesbrecht of the Central Mennonite Committee of BC said "'It would be an unconscionable act to send this old man away to an unknown future, away from his family... Giesbrecht emphasized the Mennonites do not question Luitjens' guilt and also have 'enormous sympathy for the atrocities suffered by the Jewish and other peoples during the Second world war.'" However, he said, Luitjens was only 17 years of age at the time, and has since then had more than 40 years of consistently good living'. He also pointed out that Luitjens had not held a rank in the Landwacht and that if he is deported then possibly a great many others from Asia and Europe might easily face the same procedure. (Vancouver Sun, December 17/91).

Brian Morris and Ian Keegan, spokespersons for B'nai Brith of Canada, responded in a written reply saying why they believed Luitjens 'does not merit residence in Canada.'

In the following April a three member Federal appeal court held that Luitjens had entered Canada and taken up citizenship through hiding his collaborationist past and that "denying Luitjens an appeal at this stage does not contradict the Charter of Rights and Freedoms." "It is permissible for Parliament to constitutionally deny the right of appeal', wrote Justice Allen Linden. Luitjens is the first Canadian to lose his citizenship because of 'war crimes' committed during the Second world war" (Vancouver Sun, April 14/92). The first of many, if the B'nai Brith and the Wiesenthal Centre have anything to say about it.

Luitjens, then 73, was spending most of his $1,200 pension on legal fees, it was said. On November 22/92, the Vancouver Sun ran another editorial demanding the deportation of Luitjens, saying that since he has been stripped of his citizenship surely he can be deported - speedily. The following day Michael Elterman, regional chair of the Canadian Jewish Congress, noted that "The government has acted slowly... But one must remember that this is one of the first cases of its type. We would hope that the government will use this method [denaturalization and deportation] in a lot more cases. And we would rather that the government got it right this time, so that the correct precedents are set for future cases".

"Finding proof of war crimes committed 50 years ago is extremely difficult, Elterman said. Canadian judges are reluctant to go to Europe to hear evidence, and many of the witnesses are dying off... So this other method of
denaturalization on the basis of people not declaring that they were Nazis provides an alternative method of dealing with such cases" (Vancouver Sun, November 23/92). What could be clearer than that - if you can't find any proof of war crimes you can still strip an immigrant Canadian of his citizenship.

The following day the Vancouver Sun runs a full page article by William Boei entitled 'The Holocaust would not have happened without men like Luitjens, historians say.' Apart from the utter ludicrousness of that claim, Boei delves into something of Luitjens' upbringing, which he claims had all the trappings of Hollywood. A veterinarian father from a Dutch colonial background who was a Nazi in the 1930s, Luitjens allegedly joined the Dutch Nazi party in 1941 and signed up for the Landwacht in 1944. (This means that he allegedly joined the Dutch Nazi party at age 13.) Michael Elterman, chairman of the regional Canadian Jewish Congress, said that "It is quite clear from historians of the holocaust that the rounding up of the Jews of Europe could not have been done if there had not been these militias, like the Landwacht in Holland and the men who were doing the work of the Germans." Right, sure.

All these claims are simply attempts to broaden the target, to include as many people as possible within their charges. To Elterman it is not simply a war crime but a crime against humanity. Since Luitjens was part of the mechanism by which Jews and others were apprehended he is guilty of murder. "I think there is certainly the principle that justice must be done and that there is no statute of limitation on murder, either in this country or anywhere else" (Vancouver Sun, November 24/91). However no one has ever claimed that Luitjens murdered anyone. Presumably Elterman's argument would apply to the prosecution of Israeli soldiers who had served in Lebanon fifty years from now.

After Luitjens was stripped of his Canadian citizenship by a Federal Court in November of 1991 another year followed before he was ordered deported. David Matas, the chief legal mouth piece for B'nai Brith Canada, had loudly complained that deportation proceedings had not accompanied Luitjens denaturalization. "Jewish organizations lauded the deportation order but urged the federal government to act against other suspected war criminals in Canada' (Vancouver Sun, November 24/92). "...the Simon Wiesenthal Centre's Canadian director, Sol Littman, praised Canada for doing a good job in the Luitjens case. "The department of immigration has made the right decision, namely to return Dutch war criminal Jacob Luitjens to Holland" said Littman. "He added that Canada had also done the right thing earlier this month when it deported 'self-confessed fascist' (this is a gratuitous lie and slander) David Irving (Vancouver Sun, November 26/92). Irving is a British historian who has run afoul of the Jewish lobby through his studies of Nazi Germany.

Luitjens left Canada on a flight to Holland on November 27, 1992 and was expected to be arrested as soon as his plane landed in Amsterdam. He was. 'Many Dutch feel Luitjens, regardless of his age, should be made to sit out at least a symbolic sentence." Jack Kooistra, a Dutch war crimes reporter who pursued Luitjens' story from the start, reported that "he didn't look old or broken at all but rather arrogant." In Ottawa Justice minister Kim Campbell (who would soon lead the Tory government into an election which would virtually wipe them out) said she is considering releasing more information on the hunt for war criminals in Canada. "A critical report released Friday by the Jewish group B'nai Brith Canada complained that the government, 'insensitive and ignorant judges' and immigration officials are still not taking the five-year old war crimes law seriously
enough" (Vancouver Sun, November 28/92). Nothing is or will ever be enough for that outfit.

Luitjens requested a retrial of his 1948 case but was refused by the Dutch courts. He began serving his sentence but was released after about four years from a Dutch prison at the age of 77. So ended the Great Nazi War Collaborator trial, followed by denaturalization and deportation. There were lots of other targets left.

Chapter 9. Nazi Hunters and Jewish Chauvinists

Simon Wiesenthal. The Nazi Hunter

The following is partly drawn from a television documentary called 'Into the Tenth Decade', shown on PBS television on May 10, 1992, as a tribute to Wiesenthal's 85th birthday.

Simon Wiesenthal was born in 1908 in small town in Russian Galicia into a family of small merchants. His family fled to Vienna at the outbreak of World War 1. His mother was extremely religious but his father was killed fighting with the Austro-Hungarian forces. At the end of that war the family returned to whence they had come because Wiesenthal's mother wanted to regain the remaining houses and interests they had in their home town. However they are caught up in the swirling conflicts between the Ukrainian Petlyura and the Red Cossack forces. Wiesenthal came to hate them both. In 1921, at Age 14, he became a Zionist and a local youth leader of Hashomer Hatzair in then Polish Galicia. He was still a fervent supporter of Israel 70 years later.

Throughout the 1920s and 1930s he goes on living in the Polish occupied Ukraine, then a by-word for ruthless Polish oppression. He was himself living in a semi-fascist state but it was only in 1933, after the triumph of Hitler in Germany, that he awakens to the danger that fascism poses for the Jewish people. "I had no conception that a supposedly civilized people like the Germans could elect a force such as Hitler's. It was inconceivable" he tells the interviewer. There is no issue in the world other than that of Nazi Germany and the Jews. There is nothing in western and central Europe which he finds worth considering.

During the 1930s he attends a college and emerges sometime before the beginning of World War 2 with a degree in building engineering. After the German defeat of Poland in 1939 until 1941 Wiesenthal continues working in his uncle's construction company in the Galician region recently reoccupied by the Soviet army. After the invasion of the Soviet Union by Germany in mid 1941 the German occupation forces allegedly allow the Ukrainians a four day period in which some four to five thousand Jews are killed. That is why he is so determined to track down Ukrainian war criminals, he says. His wife goes to live with a friendly Polish family in Warsaw and manages to escape persecution by passing as a Pole.

Wiesenthal is conscripted to work in Organization Todt, a large construction organization created by Germany to build fortifications. Then, in late 1942 or 1943, he is seized and taken out to be shot with other Jews. But somehow, on the edge of the grave, he manages to escape - not once but on two separate occasions. Miraculous luck, I suppose. At one point he is next in line to be dragged before a firing squad but just then the shooting is stopped. Recurrent examples of this seem rather improbable, but such things do happen in war time.
By mid 1942 and throughout 1943 Polish Jews were being segregated and are later rounded up for deportation to the death camps. Weisenthal manages to escape again and to 'go underground', not as difficult a task as it might seem, and is hidden in the home of a Polish family. A pretty risky and potentially lethal undertaking on their part. One wonders whether Jewish families would have been as ready to risk their own and their families lives to save a 'goy'.

Finally, in 1944, Weisenthal is caught again and is sent to Auschwitz, but since it is full he is transferred to Sobidor concentration camp. It is somewhat surprising that he has such a great deal of first hand information on the extermination process at Auschwitz since he was hardly there. From Sobidor he is shipped to a death camp elsewhere where he is able to detail the procedures for gassing victims. He claims to have survived five separate concentration camps.

At the end of the war Wiesenthal is released weighing a mere 95 pounds; his family, other than his wife, is dead and he is without any reason to live. What gives him a purpose to continue is that he gets an offer to join the US-led Nazi War Crimes investigations. His future life is dedicated to retribution, both personal and national.

A year later he becomes the head of a subsection of the investigations and given an office and small staff to work with. With no investigative background but with a rather florid imagination, he sets out to track down hidden war criminals. He does this through pouring over the charges laid by other investigators and is remarkably lucky in that many of those he is searching for are not really hidden at all. Many of the war crimes he is pursuing were laid en masse by the two occupation authorities, the Americans and the Soviets, without much investigation or evidence. His efforts result in the apprehension and swift 'trials' of those concerned, along with a very occasional finding of innocence. As far as Wiesenthal is concerned anyone charged is invariably guilty.

This all goes on for a number of years until the Americans and their allies begin to lose enthusiasm for the hunt. By the early 1950s Simon Wiesenthal is, according to himself, one of the few still ferreting out those charged with war crimes. What accounts for the major trials of war criminals in Germany until the early 1960s? Wiesenthal doesn't say, but holds that Israel alone was continuing the hunt. The search for real and alleged war criminals who have escaped overseas picked up steam again in the early 1960s with the capture and hanging of Adolf Eichman.

What Wiesenthal's fame actually entails is his indefatigable commitment to continue tracking down real and alleged Nazi war criminals for as long as he lives. An endless string of reports issue from his office charging individuals almost everywhere with anti-Jewish war crimes. Over time he 'reveals' that some 3,000 war criminals have made their way into Canada, and many thousands more into America and South American countries. In a great many cases he has only the most tawdry evidence for these charges, or effectively none at all. In some cases he is simply mistaken in his identifications. However his ongoing efforts keep the kettle boiling and wins him increasing support among the Holocaust revivalists in America, who come to portray him as an infallible, avenging saint. By the late 1960s he has achieved the status of 'the world's leading Nazi hunter' and others intending to copy his act spring up, backed by well funded organizations.

Without digging into the case records of those he has 'brought to justice', there is no way to know of his standards of evidence or proof. However we may consult a book he originally wrote in the mid 1970s called *Sails of Hope. The Secret Mission of Christopher Columbus* (1973, New York). The thesis of this book,
which the publisher noted 'was written with all the careful investigation which Wiesenthal brought to his efforts to bring Nazi war criminals to justice' is that Columbus was a 'hidden Jew' operating out of Spain to find new lands to which Spain's tortured and terrorized Jewish community could flee and establish their own state. Wiesenthal does not provide one iota of evidence for his claim about Columbus's Jewish background, which was probably a piece of folklore floating around the Central European Jewish communities of his youth. He is reduced to discovering 'Jewish traits' in a portrait of Columbus, painted after his death but by an artist who claimed to have actually seen the great man when he was alive.

More than a half of the book is an adulation of the Khazars, who in the 7th and 8th centuries are said to have built up a powerful state in the north of the Caucasuses which converted to Judaism and which ruled over their neighbours with a firm hand. Unfortunately, the Khazars vanished without a trace and no present day record of them exists whatsoever. There is also his rehash of the Spanish Inquisition and its oppression of Spanish Jews, 'which was like that of the later Nazis.' Both of these themes in Wiesenthal's hands are simply silly, juvenile.

But fortunately there is an ultimate proof. He notes that "The possibility [of an ancient link between the Israelites and the native people of the Americas] continued to tantalize a fair number of scholars over the centuries, but it was not until very recently that two separate discoveries from entirely different quarters, seemed to give fresh life to such speculation." (Sails of Hope, 1973: 222)

What are they? A large building stone originally discovered in a native burial mound in Tennessee in 1886, was recently deciphered by a professor from Brandeis University. It bore the clear inscription "For the Land of Judah". You see it was written in Hebrew and no one at the Smithsonian Institute in all those years had had the insight to read it properly. The professor held the inscription to be carved en situ and estimated it at about a thousand years before Columbus' voyage. The other key piece of new evidence was that the people of the region where this stone was found were the Melungeons, an 'Indian tribe' who are said to have definite Caucasoid features. This is hardly surprising since the Melungeons were a population of mixed Indian, Black and white ancestry, who had no existence before the 1840s.

What all this adds up to in Wiesenthal's account is that not only was Columbus a 'hidden Jew searching for a new land for the Jews of Spain but that yet earlier Jews had already found it long before. Well, well, imagine that! However, Wiesenthal generously notes that Jews do not make any exclusive claims to this new land but hold that it should be for all (or almost all) who are searching for a land dedicated to human liberty - the U.S.A.

Wiesenthal timed the re-publication of his Columbus book to accord with the five hundredth anniversary of the discovery of the New World by Spain (or by a 'hidden' Jew). By the early 1990s he had added that, although there were no records for it, almost a third of Columbus crew were Jewish. One of these Jewish seamen was also the first to actually first sight the new land. There is absolutely no record of any of this and we have to accept Wiesenthal's revelation on the matter. "Wiesenthal said his research showed that today's history books were full of myths about why Columbus sailed to America in 1492" (Vancouver Sun, September 15/91).

Those, believe it or not, are the major theses and proofs of a book which Wiesenthal stood by and 20 years later had republished. One wonders whether standards of evidence, comparable to those found in Sails of Hope, were utilized
in his Vienna Documentation Center during his forty years of 'hunting down' alleged Nazi war criminals. It is a scary prospect.

From the mid 1960s to the mid 1980s were possibly Wiesenthal's golden years. He was a household name throughout the western world. Films were made about him and biographies written. He was toasted by leading political figures in Europe and America. Marvin Hier, the California rabbi who had first made a name for himself defending President Nixon and America's role in Viet Nam, established a Simon Wiesenthal Documentation Center in Hollywood to aid in the world wide pursuit of Nazis, neo-Nazis and assorted unAmerican anti-Semites. While Marvin Hier remained the boss of that organization its honorary president was Simon Wiesenthal himself, although I don't believe he had much to do with the Center's operations. Wiesenthal himself was still churning out demands upon and denunciations of foreign governments, including Canada, who he believed were 'harboring Nazi war criminals'.

If I may briefly backtrack: during his years in Vienna, in the late 1940s, Wiesenthal along with Kurt Waldheim and others had helped found the conservative People's Party of Austria. Although it rarely won a plurality it served in a coalition government with the leading Social Democrats during the first 40 years of Austrian post war history. In 1985, following his Secretary-Generalship of the UN and with his bid to run for the Austrian Presidency, Kurt Waldheim was charged with having been a former Nazi and a war criminal. This became a world wide classic smear campaign, led by the World Jewish Congress. Wiesenthal brusquely dismissed these charges and criticized some of the American Jewish organization which were making them. This brought his stock into low repute amongst his former American backers, some of whom suggested that he was becoming senile.

A German television program interviewed a number of rival Nazi hunters from the US, Israel, France and elsewhere "...all of whom were scathing of Wiesenthal's 50 year career in tracking down war criminals". A Mossad officer claimed that Wiesenthal's role in the hunt for Adolf Eichmann was at best marginal, and that his role in the search for Martin Bormann and Joseph Mengele provided "wrong and useless information".

"All those interviewed are known to have waged long-running feuds and vendettas against Wiesenthal. They included Beate Klarsfeld, the French Nazi hunter, Isser Harel, the retired Mossad agent who headed the Eichmann capture operation and had been angry for decades over Wiesenthal's perceived effort to take credit for the spectacular kidnapping, and Eli Rosenbaum, the head of the US justice department's special investigations, whose 1993 book, Betrayal, is an indictment of Waldheim and Wiesenthal's role in the Austrian [Waldheim] scandal" (Vancouver Sun, February 19 1996).

And that was about the situation that existed by the end of the 1990s - the sorcerer had been denounced by his apprentices. He continued in his office, on a much restricted schedule, into his 90s and died in his sleep on September 19, 2005, at age 96.

Elie Wiesel. Professional Holocaust Survivor

Elie Wiesel was born in Rumania (Rumanian-annexed Transylvania) in 1928. He was a member of an orthodox Jewish family of merchants and grew up in a small Rumanian town, attending Jewish religious schools pretty well isolated from the surrounding non-Jewish population. He had little comprehension of the broader Rumanian society of which he and his family were a part. He knew little
of the backwardness in which Rumania was steeped or of the ruling class' oppression of the Rumanian peasantry during his youth. It was apparently nothing which interested him.

Possibly he had heard something of the Rumanian peasant rising of 1907, a rising against both the large landlords but also against the Jewish merchants and money lenders who, to some extent, battened on the peasantry. This rising was put down by fire and sword, the Rumanian army using artillery to shell rebellious peasant villages and then executing anyone thought to be associated with the revolt. It left more than ten thousand dead and a thoroughly beaten peasantry. This rising is invariably described as 'anti-semitic' in later Jewish literature because of the few hundred Jews who were murdered.

Transylvania was transferred back to Hungarian control in 1940 under the threat of Hungarian military attack. The Rumanian King was thrown out as a result, a previously suppressed Fascist party was legalized, and Rumania was secretly promised new lands in the southern Ukraine. It joined with the Axis powers in an invasion of the Soviet Union the following year. It is unclear how much of this Wiesel actually knew, even as an intelligent young teenager, since he was immersed in an orthodox Jewish religious education.

While some quite horrendous pogroms were carried out by Rumanian forces when they acquired Soviet Bessarabia, such pogroms were quickly quashed when they appeared in the Rumanian heartland itself. Indeed, numbers of Rumanian Jews were conscripted into the army and served in the invasion of the Soviet Union. This did not apparently apply in Hungarian Transylvania, where most of the Jewish population remained at home during that war.

It was only near the end of the war, in mid 1944 when Soviet forces were edging close to the Transylvania region, that the Nazis reached out and seized Wiesel's family. They were rounded up with all other Jews in the region and deported to concentration camps in Poland, where his mother and sister died. He later reminisced about his shock at the time, wondering how a just God could allow such things to happen. Whatever conclusion he came to he remained orthodoxly religious. Wiesel survived the death camps and emerged in 1945, liberated by the Soviet army, to which he feels a deep antipathy. After a short period in a refugee camp in Germany he emigrated to France as a 17 or 18 year old.

His writings are a paean of hatred towards Germany and Germans regardless of who they are or what they did. In his accounts of the sufferings imposed in the concentration camps he nowhere mentions that at the end of the war some 250,000 Rumanians of German ancestry were murdered by the Soviet and allied Rumanian forces. If we add that to the 250,000 persons of German ancestry who were murdered in Hungary during the last months of the war with the two million others who were killed in Rumania, Poland and Czechoslovakia, we have a toll of victims which roughly approximates the Jewish dead in those countries. None of these 'Germans', men women and children, were tried for any crime, many of them met a death at least as terrible as those inflicted in concentration camps.

This, however, does not concern Wiesel in the slightest. They were all members of an enemy race which had inflicted terrible suffering on the Jewish people and were all guilty, as a race. Their deaths are all justifiable. That is a viewpoint which he has maintained throughout his life. He learned nothing whatsoever from the bloodletting of that war. Wiesel is a totally unreconstructed Jewish chauvinist – however, a Holocaust survivor of whom nothing negative must be said.
On emigration to France he is taken up by the Jewish community there and went to university there, emerging with a degree and with an active commitment to memorializing the Jewish Holocaust. As he repeatedly says, bearing constant witness to the Holocaust is his life’s work. Why he didn’t emigrate to Israel where he would have continued his concern about anti-Semitism and could have been part of a Jewish regime oppressing others, is difficult to say. He may have seen his decision in terms of his life-long duty to serve as a witness to the Holocaust and to forever hold Germans to account for ‘their’ past crimes.

By the mid 1950s Wiesel is already publishing his first Holocaust stories and by the late 1950s he may have come into contact with Yitzak Shamir, then nominally on a diplomatic mission in France who was organizing Jewish support for France’s war against the Algerian Liberation Front. Israel then had a sweetheart relationship with France.

It is following this period that Wiesel’s rapid rise to prominence as a Holocaust revivalist. He begins to give talks about his and others experience of the Holocaust - mainly as an unparalleled act of evil with no broader context. The primary theme of his accounts is the lesson that the world must redeem itself for allowing the holocaust to happen and that Germans must forever be held guilty for it. Nice and simple, morally clear, the way the Americans like ‘history’ lessons.

Wiesel was already familiar to some Jewish organizations in America but when he finally emigrates there his rise to fame takes a quantum leap. In the 1960s and 1970s he publishes more of his 26 books about his Holocaust experiences and what lessons they have for all Jews everywhere. In the growing drift to the right, Jewish and non-Jewish readers, especially state intellectuals, take to his books like hogs to manna. He becomes a much quoted author, a best seller whose books clog library shelves. His talks are attended by a worshipful audiences intent on being once again safely outraged and teary eyed. An awful lot of blood has been spilled and a great many people have been killed since the Holocaust but in his accounts it is always the 2nd world war, or more exactly ‘the war against the Jews’, which holds center stage. Israel and America always emerge as the moral leaders of the world.

This is a theme on which there apparently can never be too much repetition, at least for his audiences. He becomes renowned for his impassioned deliveries of a ‘great moral theme’, which invariably means his and other Jews experiences in the concentration camps, his memorials to those who did not survive and the never ending denouncement of the people who did not aid the Jews. This is often delivered with tearful appeals during his speeches. After rising to sainthood he delivered these speeches for $25,000 a shot. They, along with their tearful appeals, became so standard that they were in danger of becoming a topic for jokes.

During the Reagan era Wiesel had reached his full stride and he expatiated on the moral duty of all and sundry toward the Jews. ‘Save Soviet Jewry’ was just one campaign he was involved with during those years. These Jews were threatened with both anti-semitism and cultural assimilation, a process which allegedly is next door to genocide. Where Wiesel picked up his anti-Communism is a puzzle to me, seeing that the Soviets liberated the camp in which he was confined.

Wiesel claims that it is impossible for anyone who was not incarcerated in a concentration camp (and a Jew) to ever know what that condition was like. Still, he goes on to write endless books about his and others’ concentration camp experiences and others buy them and read them. Why is that, if they can never
understand the experience? And if they can't understand how do they know they are or are not being peddled a load of crap?

Wiesel speaks of the events in concentrations camps as a kind of language. "This was the concentration camp language. It negated all other language and took its place. Rather than a link, it became a wall." What he suggests is not only that no one else could possibly understand such experiences but that they convey a moral superiority on all survivors, a morality which no one in the world can challenge or match. I suggest that there probably were many who survived that experience and left the camps completely unenlightened. Nor did events necessarily make them into moral beings.

Wiesel entitled an article, "Why I write." The answer he gives is "'to serve as the voice for the dead, to honor those who cannot speak, to memorialize the holocaust and those who died and to call the nation which perpetrated it to perpetual account.' "Jewish children - they haunt my writing. I see them again and again. I shall always see them. Hounded, humiliated, bent like the old men who surround them as though to protect them, unable to do so." (New York Times Book Review, April 14/85)

This is the age old imagery of the victimized Jew. There is no room in his vision for Jewish soldiers strutting among their latest victims, no images of Jewish exploiters lording it over others, no place even for ordinary Jews living more or less like others with no special morality.

*The Bitburg caper*

Bitburg is a small town in West Germany in which there is a large cemetery which contains the remains of German soldiers killed in the Second world war. In April 1985 president Ronald Reagan's office notified the press that the president intended to visit the cemetery in the coming month as part of the 40th anniversary of VE day. Almost immediately there followed a wave of denunciations from American Jewish organizations and the American press, suggesting that Reagan's visit was tantamount to honoring dead Nazis. That he was closing the book on the unspeakable crimes they had committed. Both the right-wing and the more 'liberal' press began a campaign of denunciation. All of the world war 2 hatreds were resurrected afresh, forty years after the end of that war. But, surprisingly, Reagan held firm in his resolve to make that visit.

A *Globe and Mail* report of April 19/85 has one Moshe Mills, the president of an Israeli veterans organization, say "The honored president will lay a wreath on Nazi graves... How can one refrain from being torn apart by the shame and the pain." During Israel's Holocaust Day ceremonies Shimon Perez and Yitzak Shamir addressed the Knesset. "'Neither the allies, nor the free press, nor the Red Cross nor the Pope' did anything to save the Jews from destruction', Perez said at the main state ceremony at the Yad Vashem Holocaust museum in Jerusalem" (Globe and Mail, April 18/85). This is the man who ordered Israeli soldiers to break the bones of any Palestinian protestors, even if they were children.

Reagan responded by saying that many of the dead buried at Bitburg were seventeen and eighteen year olds. 'I see nothing wrong in recognizing they too were victims of Nazism.'

On April 19/85 the *Globe and Mail* again runs an article on Israel's Holocaust Day. It notes that prominent Israelis are angered by Reagan's proposed visit to a German war cemetery. Yitzak Shamir, not yet prime minister, held that "We say today to those who took part in the defeat of the Nazi beast that it is their duty to remember and to remind, to educate and make sure that this monstrous occurrence never happens again."
Shlomo Hillel, speaker of the Israeli Knesset, said that "Mr. Reagan's decision 'resembles a contribution', albeit an unwitting one, to the process of forgetting the Holocaust."

Reagan touched off a second storm of Jewish denunciation when, during the White House briefing he told reporters that German soldiers had been victims of the Nazis, 'just as surely as the victims in the concentration camp.' One Jewish spokesman called such comments as "morally unconscionable and politically outrageous." Abraham Foxman, associate national director of the (Anti-)Defamation League of the B'nai B'rith (Sons of the Covenant) and himself a holocaust survivor, said 'I am flabbergasted at the continued insensitivity and shocked at the lack of historical perspective' (Globe and Mail, April 19/85).

In a Globe and Mail opinion piece Jeffrey Simpson, notes that it is proper not to forget or to diminish the Nazi crimes against the Jews forty years previously but what can the Germans do about it now. He reports that many Germans are flabbergasted about the international controversy over laying a wreath at the graves of German war dead, and feel that all the old anti-German hatreds are being stirred up again and anti-German racism perpetuated.

The Vancouver Sun of April 20/85 noted that "Wiesel, chairman of the Holocaust Memorial Council [in the US], pleaded with Reagan to abandon the trip at a ceremony Friday at which the president presented him with the Congressional Gold Medal. Accepting the medal for 'all those who remember what SS killers have done to their victims', Wiesel beseeched Reagan to do something else, to find another site to demonstrate his desire for reconciliation with the German people."

"Gravestones at Bitburg indicate 47 "of the approximately 2,000 persons buried there were members of the SS corps blamed for many atrocities against Jews under the Third Reich."

"However, Reagan has pointed out that many graves are those of teenage conscrits whom he says were victims of Nazism. In his remark at the medal ceremony, the president made no direct reference to the controversy. But he said, 'Today there is a spirit of reconciliation between the people of the allied nations and the people of Germany and even between the soldiers who fought each other on the battlefields of Europe. That spirit must grow and be strengthened' (Vancouver Sun, April 20/85).

The Globe and Mail (April 20 /85) reports a fragment of Wiesel's talk at his Congressional Gold Medal acceptance speech. "One million Jewish children perished", he said, 'If I spent my entire life reciting their names, I would die before finishing the task. Mr. President, I have seen children, I have seen them being thrown into the flames -alive! Words, they die on my lips.'" (But not until they've been embellished, repeated ad nauseam, written and filmed and peddled world wide.)

The Israelis were also outraged over Reagan's latest comments that ordinary German soldiers were also victims of Nazis. "'If it is possible to claim, after the most sadistic mass murder of all time that there are no guilty parties', the daily Maariv wrote, 'that the murdered and the murderers alike are victims worthy of understanding and forgiveness, then this would seem to retroactively clear all murderers of all times of guilt. If all those guilty are rendered innocent, then what can we warn our children about?' Well, you could warn them about the policies of your own state and of the bone deep racism proffered by hate-mongers like Elie Wiesel."
It is clear that Israelis and their supporters view Germans as guilty as a race. One Abraham Rabinovich notes that diplomatic ties between Germany and Israel have been established for almost 30 years but that "None of this activity, however, has diminished in Israeli eyes German's responsibility for its Nazi past" (*Globe and Mail*, April 23/85).

On May 2nd 1985 the man about to be appointed American ambassador to Germany, one Richard Burt, read a prepared statement to assembled German reporters which included the phrase "We must never forget and we can never forgive". This has become a standard mantra of Holocaust revivalism. When questioned on just what he meant by this, Mr. Burt simply left the meeting" (*Globe and Mail*, May 3/85).

However the vast majority of those addressed are innocent of any crime and do not need to be forgiven for anything. Moreover, those who know virtually nothing about life under fascism know nothing that they can forget. The entire thrust of the campaign to resurrect world war 2 hatreds is merely a ploy to get others to forget the crimes, oppression and mass murders carried out by the victors of that war during the past half century.

Wiesel of course has supported Israel in every war, every repression, every murder, every action it has taken against neighbouring states. On the invasion of Lebanon and the bloody massacre of Palestinians carried out under Israeli direction, he said that he 'did not have first hand knowledge of the situation and trusted those who led Israel in whatever actions they took,' "He was a supporter of Israel - first, last and always - and not a critic and second guesser". American and Jewish patriots saluted and cheered.

To add a surreal touch to matters, Wiesel was recurrently proposed for the Nobel Peace prize. What made it more than surreal is that he was actually awarded that honor in the fall of 1986. That matches awarding the Nobel Peace prize to Henry Kissinger near the end of the war in Viet Nam.

Elie Wiesel was on the front center stage in all the demands that Reagan not visit a German war cemetery; he publicly wept and pleaded that Reagan have nothing to do with the German war dead. "It is too soon, too soon", he repeated. Probably he wished that Germany still be an occupied country, pastoralized, broken up into fragments and living under stern foreign supervision. At least for another six or seven generations, if not in perpetuity.

Speaking at the unveiling of a plaque honoring victims of the Holocaust at the UN headquarters in New York, Wiesel links the Holocaust with the terrorism now aimed at the United States. Such "Terrorism has become state-sponsored, state-financed and state planned. It must be denounced as an onslaught against humanity" (*New York Times*, May 2/86). This of course does not apply to American financial and military backing of the contra forces in Nicaragua or its other wars spread to the four corners of the world.

On October 14, 1986 Wiesel received the Nobel Peace prize and is lauded for his moral stand on the Jewish Holocaust - but not about the more contemporary cases of mass murder which flow from both the country he now calls home and from his spiritual homeland.

At his acceptance of the Nobel prize he repeats the spiel which he has been giving for 30 years. 'I have devoted my life to a certain cause, the cause of memory, the cause of remembrance', Mr Wiesel said in New York where he lives. 'I owe something to the dead. That was their obsession, to be remembered. Anyone who does not remember betrays them again" (*New York Times*, October 15/86., *Globe and Mail*, October 15/86).
While Wiesel certainly remembers what happened to him and his own he never has bothered to understand the forces involved in the Second world war. The Holocaust and world war 2 remain a simple morality tale of good versus evil. 

New York Times reporter Henry Kam outdoes himself in resurrecting fabulous and one would have thought now discredited stories about German atrocities. He dishes up the story, first floated by British world war 1 propaganda, about soap being made from the bodies of the dead. "In the Jewish cemetery, a cinder block tomb holds cakes of soap that survivors brought back. They were made of the remains of the victims of the gas chambers and furnaces of Auschwitz" (New York Times, October 27; December 9/86). Ah right - soap or soup?

Wiesel also finds time to castigate Canada for closing down avenues which refugee claimants had used to enter the country. He notes that "...Canada's policy toward refugees should be especially generous in light of its dismal record in admitting Jewish refugees during and after the Second world war" (Globe and Mail, May 6/87).

One Sheena Mackenzie Green replies on May 16, in a letter to the editor which briefly says "Re Quote of the Day (May 6) 'I believe a society can be measured and judged by its attitude towards strangers'. Too bad Elie Wiesel saw fit to condemn Canadians for their policy regarding refugees just at the moment the Israelis were bombing hell out of the Palestinian refugee camps." Outrageous!

Wiesel also appears at the French trial of former Gestapo chief Klaus Barbie, charged with murder while serving in occupied France. Barbie had finally been tracked down and extradited from Bolivia. He and his associates definitely deserve to be executed but Wiesel's moralizing for the prosecution actually may have detracted from the case against Barbie. Wiesel tried to turn that trial into one against the German people, at least those living during the Nazi era. In part he said, "I believe in justice, in French justice, but for me there is far more at issue, for there is no justice possible for the devil." Thus speaks a spokesman of higher Jewish morality.

Barbie's defense council noted that there had been many comparable crimes carried out since world war 2 and that Jews were among the perpetrators of some of them. Wiesel answered "I think it is regrettable, deplorable, that the defence council, defending a man accused of such crimes, should accuse the Jewish people while knowing the memories we have." Later, speaking to reporters, Mr. Wiesel said Mr. Verges [the defence lawyer], who is known in France as an advocate of the Arab position in the Middle East, 'was full of hatred, hatred for me personally, hatred for the Jewish people, and hatred for the victims.'" In short, he is guilty of disagreeing with Wiesel (Globe and Mail, June 3; New York Times, June 3/87).

To round out his activities, Wiesel demanded that the Soviets 'release Raoul Wallenberg' who the Soviets say died in prison some forty years earlier but whom 'eye witness' accounts say was still alive. 'Saving Raoul Wallenberg' is part of a Jewish campaign to implicate the Soviet Union in anti-Semitic acts, since Wallenberg is now claimed to have saved 100,000 Hungarian Jews (Globe and Mail, November 4/87).

During the mid to later 1990s, Wiesel's star began to fade. He began repeating his earlier comments about his fears of 'becoming the last Holocaust survivor' and the dreadful feeling of taking all his experiences with him to the grave. He needn't have worried, since a fresh generation of newly minted 'Holocaust memorialists' are now being manufactured.

He has a house in Israel, visits regularly and will not say a word about the oppression of Palestinians and others by the Israeli state. 'He is not qualified to
judge', he says. But he does feel qualified to judge everyone and everything in the world relating to world war 2. "He reminds his interviewer: 'When we needed people to speak for us, there were no such people.' If the world had spoken up with one voice during that time there would not have been a Jewish holocaust." Only the circa forty million non-Jews who died during that conflict would have perished.

Wiesel's biography notes that he is married to another Holocaust survivor and that he has a son and daughter. He teaches a course on the 'Literature of Anguish' at Boston University.

Meir Kahane and the Jewish Defense League

Meir Kahane was born in 1932 and grew up as the son of an Orthodox rabbi in the Flatbush Avenue district of Brooklyn. He proceeded through an Orthodox rabbinical institute, got a degree in law and emerged as an Orthodox Jewish extremist in the mid 1960s. Kahane became a prominent figure in the Williamsburg district of New York, home to numbers of Ultra-orthodox Jews.

A number of minor clashes between Orthodox Jews and Blacks had taken place before Kahane arrived. Some of those involved were Jews who had the deepest disdain for the 'goyim' among whom they lived - to many of them the goyim were dirty, ignorant, impure and utterly unJewish. Their Jewish private schools, their rabbis, their fathers and elders generally seemed to forward this view - which also applied to most Jews who were not orthodox. Treif, treif. It was into this community of crumbling tenements bordering the Black ghetto of Bedford-Stuyvesant, a short subway ride from the heart of New York, that Meir Kahane came.

By 1968 Kahane had established the Jewish Defense League; a gang of Jews who wore distinctive arm bands and cruised the streets with baseball bats late at night looking for any Blacks or other non-Jews who might be drifting around their neighbourhood. They acted like an organized gang of thugs. Although they attempted to co-opt the New York police force by informing them of their day to day actions and requesting their help in 'training' the Jewish defenders, the N.Y.P.D. was not buying into it. However a number of reports appeared in the New York Times glorifying the 'anti-crime' stance taken by the Jewish Defence League. Some years later they had cause to rethink their previous support.

During the later 1960s, with the upsurge of Black ghetto 'riots' (urban risings actually), other 'citizens groups' began to imitate Kahane and organized patrols of their own neighbourhoods. Blacks and others who might look suspicious to these citizen-defenders had to be very careful that they were not stopped, interrogated and possibly beaten up by such vigilantes.

Dershowitz and the Jewish Defence League

Allan Dershowitz had grown up in Borough Park, Brooklyn, to go to Yale and to become a law professor at Harvard University. He is an amazingly successful and prominent lawyer who was ready to defend Jewish extremists even though he knew that they were guilty of murder. He says as much in the first chapter of his The Best Defence. 'The Boro Park Connection' provides a colorful account of his legal defense of a group of Jewish Defense League thugs who made and set off a bomb in impresario Sol Hurok's office. It killed one assistant and wounded others. The account starts off with a brief tour of Boro Park, an Orthodox Jewish neighbourhood in Brooklyn from which Dershowitz sprang and where the Jewish Defense League was concentrated.
He provides a eulogistic account of Meir Kahane's arrival in the neighbourhood and his creation of the Jewish Defence League to "protect Jewish teachers in racially troubled schools" (i.e from Black students). He also mentions the J.D.L. slogan of 'Never Again', referring to the Holocaust, and their other slogan 'Every Jew a .22'.

Although Rabbi Kahane and his league had attracted considerable attention, it had not received the support of all segments of the Jewish community. He did however capture the imagination of many young Jews, particularly from the lower middle-class of Brooklyn and Queens. "Spurred by the romantic vision of a rabbinic warrior equally at home with rifle manuals or Talmudic discourse these kids - I was to meet some as young as thirteen years old - formed a small army of devoted and disciplined followers. They took paramilitary training at a summer camp located in the Catskill Mountains, just a rifle shot away from Grossinger's. The huskier kids became a rumble of pushing and shoving bodyguards, appropriately named the chaya squad - the Hebrew word for animal. Those with a scientific bent formed a munitions squad, constructing bombs and other weapons. Some became sharpshooters" (Dershowitz, 1982:14).

On January, 1972 two neatly dressed men walked into impresario Sol Hurok's office in mid town Manhattan. Hurok was an 83 year old immigrant to America in 1905, who for 50 years had been a prominent figure in staging assorted cultural fetes. At this time he was putting the finishing touches on an American premiere of the Russian Osipov Balalaika Orchestra. The J.D.L. was strongly opposed to cultural exchanges with the Soviet Union because it had refused to let Jews emigrate to Israel. The two men leave behind a timed bomb in a briefcase. At the same time another two men leave behind another bomb at the Manhattan offices of Columbia Artists Management, which was also bringing Soviet performers to America. A few minutes later the bombs exploded, turning the office and the connecting conference rooms into a maze of flying glass, smashed furniture and suffocating smoke. Hurok's accounting secretary, Iris Kones, a 27 year old Jew, is killed, two others are suffocated by smoke inhalation and the 83 year old Hurok barely escapes death by suffocation.

Within minutes the bombers telephone Associated Press and N.B.C. with the message, "Soviet Culture is responsible for the deaths and imprisonment of Soviet Jews" J.D.L. disclaimed any responsibility while Bertram Zweibon, general counsel for that organization "blamed the bombing on provocateurs of the radical left seeking to discredit the J.D.L." (Dershowitz, 1982:4-6).

In June 1972 three members of the J.D.L. were arrested for those bombings - a Stuart Cohen, a Sheldon Davis and one Sheldon Seigel. Cohen was a squad leader at Kahane's summer camp while Sheldon Seigel was the bomb maker.

The first court hearing was on September 8/72 before a recently appointed judge, one Arnold Bauman. Representing Sheldon Davis was Bert Zweibon, one of the founders of the J.D.L., and Rabbi Kahane's hand picked successor. "The government was unhappy with Zweibon acting as counsel for one of the defendants since it regarded him as an accomplice to the crime. But Zweibon remained on." Judge Bauman, the defendants, the defense lawyers, and the prosecutors were all Jewish. Some observers drew parallels to the Rosenberg case, in which all the participants were also Jewish. These parallels became even more striking when it was revealed that the presiding judge in the court of appeals was to be the same man who had sentenced the Rosenbergs to death (Dershowitz,1982:19).
Dershowitz soon 'discovers' a police informant among his clients, Sheldon Seigel. He told a tale of having fallen in love with one Tova Kessler, whose entire family were militant members of the J.D.L., and gotten dragged deeper into a bomb-making plot than he intended. His first task was to bomb the apartment building in which the Soviet Trade mission to the US was staying in early 1971.

In a discussion of police investigative methods, Dershowitz tells how Seigel was tracked down. On June 4, 1971 a New York detective assigned to shadowing the suspect follows a car containing Seigel and one Izzy Danzinger to a public garage. The detective opens the trunk and discovers a load of bomb making equipment. The police delay the arrest, however, because they want to get information on the inner counsels of the J.D.L. They approach Seigel and through threats of future prosecution get him to inform on all his fellow conspirators.

In August 1971 Seigel went before a secret grand jury and testified on the two previous bombing cases. He is indicted along with six others the following day. However, a few days after the indictment a sniper fired four shots from a high powered rifle into the bedroom window of the Soviet mission to the United States, barely missing four children sleeping there. A major rebuke from the Soviet government and its UN ambassador followed. The heat was now on the New York police to arrest those behind these attacks. They begin a campaign to track down the J.D.L. activists.

However, the bombings of Sol Hurok's and Columbia offices in January of 1972 caught the police totally off guard. They apparently already had some of the participants under surveillance. The rationale for the bombing was that Hurok's sponsorship of a Soviet song and dance group was 'offering comfort and aid to the enemy'.

"When a Soviet court sentenced two Jews to death for planning to commandeer a Soviet plane and fly it to Sweden, the J.D.L. immediately threatened to execute four Soviet diplomats if the death sentences were carried out. Secret State Department cables revealed the US diplomatic personnel were worried that the J.D.L. was capable of implementing its threats. On the eve of the scheduled execution the State Department put its diplomats on maximum alert, but the sentences were commuted to life imprisonment" (Dershowitz, 1982:40).

There follows a discussion of the intricacies involved in Dershowitz having police wiretap evidence of J.D.L terrorist plots disallowed in court - a legal strategy and argument which I cannot follow. In any case Dershowitz won and throughout this case the bulk of evidence was never heard in Judge Bauman's court. By this time, however, the F.B.I. had learned of Seigel's involvement in buying guns for the J.D.L. Says Dershowitz, "Our tactic was to place the government on the defensive; to get Parola, Pattison [NYC detectives] and other government officials on trial for their conduct before the government could put the J.D.L. defendants on trial for the killing of Iris Kones" (Dershowitz 1982:42).

Dershowitz goes on an offensive against the US government, both over its violation of the Fourth Amendment, which restricts the government's power to search and seize evidence, and the Fifth Amendment, which prohibits the government from compelling any person to be a witness against himself. On April 25, 1973 Judge Bauman comes down with the ruling that Seigel had to testify about his knowledge of those involved in the Hurok bombing. The courtroom was packed with J.D.L. supporters, swaying and praying, with one woman casting 'an ancient Jewish curse' on the judge. This is the kind of people they are. A very dangerous sect.
Seigel is finally called to testify as to the involvement of others in the Hurok bombing but he reads a statement refusing to do so on the grounds that government agents had promised that he would not have to. He is then held in contempt of the court and ordered confined until he changed his mind. Dershowitz then reminds Judge Bauman that he was scheduled to have Seigel’s case before the United States Court of Appeal in twelve days. Judge Bauman sets bail for the defendant. The presiding judge of the relevant Appeals Court was Justice Irving Kaufman, the man who sentenced the Rosenbergs to death twenty odd years earlier. Dershowitz presents testimony about the wiretap recording of Seigel’s confessions had not been preserved. The argument goes back and forth and finally Kaufman tells the two sides that they will soon have their answer. After twelve days the State Court of Appeals reverses Judge Bauman’s contempt ruling. It ordered, in an apparently classic phrase, 'that the constable had blundered and therefore the indicted person goes free.' To make its conclusion absolutely clear the court stated that Seigel could not be prosecuted under any circumstances, either for the Amtog [Soviet trade mission] or Glen Cove bombings or for the possession of the explosives found in the defendant's car (Dershowitz, 1982:78). What a strange sense of humor the NY Appeals Court must have. The following day the Hurok trial begins again but this time without the threat of contempt charges hanging over him, Seigel refused to testify. Without his testimony the judge is forced to dismiss the entire case. "Stuart Cohen, Sheldon Davis and Sheldon Seigel started to leave the courtroom, congratulating each other and laughing, when Judge Bauman turned to them in anger and said, 'Do you know who isn't in court today? Iris Komes. And my [Dershowitz'] thoughts turned to the innocent victim of the Hurok bombing. I heard the judge's voice grow louder and angrier. 'Someone has committed a dastardly, vicious, unforgivable, unforgettable crime, someone is frustrating the administration of justice in a case that, in my mind, involves murder.' While enunciating these final words Judge Bauman averted his eyes from the young defendants and focused them directly at me, almost as if to say, 'And you are responsible'" (Dershowitz, 1982:78). And so he was. The J.D.L created a climate of fear among ordinary Arab-Americans during their campaign of intimidation. There were threats to Arab-Americans warning them not to support anti-Zionist causes and there were fire bombings of the homes and businesses of those who did not follow their orders. Finally, the director of the American Arab Anti-Discrimination League was murdered by a bomb attached to his office door. Any reasonable person would hold that this was the work of the J.D.L., since they had threatened the victim's life previously. But no one could find or prosecute the killers. This pattern of Jewish terror parallels the actions of Zionist militants in Palestine during the 1930s and 1940s. The three bombers tried in the New York case went on with their lives in the American lower middle class. Two of them reemerged in the the early 1980s as spokespersons of the Jewish ultra right in New York. However, the Jewish Defense League's support gradually dwindled - although its spokespersons continued to make threats against those they considered newsworthy enough to threaten. Shortly before his removal to Israel, Kahane was convicted for conspiring to make bombs in the USA. After serving a very brief sentence he steamed off to Israel where he came into his own, becoming a leading voice of religious Jewish fascism.
Kahane in Israel

In Israel Kahane established another 'Defense League' like' group among the ultra orthodox - now aimed at the Palestinians not at Blacks. He spent more than twenty years there, flitting back and forth between America and Israel, organizing among the Jewish extremists of the West Bank. He also wrote books proclaiming the need for an exclusively Jewish theocracy to replace the current Israeli governments. His Judaism would, if strictly applied, dump the great majority of world Jewry, all those who had not married by Orthodox rabbis and all their descendants, into the religious category of 'bastards'. They and their descendants would be perpetually voteless and powerless, pariahs within this spiritual community. His strict reading of Jewish religious texts stirred up something of a storm among Jews in Israel and abroad - since it would exclude most of the founders of Israel and all non-religious Jews from full citizenship in that state. This didn't faze Kahane since he was playing to his own audience, the 10% of Israel which is ultra Orthodox. They elected him as a representative of Kach (his own political party) to the Israeli parliament, where he sang the praises of Menachem Begin, then the Irgun prime minister.

If you think that the statements attributed to Kahane here have been taken out of context, or exaggerated to make him seem more venomous and reactionary than anyone could reasonably be, you have only to peruse his lengthy list of books. They convey his position on a wide variety of topics. It is sobering that such views still exist. They are paralleled only by the views of the most backward Moslem reactionaries.

So it went for almost twenty years. Jewish religious fanaticism gaining prominence in Israel and elsewhere in the western world. Kahane and his party supported the total deportation of all Palestinians from Israel, Gaza and the West Bank. All three to four million of them. He held that he didn't demean the Palestinians by considering them to be animals but rather human beings who wanted their own land and not to be forever second class citizens in a Jewish state. But God had granted Israel to the Jews some three thousand years earlier, and it was in fulfillment of God's commandment that he insisted on the establishment of a uniformly Jewish state to operate under Jewish religious laws.

Kahane, of course, supported the invasion of Lebanon and the destruction of the Palestinian forces operating there - he was even more bloodthirsty than Menachem Begin and Ariel Sharon, if such a thing is possible. He was one of those Jewish leaders who shouted 'Blood Libel' when the civilized world reacted to the Israeli-instigated massacres at the Sabra and Shatilla refugee camps in Beirut in 1982. He recurrently called Arabs 'dogs'. At the same time he campaigned for the right of Orthodox Jews not to be drafted into the Israeli army and for the exclusive right of Orthodox rabbis to determine who was and who wasn't a Jew and therefore eligible for entry into Israel under the 'right of return'. He supported the continuation of publicly funded religious schools and for religious laws to apply to everyone in Israel. His Kach party became so extreme that it was ultimately banned from the Israeli Knesset.

An upsurge internal Jewish terrorism in Israel was reported by the Globe and Mail on February 9, 1984. It noted that some 15 cases of bombs being planted by Jewish extremists, in mosques and elsewhere, were intended to kill and intimidate the Palestinian population. The targets also included some Christian shrines in Jerusalem.
On June 19/84, the Israeli parliament banned Kahane's Kach party from national elections on the grounds that it was "a racist and anti-democratic body that opposed the basic values of the state... 'The Weimar Republic fell because it let elements like Kahane use the tools of democracy to destroy democracy', said elections committee member Shulamit Aloni" (Globe and Mail, June 19/84).

Kahane called the Israeli declaration of Independence a 'schizophrenic document' because it enshrined equal rights for Arabs along with the establishment of a Jewish state. Kahane also applauded the actions of Jewish terrorists who were on trial for murdering Arab civilians. The election committee which barred him and his party from participating in Israeli politics also noted that Kach had issued a number of pamphlets warning Jewish girls against any contact with Arabs, 'which Mr. Aloni likened to Nazi pamphlets that warned German girls not to associate with Jews.' A vocal minority of the election committee opposed the banning of Kach.

Following a divisive election the Israeli Labour party attempted to weld together a majority government along with Likud. "Another element encouraging sentiment in both major parties toward some kind of national unity is the emergence of a fanatical right-wing party headed by Rabbi Meir Kahane, who calls for the expulsion of Arabs from Israel and hints at the use of violence to accomplish this end. With the balance of power so precarious, even one seat, such as Rabbi Kahane's, may prove crucial to the formation of a coalition. But both parties are opposed to including his brand of extremism in government" (Globe and Mail, July 26/84).

About a month later Kahane mobilized his supporters and set out to harass Palestinians in the large village of Umn el-Fahm. A Globe and Mail journalist reports that the village, composed of Israeli Arabs, lies about 60 kilometers north of Jerusalem. Kahane, then still an elected representative in the Israeli Knesset, has been mobilizing his followers to expel the Arabs from 'Jewish land' (i.e. all of Palestine). He had jokingly offered them passage to America if they leave but the village mayor told him to stay out of their town. "This disgusting dog will not tell us what to do' shouted Kahane. His supporters cheered, some yelling 'Arabs are slaves'."

"The village of 26,000 is Rabbi Kahane's first target in a campaign to expel Israel's 700,000 Palestinians, citizens who make up about 15% of the population [of Israel proper]." His actions created a degree of solidarity with Jews for the beleaguered Arab population, with even some Conservative rabbis spending the Sabbath night at Umn al Fahm (Globe and Mail, August 27/84).

When the police stop Kahane's assaults he is outraged and demands that the police should block 'Arab' settlements, not him. "'Kill those dogs with gas', he screamed... Some 5,000 residents of the village, accompanied by a handful of left-wing Israelis, blocked the road into the village down which Kahane intended to drive" (Globe and Mail, August 30/84).

Two years later the New York Times (November 13/86) reports that Kahane's star seems to be fading in Israel, with his party's support down from more than 9 to less than 2 percent in the national poll. However, his extremist views have taken root. Almost 38 percent of the Israeli population now support expulsion of all Palestinians from Israel. Kahane's support was especially strong among the young, particular those who had emigrated from Moslem countries.

Finally, on June 8, 1987, the Israeli Parliament barred Kahane from taking part in any parliamentary activities after he refused to take an oath of allegiance to the state of Israel. ".... Parliament enacted an anti-Kahane bill banning anyone
with a racist platform from running for Parliament. However it did not define 'racism'. That was left to a later bill, which, under pressure from religious parties, explicitly excluded from 'racist' any action taken on religious grounds. Mr. Kahane bases all his anti-Arab views on Jewish religious texts, so he ended up voting for the second bill [excluding racists] while its left-wing originators voted against it" (*New York Times*, November 13/86).

In Ashkelon, where two Jewish residents were stabbed to death recently by a Palestinian, there were cheers for Kahane's proposals to expel all Palestinians from Israel and the occupied territories. "I say that if any Arab raises a hand against a Jew, no more hand. If any Arab raises his head against a Jew, no more head." "A teenaged girl in the crowd said, 'He's right. There are extremists on their side, why shouldn't there be extremists on our side?"

In America other Jewish extremist organizations have gotten into the act. The J.D.O. or Jewish Defense Organization is one of several groups that have split from the J.D.L. Another is the Jewish Armed Resistance, which claimed responsibility for a 1975 blast at La Guardia airport that killed 11 and injured 75.

The *Globe and Mail* reports that a 1984 Kahane tour of America started with an attack on Jesse Jackson, the leading Black civil rights activist at the time. Kahane urged Jews who cannot vote for Ronald Reagan to stay home rather than to vote for Democratic challenger Walter Mondale, who he characterized as a 'gutless wimp who cannot stand up to Jackson.' He also characterized Mr. Jackson as a 'bigot' and a 'racist' and declared that 'Jews should wash their hands of the Democratic Party.' He discussed the contradictions between the preservation of an exclusive Zionist state and a pluralistic western democracy, saying that he was fully in accord with an Orthodox Israel. Speaking of Jewish liberals who denounce him and his policies he calls them 'sick Jews' (*Globe and Mail*, September 1/84).

On August 20, 1985 Kahane steps down from the leadership of the Jewish Defense League in America citing lack of time to lead it. He passes control over to an Irv Rubin, a private investigator from Los Angles. Rubin claims that American membership now stands at 13,000 but other Jewish leaders deny this figure (*New York Times*, August 20/85). On April 15, 1985 CBC television news reports that the Jewish Defense League in Canada claims a membership of 8,000. It is outraged that Canada has so far denied a visa for Kahane to visit as their 'spiritual advisor'. Even if these figures are vastly overblown they indicate a significant number of Jews involved in a right-wing terrorist organization within Canada.

William Johnson, a reporter for the *Globe and Mail*, outlines a speaking tour of Meir Kahane through the US of A. He notes that his talk in Washington attracted the condemnation of a 'Washington Board of Rabbis' who consider Kahane a "danger to the Jewish people and his teaching antithetical to the essence of Judaism". They mounted a vigil where Kahane was to speak.

According to Johnson, Kahane's main proposals are: "(1) outlawing intermarriage between Jews and non-Jews; (2) preventing Jews married to non-Jews from holding public office in Israel; (3) support for the annexation of the territory Israel had previously conquered and the expulsion of all Arabs from all of Israel; (4) a program to have Jewish municipalities, communities and private firms fire Arab employees and hire only Jews."

"When he spoke to the press club, Rabbi Kahane made no apologies for his views. 'Meir Kahane says it is not racism, it's Judaism.' He argued that his views were those of the Torah". He also noted a fundamental conflict between democracy and Judaism, since a growing Palestinian population in Greater Israel
would ultimately swamp Jewish voters. He defends Judaism against democracy (Globe and Mail, September 13/85).

The New York Times of September 11, 1985 reports the release from an Israeli prison of one Uri Maier, who had pleaded guilty to attempting to bomb a car belonging to a member of the Palestinian National Guidance Council in February of 1980. His sentence was reduced by a third by president Chaim Hertzog, while the Israeli 'justice' minister, Moshe Nissim described Maier "... as a pioneer of Jewish settlement who had slipped." In fact it appears that most of the Jewish terrorists of the West Bank are treated with kid gloves.

An article in the New York Times of November 11, 1985 under the heading of 'J.D.L.'s New Leader Aims To Press Weapons Training' provides a chilling overview of this leader, Irv Rubin. He is a forty year old Jew who runs a private investigations firm and who has been the West coast spokesperson for the J.D.L. for ten years. In a move which may split the organization Rubin says he plans to incorporate non-Jews who take the same positions as Jews in the organization. His and competing militant Jewish groups have been the focus of Federal investigations into recent bombings on the East and West coasts and the F.B.I. says that the J.D.L. was responsible for three of those bombings.

"Law enforcement officials on both coasts say they are concerned that the J.D.L. may have formed a militant underground effort in the United States. In 1979, Brett Becker, then a top J.D.L. officer, wrote an article for the group's publication Update, calling for a secret underground strike force which will eliminate those individuals that threaten our very existence."

"Mr. Rubin, who has worked in the area to train adults and teenagers in weapons use, said he planned to extend such activities across the country. 'I want to see proud, tough Jews' he said. 'I hope to see the day when they will go into every corner, nook and cranny of this country and teach the Jew-hater a lesson we will never forget.'" All in all, the Jewish Defense League should remind us of nothing so much as the early Nazi party - possibly a bit more blood thirsty.

"Over the years the J.D.L. focused much of its attention on the Soviet Union because of its [alleged] treatment of Jews. The targets have included Soviet diplomatic residences, travel and airline offices, dance troupes and businesses sponsoring cultural events.

Four gunmen who fired on an Arab bus in the Israeli occupied West Bank wounding seven passengers on March 4, 1984, were J.D.L. members, Rabbi Kahane said. "They were trained in the use of weapons at League camps in New York state and in Los Angeles..."

Rubin says he remembers Kahane saying 'Don't sit down with an anti-Semite and try to talk with him. Just smash him'. I presume that applies to all those who criticize Israel and its supporters. "Mr. Rubin has been arrested more than 30 times on charges ranging from malicious mischief to conspiracy to commit murder, but says he has never been convicted of a felony or served any time. ...He often spends his summers giving 10 week courses to teenagers and adults on how to shoot dummy targets decorated with swastikas. For these activities he generally uses private property of friends and sometimes uses a public forest."

Rubin is involved in rebuilding the J.D.L. over the next few years and to establish it across much of the USA, including New York, where J.D.L. supporters have shifted to other militant Jewish organizations. Law enforcement officials decline to say who they believe is funding the J.D.L but Rubin says, "You'd be surprised at the names of the people who give to us." (New York Times, November 11/85). No, I wouldn't be all that surprized.
Further accounts of the J.D.L in America

In a report entitled 'FBI Says It Has Suspects Among Extremist Jews', the New York Times of July 17/86 says that "Oliver B. Revel, the bureau's executive assistant director, told a House subcommittee that the FBI had made it a 'top priority' to 'solve these cases, which include the murder of Alexander Odeh, West Coast regional director of the American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee."

He noted that the FBI did not have sufficient evidence to yet make an arrest but that certain Jewish extremist groups were thought to be involved. "Mr Revel said that the suspects in the Odeh case were implicated as well in the bombings of purported war criminals in New York and New Jersey. [He] said that the bureau had found similarities in the Odeh murder, the August bombings of the home of Tscherim Sobzokov in Patterson N.J. which killed Mr. Sobzokov and the September bombing of the home of Elmars Spojis, in Brentwood, L.I., in which one person was injured." A neighbor had been severely injured in that fire bombing. The last two persons attacked had been rumored in the press to have been Nazi collaborators in Eastern Europe during world war 2 (New York Times, July 17/86).

Mr. Odeh was a much admired opponent of Jewish attacks on Arab-American businesses and against the general anti-Arab line of the American media. He was beginning to have some success in getting Arab-Americans to fight back against their attackers and had previously been warned of his impending assassination if he did not cease his activities. He didn't and the Jewish Defence League ultimately murdered him.

The New York Times (August 14/87), in an obscurely placed report, noted that the former head of the Jewish Defence League and two of his associates pleaded guilty to taking part in a series of bombings since 1984, including fire bombing Avery Fisher Hall at Lincoln Center in October 1986.

"The fire bomb was set off at the hall's stage door on the day of a scheduled performance by the Moscow State Symphony. No one was injured. Another defendant described as a former Jewish Defence League member, pleaded guilty to taking part in another incident at Lincoln Center when a tear gas grenade was thrown into the audience in the Metropolitan Opera House at the opening night performance of the Moiseyev Dance Company last September. Twenty people were injured in that attack, which forced the evacuation of the 4,000 members in the audience" (New York Times, August 14/87).

In the fall of 1987 Rabbi Meir Kahane staged a protest against the appointment of an Israeli Arab, a Mr. Massarwa, to be the Israeli Consul General in America. "Rabbi Kahane said it was inappropriate for an Arab to hold the government position. 'The issue is whether Israel is going to be the Jewish state or whether it going to be a Western style democracy', he said. 'It can't be both'."

Kahane had flown to America to lead a Jewish demonstration to block Mr. Massarwa's entry into the Israeli consulate in Atlanta. Kahane told his American followers to make their sentiments known at any public meeting that Massarwa might hold. (New York Times, September 4/87).

The Vancouver Sun of November 19/87 reports that FBI investigations into the Jewish Defence League suspected of a series of bombings in the US have been hampered by a failure of Israel to cooperate. The Village Voice had obtained FBI documents which charge that the Israeli authorities have not been forthcoming with information of J.D.L. members now living in Israel. "Last year, an FBI report on terrorism said Jewish extremists were responsible for four bombings in 1985 in which two people were killed."
On October 22/85 the Federal government of Canada rejected a request by Meir Kahane to visit Canada, saying it would inflame tensions between Arabs and Jews and between Jews. Len Westerberg of the Immigration Department said that Kahane was rejected on the grounds that "Rabbi Kahane was convicted in New York City in 1971 of possessing explosives, bombs and other dangerous weapons and sentenced to five years in jail" (Globe and Mail, October 23/85). Of this five years Kahane spent a few months in prison before leaving for Israel. This did not get him barred from recurrently returning to the USA to raise funds and mobilize support.

The Globe and Mail, December 31/85 reports that Kahane in Israel had threatened to break up New Year's Eve celebrations among Israeli Christian Arabs in the city of Haifa because the festivities endangered Jews. The threat allegedly is of the Christians' wild cavortings and the breaking of bottles in New Years celebrations. Kahane and his supporters want all Arabs, Christian or Moslem, expelled from Israel. "The communique said he would come to the Mediterranean port to 'enforce order' if police failed to do so."

The Jewish Defence League in Canada
Organized in the mid 1970s, the Canadian wing of the Jewish Defence League at one time claimed some 3,000 members, although suspiciously few turn up at any rally they hold. Still, there are enough of them to worry about. They only began making the headlines in Canada after their parent organization in the US was broken up by F.B.I. investigations and trials.

The Globe and Mail reports on the demands of the Canadian Jewish Defence League led by one Meir Halevi, a thuggish character. Halevi claimed to have F.B.I. documents proving that seven former Rumanian Iron Guard members were living in the city of Toronto, as well as collaborationist Rumanian clergy. "He said that he would give the federal government 'two weeks' to begin to investigate or he would make public documents [about] another man who lives in Windsor, Ontario." One of these individuals had the gall to criticize Sol Littman, the head of the Toronto Simon Wiesenthal Center of Holocaust Studies. Halevi said that "he was able to track down the names of 28 suspected Ukrainian war criminals by using the Toronto phone book." They were part of a list of over 200 alleged Ukrainian war criminals in Canada distributed by Simon Wiesenthal. A name on a list is all the evidence this lot requires before it charges people with war crimes.

On January 22 of 1988 the Globe and Mail reports that Meir Halevi has publicly named someone whom he claims was a commander of the Rumanian Iron Guard some 47 years previously and had been implicated in the murder of Jews at the beginning of world war 2. He said that his own testimony given during US deportation hearings had spelled out the specifics of his claims. An outline of the Iron Guard was prepared for Canadian judge Deschenes in his commission by Jewish researcher Ms. Rodai some years previously.

Halevi provided reporters with photocopies of documents allegedly taken from F.B.I. documents made in 1954 when Iron Guard survivors were brought to the US. There were also documents reporting atrocities committed by Iron Guard members in 1941, denunciations by shadowy witnesses, who are no longer living. Mr. Halevi had made the charges against the Scarborough resident some years earlier to Canadian solicitor-general Elmer MacKay and had testified before the Deschenes commission in 1985 but Canada took no action. Jewish thugs, terrorists, and murderers now feel free to order about leading members of the Canadian government.
Kahane Finally Assassinated

On November 5, 1990 Kahane is finally assassinated while leaving a New York hotel where he has just given a rabble rousing talk about saving Soviet Jewry. He is killed by a single shot from an Egyptian immigrant and citizen of the USA - a Mr. Nosair. The New York Times carried a front page headline and followed up the story in bold type for some days. Given Kahane's prominence, official public statements are naturally clouded with official regret. "Mayor David N. Dinkins said tonight that the shooting was 'an international tragedy that shocks all of us. ' 'While I disagreed with his every preachment, I deplore the violence that cut him down', said Rabbi Alexander M. Schindler, president of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, a Reform group. Seymour Reich, chairman of the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations said 'Whatever one thought about his political program, his shocking assassination will be deplored by friends and foes alike'." Mr. Reich had been a fellow speaker at the talk which Kahane had delivered.

"Some of the passers-by said they were not surprised on hearing of Rabbi Kahane's death and were not saddened by it. 'He deserved it', said Hassan Meged, an Arab-American who lives in New Jersey. 'He wanted to kill all the Palestinians. And what you do will return to you sooner or later'(New York Times, November 6/90).

The same edition of the Times reveals some formerly little known background to Kahane's past. Apparently he had come early to his Jewish militancy, joining Betar, the para-military organization of the right-wing Herut party. As a young teenager he had attacked the British embassy in America in reaction to its mandate policies in Palestine during the mid 1940s. More recently, Rabbi Kahane contended that "'Jewish philosophy was never based on western democratic principles, but on Jewish ritual law.' That he said forbade close contact with non-Jews. 'I have said it a million times', Rabbi Kahane said, 'Western democracy as we know it is incompatible with Zionism'" (New York Times, November 6/90).

At his funeral there were mixed calls for revenge but also the presence of leaders of Jewish organizations which had previously denounced him. "On the streets of nearby Borough Park, where thousands of Holocaust survivors make their homes, Rabbi Kahane was remembered for instilling pride and a sense of security through the citizens patrols of the Jewish Defense League in the late 1960s. His death was taken as a personal tragedy." ... "Dozens of young men stood on nearby porches and fire escapes and atop yellow school buses holding signs aloft. There were scores of signs two feet by four feet that had the word 'N'Hama' - revenge in Hebrew - in blood red." Another sign in Hebrew read 'Death to the Arabs'. While others read 'Never Again'. Hopefully not, but tens of thousands of Meir Kahanes had been spawned in the preceding twenty years.

Rabbi Moshe D. Tendler, a professor of both biology and Talmud at Yeshiva University and a friend of the slain rabbi, gave the principal eulogy. He said he would make only one political statement. "'President Bush,' he said, 'read my lips. The assassin came from the Temple Mount. Your silence made it possible for the assassin to spill the blood of Rabbi Kahane.'" Which I suppose means that the Republicans have not been sufficiently supportive of Zionist fascism. Dov Hikind, a former member of the Jewish Defense League who now represents Borough Park on the city council, gave an equally stirring eulogy. (New York Times, November 7/90)
In an obituary in the New York Times on the same day, John Kifner remembers a little of what Kahane had said in the past. "Western democracy as we know it is incompatible with Zionism", he said. "Zionism came into being to create a Jewish state. Zionism declares that there is going to be a Jewish state with a majority of Jews, come what may. Democracy says, 'No, if the Arabs are the majority then they have the right to decide their own fate. I say clearly I stand with Zionism."

Kahane advocated what he called an 'exchange of populations' - i.e. the expulsion of all Arabs - contending that 'a democracy allows non-Jews to become a majority and to turn Israel into a non-Jewish state. That was utterly unacceptable to him.

The Globe and Mail, reporting from Israel, write 'Kahane followers vow revenge'. The racist nature of Kahane's flock was clear in that any and every Palestinian in Israel could be a target. As it was, two elderly Palestinian men in a West Bank village were gunned down by shots from a passing car. "Kahane will take more Arab blood with him in his death than when he was alive", said Yoel Ben David, an activist in Kahane's Kach party." ... "Jews can dance on the blood of Arabs. We haven't done it yet. Maybe we will. You never know," said another mourner. "I don't have any reservations if there are attacks against Palestinians,' Kach spokesman Noam Federman told Israel Radio."

"'There will be revenge. We believe in revenge', said Sol Margolis, president of Kach International, the US arm of Kahane's terrorist party. ... 'We are Jews, we are religious Jews and we don't buy that crap of turning the other cheek. There will be hell to pay for this affront', said Mr. Margolis...". "Rabbi Herbert Bonzer, a long time friend and leader of the [Brooklyn] synagogue where the [memorial] service was held, said that Mr. Kahane was always welcome there. Many synagogues had barred Mr. Kahane because he sanctioned violence... The loudest applause came when Mr. Bonzer proclaimed that Mr. Kahane 'was a strident voice who called 'never again', the slogan used by Mr. Kahane in reference to the Holocaust" (Globe and Mail, November 7/90).

In a television piece, a prominent Jewish spokesperson for the West Bank settlers, one Getulia Cohen, gives an elaborate breast-beating performance (literally). She tells American reporters that she holds America co-responsible for allowing the God-given light shining from Meir Kahane's example to be put out because of its lax attitude toward 'terrorists'. Coming from a right-wing West Bank Jewish extremist that is a joke.

Writing in the New York Times two days after Kahane's death, Robert Friedman writes an atypical retrospective of Kahane. He surveys a little of his history in the US but focuses especially on his role in Israel over the previous sixteen years, especially since his election to the Knesset in 1984. He points out that the core of Kahane's influence has been his demand that Israel expel the more than 2.5 million Palestinians then living in the occupied territories, a demand which apparently has an increasing hold on the Israeli right.

Friedman mentions the then recent events which occurred on the Temple Mount in Jerusalem, where Israeli police shot to death at least 19 Palestinians for little discernable reason. He also mentions the fact that since the 1960s Kahane had been a regular columnist for the Jewish Press of Brooklyn, in which he wrote articles such as those comparing the present day Palestinians to the ancient Canaanites, who the Jews exterminated under a mandate of God. In Israel, "Far from being an aberration or a political pariah, Rabbi Kahane was on the verge of turning Kach into a right-wing juggernaut. Rabbi Kahane's diatribes against Israeli leftists have led to a string of attacks against liberal Israeli journalists, artists and
politicians, including members of Peace Now, who have every reason to fear that members of Kach will seek to avenge Rabbi Kahane's killing at their expense."

"In the past, after all, Rabbi Kahane has called for the 'liquidation' of liberal Jews whose views he disagrees with. 'Their evil threatens every Jew, their sins will sink the Jewish ship which carries every Jew', he wrote in 1984. In the same article he said that 'when a Jew rises to challenge the fundamentals of God, Jewry and Israel, that Jew must be stopped'." In that regard Kahane approximated the sentiments of Ayatollah Komeni. (New York Times, November 7/90)

During Kahane's funeral in Jerusalem a crowd of 30,000 mourners attacked police and any Palestinians they happened to encounter, stoning police and Arab-owned vehicles. Four Arabs were badly injured. Israeli police warned Palestinian nationalist leaders to be prepared for possible attempts on their lives. In the Knesset some 30 of the 120 members walked out of a minute of silence which was held in Kahane's memory. (New York Times, November 8/90)

Surprisingly, US newspapers were somewhat reticent about portraying the Arab executioner in the blackest colors. One young Israeli student temporarily resident in New York is interviewed by the New York Times and says that he is glad that Kahane is dead. That he was a racist and a hate monger and that Israel will be a slightly better place without him around. My own sentiments exactly.

In the trial of Kahane's killer, the prosecution and the assigned judge believe they had an open and shut case. They permitted a rough cross section of New Yorkers to participate in the jury. The prosecution presented its case and the defense, while not admitting the guilt of their client, went through the long list of the murderous and racist things which Kahane had been involved in throughout his life time and suggested that an Arab might legitimately feel that 'here was a fanatic enemy of his people'. The jury retired to deliberate and - wonder of wonders - comes back on December 21, 1991 with a Not Guilty verdict. That decision was the universal sentiment of the jurors.

"Jewish leaders were stunned Sunday by the acquittal of a Muslim immigrant accused of killing extremist rabbi Meir Kahane, and right-wing Jewish groups threatened to march on jurors' homes... 'It sounded to me like an open and shut case, and the defense sounded laughably amateurish', said Alan Dershowitz, a lawyer and the author of 'Chutzpah'. The defendant's lawyer, the famed William Kunstler, said he would appeal the accused' conviction on weapons charges" (Vancouver Sun, December 23/91).

The presiding judge was outraged and threatened to commit the jurors themselves to trial if they did not find the defendant guilty, but they persisted in their decision. What extraordinary decency and courage!

The Judge, one Alvin Schlesinger, goes through an outraged spiel about how justice has been violated in his courtroom and how he is limited to sentencing the defendant to 7 to 20 years in prison on a charge of owning an unregistered weapon. "Saying that he wished the defendant could have given a longer sentence", Schlesinger held that the jury's decision to acquit Mr. Nosair of murder last month "was against the overwhelming weight of the evidence and was devoid of common sense and logic." This was "a case of extreme violence visited on this city. I believe the defendant conducted a rape of this country, of the Constitution and of our laws, and the people seeking to exist peacefully together,'the judge said." Conjoining Mr. Kahane's name with 'seeking to live peacefully together' is utterly ludicrous.

The New York newspapers go through their expectable routine, expostulating about the sanctity of the law and of how no one allegedly is above it. Some also
hint that a number of the jurors were Black and were reacting to Kahane's anti-Black campaigns at the beginning of his career, superimposing Black unto Palestinian. But gradually the furore dies down. I do not know what happened to the shooter, whether he survived incarceration in New York jails or not.

PART FIVE
Chapter 10. The Holocaust Revival. Some of the Cast

Roy Cohn and His Lot (1927-1986)

Cohn was born the only son of a New York State appeals judge and millionaire. He was admitted to the bar at the age of 21 and first worked as a clerk in the US Attorney's office where he helped prepare the case against the two accused atom bomb spies Julius and Ethel Rosenberg in 1950-51. He quit the Justice Department in 1953 to join Senator Joe McCarthy in his witch hunts throughout America and soon hooked up with an early boyfriend, G. David Schine, a 26 year old heir to a hotel chain who worked for the McCarthy subcommittee as an 'unpaid consultant'.

Cohn and his boyfriend, Mr. Schine, went on an 18 day, expense-paid tour of US Information Agency libraries in Europe, investigating allegedly subversive material kept in them and those responsible for such subversion during 1954. When Mr. Schine was drafted into the US Army Cohn threatened to investigate the Army unless Schine received a purely nominal posting in the US. "Badgering the army put Mr. McCarthy on a collision course with the administration of president Dwight Eisenhower. The upshot was an independent investigation, the Army-McCarthy hearings of 1954."

Initially the hearings proved the US army to be as cowed before Senator McCarthy as was the rest of the country. But when McCarthy began to slander a young lawyer working under Joseph Welch, who represented the Army, Welch politely but dramatically called McCarthy a vile slanderer and a demagogue. This brought a ringing applause from the audience which even Senator McCarthy's indignant intervention could not silence. "Mr. McCarthy came across on television as a fulminating demagogue and never recovered" (New York Times, October 23/86).

During Cohn's brief reign in Mr. McCarthy's House UnAmerican Activities Investigating Committee the B'nai B'rith and the (Anti-) Defamation League fully supported him. It was generally suspected that these two organizations supplied names of potentially subversive and excessively liberal Jews to the FBI. They filled their circulars and publications with the ravings of the most reactionary Jews imaginable, placed their members on watch for 'any potentially subversive unAmericans' they might discover. How many other Jewish organizations acted in this manner is unknown to me but is hardly unknowable.

The increasingly neo-Conservatism of Jewish organizations by the later 1970s seems to have taken much from McCarthyism, at least his tactics of charging every opponent as a minion of the devil. They incorporated the venom of his charges and the fantasy of his claims, as well as his readiness to pursue anyone any distance for the sake of a political agenda; anyone who diverges from their standards of what is acceptable.

Mr. Cohn quit Washington and embarked on a lucrative private law practice in 1954. "The roster of Mr. Cohn's clients included Carmine Galante, short-lived
Mafia boss of bosses, and Anthony (Fat Tony) Salerno, alleged godfather of the Genovese mob as well as other noted crime figures." Presumably he did not steal from them but he did from a great many of his other wealthy clients, through a number of investment schemes. (Globe and Mail, August 4/86)

While Cohn played on his Jewish connections he was basically an ultra-right wing American; a born venom pedlar who after leaving Senator McCarthy became a lawyer for various Mafia figures in the US. He was a thievish lawyer who systematically defrauded his clients. He was indicted three separate times by various state agencies for his conduct as a lawyer but beat the charges each time, until shortly before his death when he was finally disbarred from practicing law. He was 'a life-long bachelor' and a closeted but aggressive homosexual who finally died of AIDS and its complications while in his fifties.

"Mr. Cohn remained a darling of the US right wing all his life. He was remembered as the arrogant but brilliant 27 year-old inquisitor of Mr. McCarthy's Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. Mr. Cohn and Mr. McCarthy, a Wisconsin Republican, destroyed the reputations and careers of a vast number of people they tarred as Communists and sympathizers through innuendo or guilt by association" (New York Times, October 23, 1986).

The same issue of the Times also provided a gilded tribute to Mr. Cohn on his burial. The ceremony was attended by almost 500 New York 'dignitaries' including former Mayor Abraham Beame, New York City council president Andrew Stein, former Tammany leader Carmine DeSapio, publisher Rupert Murdock, television personality Barbara Walters, cosmetics czarina Estee Lauder, New York columnist William Safire and several judges. Cohn was praised "as a patriot who deeply loved the United States and saw the Soviet Union as a 'hideous enemy'."

A Mr. Fugazy, a business associate of Cohn's, "assailed those who sought to have Mr. Cohn removed from the bar'. 'They tried to exact a pound of flesh from one of its most brilliant minds' he said. This must refer to the five member panel of the Appellate Division of State Supreme Court, notorious radicals all, which had ultimately revoked Cohn's licence to practice law.

"United States Senator Chic Hecht of Nevada and Mr. Bolan [Mr. Cohn's current law partner] praised Mr. Cohn for alerting the country to the dangers of Communism. 'The liberal establishment' Mr. Bolan said, 'never forgave Roy' and furthered what he called the 'hatred and lust for revenge that followed ...'

"The service ended with the singing of 'God Bless America' which Mr, Bolan said was Mr. Cohn's favorite song" (New York Times, October 25/86).

Previous to Cohn's death the New York Times printed a long letter-to-the-editor from one William Jackson, the chairman of the First Judicial Department disciplinary committee. He was replying to an attack by William Safire on the court's decision to release the testimony given in the inquest into Mr. Cohn's case to the New York Times and Daily News. Mr. Safire had acted as a character witness for Mr. Cohn in that inquest when he testified he was unfamiliar with any of the charges against Cohn. He now claims that all the charges were baseless and were the product of 'a cancer of hate' against Mr. Cohn.

"Mr. Safire attributed the charges against Mr. Cohn to 'liberals' with a score to settle against one who once aided Senator Joseph R. McCarthy. He said he 'suspects' that a 'majority of the inquisitors are envenomed ... with old hatreds and out to settle ideological scores." The decision to release the inquest's testimony was a unanimous one by that court, as was the decision for Mr. Cohn's disbarment. Are we to believe that all the sitting judges are 'envenomed liberals'?
One of the set of charges against Mr. Cohn was that he had accepted a payment of $100,000 from a former client some 18 years previously which he initially called a loan but which he simply failed to repay. He was then sued by his client. The specific charges against Mr. Cohn were that in 1979 while defending himself in that suit he had perjured himself, as was documented in this most recent trial.

Another charge was that over 14 years years he had pocketed escrowed funds of a client. It was only after a Federal court finally ordered Mr. Cohn's law firm to repay the client the $219,000 in the escrow fund that they did so.

Mr. Safire attacked the Special Prosecutor, one Mr. Hymes, in the criminal case against Mr. Cohn because he [Hymes] had once represented the Liberal Party of New York and that he should have had no place in the prosecutorial role. However, the panel of judges had decided that Mr. Hymes was appointed as prosecutor and that Mr. Cohn should be prosecuted for his earlier offenses.

A judge Jackson ends with this quote, "If, as Aristotle once said, we must honor truth above our friends, Mr. Safire surely cannot count among his true friends whoever it was who told him what the Roy Cohn disciplinary case was all about." (New York Times, January 7/86).

Later that year Cohn was found guilty of defrauding many of his former clients and finally disbarred from practicing law in the state of New York. He died of a protracted but unacknowledged case of AIDS shortly afterward.

As mentioned above, his funeral was attended by a crowd of his wealthy and influential supporters.

Alan Dershowitz. Getting away with murder

Dershowitz was born and grew up in an old, lower middle class Jewish district of Brooklyn during the 1940s and 1950s. He makes a point of informing his readers that this district was built by Jews, who did not simply move into some other group's former neighbourhood. His parents were orthodox Jews and his mother pushed him into acquiring a profession.

Like many later intellectuals from such backgrounds, Dershowitz makes much of the alleged toughness of his boyhood friends - always ready to fight anyone and always ready to beat up anyone they considered insufficiently philo-Semitic. He claims that he himself took part in many street rumbles - a rough and tough guy, allegedly. He certainly has a big mouth and is quick to demean anyone and everyone but I do not believe, given his size and condition, that he ever was a street fighter. His ties with mob figures and similar thugs only came long after he was an established lawyer. He was probably simply a perpetually angry, bookish grade A student, constantly on the look out for anyone or anything that might offend him.

Dershowitz got into the Yale law school and graduated in the mid 1960s. He took further advanced studies in law and sometime later wound up teaching law (as well as practicing it) at a number of the leading universities in America. From the late 1970s until the mid 1990s he became a cult figure amongst the younger and more greedy lawyers of his country. He says quite openly that he and most other lawyers know quite well that the great majority of their clients are guilty as charged but that it is the lawyers' job to defend them by any means possible. That applied especially to the mob figures he represented in various cases.

Two of his cases in the early 1970s included Jewish Defence League terrorists who had blown up impresario Sol Hurok's offices in New York because Hurok had booked a touring Soviet cultural group. This was when the JDL and other Zionists
were demonizing Russia about it not permitting its Jews to emigrate to Israel. One secretary in these offices was killed and others wounded.

Dershowitz also defended a Jewish Orthodox rabbi who had stolen the life savings of a number of his wealthy and not so wealthy parishioners through a transparent investment scam. Dershowitz got most of his clients off through minor legal loopholes, he tells us in his autobiography, with considerable pride and little soul searching.

Despite the efforts of Dershowitz and others like him, the Jewish Defence League was convicted and broken up by Federal and local police investigations. Its leader departed to Israel to launch a fascist party there targeting the Palestinians and non-Orthodox Jews. His followers in the US either went into business or entered JDL successor organizations. By this time Dershowitz was a professor of law teaching at Harvard University. Throughout the later 1980s and 1990s he delivered lectures to eager listeners in American universities and authored (or had ghosted) a number of books about America, Israel and their mutual mission to defend and expand the free world - a world where the 'rule of law' applied. No cynicism intended. In 1991 he wrote a tome called Chutzpah, in which he argued that Jews should put their alleged second class status behind them and openly enter into the struggle for who controls America.

The author of some eleven books, Dershowitz then turned his hand to novel writing. One of them is entitled Just Revenge (1999), dealing with a Jew avenging himself for the sufferings he and his family had experienced during the Holocaust. Dershowitz is an utterly hackneyed writer, his text filled with all the overused phrases and stock situations which have accompanied Z grade Hollywood flicks for the last half century.

All of the Jews in his book are the greatest in their field - philosophers, historians, lawyers, you name it and they are the tops. The stock villain in the book is a former Lithuanian militia captain who helped exterminate Lithuanian Jews - invariably in the most sadistic ways possible. He murders little Jewish children before their parents eyes and has them dig their own graves, in which they were buried while still half alive. The only thing missing is that the villain should devour the body parts of the Jewish infants before their parents, uncooked and raw.

The hero escapes and joins with Jewish partizans fighting in the Polish forests - like every other Jewish Holocaust survivor. There must have been hundreds of thousands of Jewish partisans in those forests according to the claims. At the end of the war his fellow Jewish combatants plan to kill as many of the German POWs as they can but the hero is unwilling to accompany them. We are repeatedly treated to the view that Christian doctrine does not permit the punishment of people as a class, but that Jewish law calls for vengeance against any nation which assaults Jews, even against those yet unborn. This from a preeminent American professor of law.

The Lithuanian captain is discovered by the Jewish hero as living in retirement with his family in a small Massachusetts town. Although the villain is an old man dying of pancreatic cancer the hero is determined to kill not only him but his entire family in 'just revenge'. The reader is supposed to agree with such actions, allegedly the right of any Jew in the world. The hero, with the help of a female university professor who, while now in her forties, is still constantly enraged at being raped by her grandfather when she was fourteen. I did say it was a hackneyed plot. Together they kidnap this former militia captain, who had snuck into America illegally in 1947. The Demjanuk case and his conviction in
Israel is also alluded to. Dershowitz's writing is rather like reading a commentary in the *New York Daily Post*.

In a long argument with himself the hero decides that he cannot kill all of the villain's children. A great deal of Jewish self adulation follows. However he then tortures the captain psychologically so that he later commits suicide. The hero is discovered and sent to trial in a US court. The jury is deadlocked and a decision cannot be reached. But the villain's son, who has become convinced of his fathers crimes, hands back a chalice stolen from the hero's family and calls off any further prosecution. Dershowitz surely knows that murder cases cannot be called off by a member of the victim's family.

This is the sort of slop which Dershowitz has produced for the borscht belt boobs. The message is that all Jews are survivors of the Holocaust and that any of them can legitimately kill anyone who they believe played any part in it or whoever insults them or for whatever other holy reason.

By the year 2000 Dershowitz's star status was beginning to fade - at least one didn't hear his name being shouted from the roof tops in America. At this time he is engaged in debate with a number of radical critics of American policies, such as Noam Chomsky, whom Dershowitz probably feels he had utterly vanquished with his courtroom style. He followed this up with another rallying call in *The Case of Israel* (2003). "A passionate advocate of Zionism and Israel, who after September 11 [the New York office towers bombing] made the case for the torture of suspects whom the authorities believed to be hiding information about 'an immanent large-scale threat'" (The Guardian, August 19/2005). Justified torture, of course.

By 2005 Dershowitz was involved in a verbal battle with Norman Finkelstein, a younger but vocal American professor of political science. In 2000 Finkelstein had published a work entitled *The Holocaust Industry. Reflections on the Exploitation of Jewish Suffering*, which has since been translated into 17 languages and has become something of a publishing success, despite the widespread criticism it drew from Jews who claimed it played to anti-semitic sentiments.

The current debate is over Finkelstein's *Beyond Chutzpah. On the Misuse of Anti-Semitism and the Abuse of History*. In an aside Finkelstein says that "Dershowitz is a 'total liar', adding that 'If a true word were to leap out of his mouth it would explode' (The Guardian, August 19/05). This is merely a colorful way of saying that what Dershowitz really is is a venomous American lawyer. Dershowitz responded in a similar vein.

"But beneath the vitriol lie some vital issues, namely Israel, Palestine, human rights in the Middle East, anti-semitism, academic freedom and intellectual honesty. Not to mention the scope for discussing these subjects in the United States, Israel's greatest ally, where the parameters for debate are relatively narrow compared with the rest of the western world" (The Guardian, August 19/05).

According to the Guardian reporter, when Dershowitz initially found that Finkelstein's *The Holocaust Industry* was to be published he bent every effort to persuade the publisher not to do so, including ongoing telephone calls and hints that court actions might be taken against the book. When the manuscript of the later book, *Beyond Chutzpah*, was being considered for publication by the University of California Press, Dershowitz lobbied Arnold Schwarzeneger, an old acquaintance of his and then governor of the state, to have the U of California press not handle it. He even arranged for a prominent California law firm to write
stern letters to the University's Board of Regents and the press's 19 member faculty review committee. They did publish the book however.

"Dershowitz denounces the UC Press as 'very hard-left' and 'very anti-Zionist.' No other university press would publish garbage like this," Dershowitz, who received the William O. Douglas First Amendment award from the Jewish advocacy group the (Anti)Defamation League, says "he never wanted to curb Finkelstein's freedom of speech. '"I want to see his book published' he says. 'I want to see it demolished in the marketplace of ideas. I just want the false personal charges taken out" (Guardian, August 19/05).

The high decibel venom peddling and legal threats continued.

**Steven Spielberg, Schindler's List and Hollywood**

Steven Spielberg was born in the early 1950s and grew up in an observant Orthodox Jewish family in the American Southwest. He allegedly always had visions of himself as a film maker and steeped himself in the mechanisms of the genre early in life. He traipsed off to Hollywood in his twenties where, surprisingly, he did work his way up to become a film director by the late 1970s. His films are all rather juvenile, dealing with the tribulations of a grotesque but appealing space alien stranded on earth (*E.T.*), the ravages of a man-eating shark (*Jaws*) and the endless expectant arrival of space aliens (*Encounters of the Third Kind*), who never do anything or even reveal themselves. After two hours of endless build up they make their anti-climactic entrance and departure. He also produced *Jurassic Park*, a tale of what happens to a perfectly 'normal' American family when trapped inside a game park which has discovered a technique whereby they have reconstituted living Tyrannosaurus* for public delectation. (One winds up rooting for the dinosaurs to polish off all the actors.)

Spielberg is also responsible for the 'Indiana Jones' film trilogy, a clearly racist series which pits an all-American hero against a world-wide assortment of unAmerican terrorists, neo-Nazis and other vicious degenerates. Movies whose childishness is matched only by their odious sentiments, Spielberg's *Raiders of the Lost Ark*, *The Temple of Doom*, and *Indiana Jones and the Last Crusade* are both hackneyed and given to vicious Hollywood stereotypes. Bloodthirsty but easily defeated Latin American drug lords in Colombia, lascivious, treacherous but cowardly middle-eastern sheiks and fat and slovenly German soldiers and their demonic officers.

In the final Indiana Jones movie Ford is paired with Sean Connery, as his father. They make their way though a castle filled with leering and sneering Nazis on the Austrian border in a race for the Holy Grail (Menachem Begin's chamber pot?). They waltz through a book burning rally in Berlin in 1938 and to a middle-eastern desert where Ford overtakes a German tank while on horseback. It's true that all these films are aimed at the kiddie market but it says something about what Spielberg wants them to see and learn.

By the early 1990s the Holocaust revival industry had become a full-blown concern in America, and Spielberg decided to do a Hollywood film about the Holocaust, in particular the role of one man, Oskar Schindler, a minor German industrialist, and his list of Jews who he preserves from the extermination camps through employing them to work in his munitions factory.

In Poland, the main locale of the events, the already rebuilt Auschwitz concentration camp, was spruced up for the stream of 'Holocaust experiencing' Jewish visitors which soon began to arrive from America. Boys and girls from the wealthier suburbs in Canada and America arrive to be suitably outraged and
aggrieved. They take 'first hand experiences' of the Holocaust to their fellow students back home. Their teachers are usually eager to encourage this 'sharing of information which has been overlooked for too long.' Etc. etc. Movie theatres are filled with repeat viewers of Schindler's List and finally it is shown on television broadcasts throughout North America.

The Globe and Mail of April 24/93 reports that the World Jewish Congress is outraged that Spielberg intends to use the reconstructed Auschwitz camp as a locale for his scenes. It is virtual blasphemy. So Spielberg filmed his Polish scenes in a disused lime quarry some 50 miles from Auschwitz, where he builds his prison huts, etc. "But Schindler survivor Nusia Horowitz [a Polish Jew] isn't convinced. She has recently been quoted in the Polish press as criticizing the script as 'superficial and not reflecting the tragedy or the situation at the time.'"

Schindler's List was released in the fall of 1993 and nominated for the Oscar prize the same year. It is shot in black and white, and techniques are used to give the film a documentary 'feel'. It opens with a camera shot of two SS officers in a burned out ghetto, who when accosted by an elderly Jew, simply turn and shoot him without batting an eyelash. That opening shot sets the tone of the film throughout. Simply mindless murderers killing an entire people without a feeling or thought. There is plenty of room in this two hour film to funnel in highlights of American world war 2 demonology.

Schindler's List immediately becomes a runaway success. North American newspapers from the Brooklyn Eagle to the San Francisco Chronicle are filled with praise; so too are the leading journals of the day. Some university somewhere may even have given courses about the background of the film. Jewish organizations picked up the beat and demanded the introduction of Holocaust Studies classes in high schools throughout the land. And in many cases got them.

The Vancouver Sun of April 14/94 runs an article entitled 'Spielberg movie turns Krakow into an eerie tourist attraction.' It notes that one Stu Feiler, a Chicago travel journalist writing about Eastern Europe has put together an eleven day tour of 'Schindler's Poland'. "This is a tour with guts and a lot of soul... We are giving people a deeper, real life version of what the movie Schindler's List was all about." He is booked and ready to go. The tour includes visits to the reconstructed Auschwitz-Birkenau concentration camps and other anti-Semitic locales in Poland (Vancouver Sun, June 16/94).

A host of new Holocaust survivors appear in Canada and the US and get interviews in the local press telling their tales of death and survival. However in California a class of high school students taken to see Schindler's List are tossed out of the theatre because of their joking manner. School programs include a follow-up of juvenile discussions about intolerance, racism and the Holocaust (Vancouver Sun, January 25 and 27 94).

In 1997 NBC broadcasts the first television screening of Schindler's List. A Vancouver Sun reporter, one Peter Birnie, gives a glowing yet outraged report of the theme. He tells us that presenting the film to a child requires some explanation.

"It isn't enough to explain that, like the kindly child molester, anti-Semites often hide behind the sweetest of words and the nicest of demeanors and that the result of their deranged efforts today is an air of vague disbelief about what happened. You could lay out the facts, that Nazi Germany and its allies systematically killed millions of Jews as well as many of the members of a dozen other minorities, and that the nation was well into perfecting its death camps long
before it provoked the more generalized slaughter of the Second World war." Yes, and they were filled by anti-war Germans, not Jews.

Anyone who disbelieves one iota of Spielberg's Hollywood film is an anti-Semitic Holocaust denier. This seems to be the kind of simple-minded sentiment which Spielberg wanted to resurrect.

*An Empire of Their Own. How the Jews Invented Hollywood*

The above is a title of a book written in 1988 by one Neal Gabler, a Jewish film critic living in California. It is both thoughtful and revealing. Gabler notes that it is quite true that for some 40 years, from the beginning of the 1920s till the end of the 1950s, Hollywood films were mainly produced by Jewish-owned and directed film companies. Metro Goldwyn Meyer, Warner Brothers, Columbia Pictures, Universal Pictures, Paramount Pictures, Fox Films and other more transitory operations were all owned by first generation East European Jews. Such a comment, made by a non-Jew, would immediately be charged as being anti-Semitic, and with a comment that there was nothing particularly Jewish about their films. Allegedly the films were no more uniform than what one might expect from any combination of film makers.

Gabler disputes this, holding that what all (or at least most of) these Jewish film makers created an Andy Hardy-like mythology of what America was like, what they wanted it to be like. Their films contained no Blacks, no Asians, no Mexican Americans and their caricatures of immigrants were drawn from borscht belt comedy routines. These films contained no sex or nudity, other than a little demure leg show. They didn't cast Jews in central roles but treated them, when they did, as simply other Americans with a slightly different religion, which they felt themselves to have become. Certainly the films contained no rampaging rabbis or Jewish Defense League-like thugs. In these movies the hero almost invariably gets his girl and they presumably live happily ever after. Good Americanism triumphs over evil and corruption, usually after a brief interlude of suspense. Those who die are always secondary characters and indistinguishable members of the cast. There is nothing fundamentally wrong or exploitative about the American system (even in the depths of the depression). Immigrants are normally boobs from a backward world who are entranced by American freedoms. The accepted shibboleths about doing things are always the best in the end.

Most Jewish studio owners started out as poor East European emigres who came to the US in the late 19th century. They typically worked at a wide array of undertakings when young, always looking for a new way to make money, and were not committed to any industry and certainly to no art form of any kind. They were all very poorly educated (few went farther than public school) although they were quick when it came of making deals and taking chances.

Many of them started out by running Nickelodeons after 1905, expanding these into chains of such movie theatres, then into film distribution and finally into film production around circa world war 1. They typically had contempt for any intellectual or any political views, or anyone with specialist knowledge. Their main and often only question was 'Can it make money'?

Until at least the 1940s they played down their own and their actors Jewish backgrounds. They rarely introduced Jewish characters into their films. When they did they were saccharine stereotype figures. There were no Jewish gangsters, no Jewish racists, no Jewish bankers or industrialists, no Jewish radicals, and normally few Jewish workers.

If they knew anything of how American government actually worked, of exploitation, of open racism or ethnic chauvinism, these aspects of American life
were almost universally swept under the rug in the small-town America imagery
their simple minded movies portrayed. Their vision was of a totally uniform
Anglo-America with virtually no Blacks shown and with European immigrants
normally used as humorous sidekicks.

This was only slightly modified by a few of the movies produced during the
mid to later 1930s, which generally took a very passing notice of the depression,
if at all. In many movie studios, such as the largest, MGM, no heed was taken of
anything which was troubling America outside the movie lot. MGM's philosophy,
and that of most of the others, was to produce a dream America - which, allegedly
their audiences wanted to see, to feel better about their conditions. Black and
white villains versus heros, where the hero always wins in the end.

There were no labor strikes and no political confrontations in these movies,
nor would you know that the great majority of Americans spent most of their
waking lives at work (or out of work during the depression). Death and old age
did not normally trouble the main members of movie casts and any sexually
active woman was scheduled to die off as the victim of a plot. Everyone supported
the American Way of Life and it was only the unfathomably evil, stock figures all,
who did not. Why they did not was never asked.

Some historical overviews of this period of movie making and its influence on
America have held that the Jewish owners and directors were reflecting back
what they believed they knew about America - which wasn't much. They loaded
their movie tales with many stock scenes and plots from Jewish popular theatre.
Americans and other viewers of Hollywood films were faced with an overwhelming
repetition of such films, and came to accept them as the proper way of telling
stories and presenting plots.

This continued until the 1950's, when a gleichshaltung of the American mind
through the cold war crusade set additional limits on what could been produced
and what seen. The movie theatres were flooded with musicals with Doris Day and
technicolor spectacles with Rock Hudson and Charleton Heston.

That was the tiresome malarkey which Hollywood peddled to the American
public for 40 years and more. That a handful of American heroes were winning
wars and righting wrongs around the world. Trouble anywhere? Just send in John
Wayne.

Gabler tells us that the great majority of these movie-making Jewish moguls
came of undistinguished, Jewish immigrant families. In a review of Gabler's book,
Christopher Lehmann-Haupt, a sometimes snotty commentator on high culture for
the New York Times, says the following: "...the quintessence of what we mean by
'America' was founded and for some 30 years (?) operated by East European Jews
who themselves seemed to be anything but the quintessence of America. Above
all things, these moguls 'wanted to be regarded as American, not Jews; they
wanted to reinvent themselves here as new men.' And in doing so the Hollywood
Jews created a powerful cluster of images and ideas - so powerful that, in a sense,
they colonized the American imagination." In other words, they created and
successfully pedaled Hollywood Schlock.

Writing of Louis Mayer, the early founder of the Metro Goldwyn Mayer studio,
Gabler says "In the end, it was this world that he was trying to protect from the
leftists, freethinkers, cynics, and realists who were already destroying it."

Actually, no one was destroying that world - it had never existed.

Gabler also notes that none of these Hollywood moguls had the least interest in
opposing fascism before America's entry into world war 2, after which they
rapidly turned to churning out the anti-Hun stereotypes. Says Lehmann-Haupt,
Gabler's book "...arrives at the not exactly original conclusion that while the Jewish executives were cowardly, expedient, arrogant, stupid and reactionary in response to the Communist witch hunts after world war II, 'they were also in the grip of a deep and legitimate fear. The fear that somehow the delicate rapprochement they had established between themselves and this country would be destroyed and with it their lives.'"

This smacks of saying that they were what they were because of their fear of looming anti-Semitism. Nevertheless, Gabler's is a richly documented and thought-provoking commentary on Hollywood and those who ran it for so long.

Anne Frank - Again

Anne Frank is certainly the most recognizable Jewish victim of the Nazis to have her story written and told. The Frank family was originally from Germany but fled to Holland in the early 1930s. In 1942, about two years after the German occupation of Holland, they entered an apartment built above an active storehouse being operated by a Dutch benefactor and lived there secretly, along with another couple, for another two years. In August of 1944 their hideout was discovered by a Dutch informant, who carried the information to the police and the family was seized and deported to a concentration camp. There Anne and her mother and sister died shortly before the end of the war in May 1945. Only the father survived.

The father, Otto Frank, survived to return to their old hideout some years later where, rather amazingly, he discovered the diary kept by his daughter. It had been left by those who had searched the locale. Despite his shock he showed this manuscript around to various publishers but they thought that with their best will, it was too fragmentary and mundane to do as a book. The father then approached a US novelist and screenwriter, one Meyer Levin, who had written two left-wing novels during the 1930s but had since become a reborn Jew and supporter of Israel. Levin agreed to take on the diary and rewrote a nd reordered considerable portions of it. Finally it was ready for a publisher and went to a Dutch press in the late 1940s; it became a best seller overnight and was translated and published in English in 1953. Endless reprints and editions were run off by numerous presses, in English and in many translations.

Apart from the inherent drama of the case, her reworked diary did not strike me as especially perspicacious. Anne was the daughter of a successful businessman who was not especially Jewish and who had no understanding of what others had lived through prior to their own flight. It is not particularly insightful even for a 14-year old.

In the course of the book's runaway success, Levin asked that his original straight fee for rewriting the text be amended so that he could garner some of the royalties being earned. Mr. Frank contested this and in the course of an embittered court hearing, held in the United States of America during the early 1950s, Levin at one point claimed that he had largely written the account from simple diary notations. He offered proofs from his copy of the original diary compared with the final versions as they appeared in the book, The Diary of Anne Frank. These are not speculations but facts documented in the verbatim trial transcripts. However, Mr. Levin's case did not find favor in the court and he was dismissed without gaining anything - except a bad name for bringing a cloud of questions to a book which was already then becoming Holy.

The father devoted the remaining 35 years of his life to disseminating the Diary and establishing a remembrance for his daughter. By 1987 some 15 million copies
had been sold in more than 50 different languages. \cite{New York Times, April 21/87}

It might be noted that the Diary ends a few days before the family is apprehended by the police and there are no scenes of being transported 'in cattle cars' to filthy, crowded and murderous death camps. It ends on a calm fall afternoon in Amsterdam. Anne Frank died three months before the end of the war in Bergen-Belsen concentration camp. She was fifteen years old.

The film version of the Diary, produced at the end of the 1950's, turned it into a Hollywood tear-jerker. It earned money but diminished rather than illuminated the story. It was cast as a typical Hollywood family drama of the period and is best forgotten. Later, made into assorted plays, her story was repeated in endless theatrical venues, memorials and high school performances around America and the world. At one point Mordecai Richler, a prominent Jewish-Canadian novelist, attended one such performance and was sickened by the hoakum presented. At a moment of high drama when the factory beneath where the Frank's are housed is being searched by the Nazi police, he shouted out over the audience, 'She's in the attic' to the stage Nazi. This outraged many Jewish theatre goers. By then, Anne Frank's life had become a vehicle for adulatory tears.

Alright. So far, so good. There had been an Anne Frank and she had lived approximately as the account claims; she had died, along with hundreds of thousands of others, under conditions which were not portrayed but could be imagined. Anne Frank probably died from a combination of severe malnutrition and infection by one of the communicable diseases which were prevalent in concentration and Prisoner of War camps. Is it really necessary to demand anything more, should we require any greater realism from such an account, however doctored up it is? I don't know but I don't think so. If the events were not true in her particular case they were approximately true for others. But for some time arguments raged back and forth as to the authenticity of this record.

After the book's international success a number of Dutch school buildings and special study centers dealing with the Holocaust were named after her. But some twenty or so years after the original discovery Anne Frank's diary her reputation was beginning to wind down. That was when an American Holocaust memorial organization began investing funds into 'restoring' the Frank's hideout to the condition in which it was described in Anne's book. That sounds a little fishy. At that time (in the mid 1970s) a wandering researcher just happened to find, tucked away in a corner, undiscovered over the many years, a second volume of Anne Frank's diary. Well fancy that, what luck!

This was conveyed to American publishers who snapped it up but it did not have the same success as the original volume. Possibly because all those who were carping about it being a transparent fabrication had had their effect. This book was soon followed-up with yet another volume entitled Anne Frank, Letters to Americans, a series of letters which Anne Frank allegedly penned to imaginary American readers of the time. These were drawn from papers found with the second diary. That was finally too much of a good thing and many American readers finally had had enough. It didn't sell except to the fully committed, and required recurrent statements as to its genuine authenticity. Some years after their publication the second diary and the 'American letters' were withdrawn and rarely referred to again.

By the late 1980s Anne Frank was beginning to sink back into the limbo which awaits us all. She was remembered in any kind of detail only by those professionally committed to preserving her memory.
In April 1987 Mr. and Mrs. Gies, the couple who had hid the Frank's from the Nazis, were given an award by the (anti)Defamation League of the B'nai B'rith. *(New York Times, April 23/87)* That spring Miep Gies published her own book entitled *Anne Frank Remembered. The story of the woman who helped to hide the Frank family.* It is instructive about neither the Frank family nor the general conditions which prevailed.

On June 9, 1988 the *Globe and Mail* reports that the Dutch government has revealed that forensic tests have finally 'established' Anne Frank's diary to be authentic. One David Barnouw, of the Netherlands State Institute and the co-editor of the latest version of the Frank diary said there were three versions of it, her original draft, a second more polished rendering and the final version which was "complied by her father" and which is the basis of the published 'Diary'. There is no mention of the rewriting done by Meyer Levin, whose role in its publication seems to have been completely dismissed.

All three versions of the diary, along with explanatory notes, appear in the most recent edition of Anne Frank's diary. This has been published to answer the charges of heretics around the world who hold that the diary is a forgery.

On July 22, 1988 the *New York Times* notes the existence of a letter written by Anne Frank to a pen pal in Iowa in 1940. It is in flawless English. The recipient, a Betty Wagner, said she had written to Anne after the end of the war but received a reply from her father saying that she had died during it. The letter is to be auctioned off in New York. It was purchased by an unidentified buyer for $165,000 US and is to be donated to the Simon Wiesenthal Center, Hollywood. *(New York Times, October 27/88)* It is to be exhibited in the Beit HaShoah Museum then being constructed in Los Angeles. Miss Wagner says she intends to contribute the bulk of the sum to Wayfarer Ministries, which ships books to missionaries abroad. Wonderful.

There was another burst of 'remembrance.' activity as CBS launched a novelized mini-series on the life and times of Anne Frank in the late 1980s. *(New York Times, April 15/88)* The *Times* reported that an 800 piece traveling photo exhibit of Anne Frank is making the rounds of the major North American cities in mid 1989. Many of the photos deal with current demons whom the exhibitors claim would restart the Holocaust if given half a chance. By this time Otto Frank is dead.

This last exhibit was backed up by an hour-long television documentary of Anne Frank's last months turned out by a Dutch production company which triggered a raft of new touring theatre performances of the play. *(Globe and Mail, June 12/89; New York Times, November 16/89)* By this time high schools around North America were providing compulsory Holocaust revival courses for their impressionable pupils, converting world war 2 into a morality tale about the suffering of the Jews and the unspeakable brutishness of the Nazis.

It is now a heinous act to question any part of Anne Frank's story or that book's authenticity.
The Catholic Church and Anti-Semitism

The Catholic church remains by far the largest of the Christian denominations in the world. Hostility between Jews and the church stemmed partly from the church’s role in the Spanish inquisition and its involvement in the forced conversion or expulsion of the Jewish population of Spain in the late 1400s. For the last 500 years, and particularly since the French Revolution of 1790, that church had been one of the most reactionary institutions in the Christian world. Throughout the 19th century its policy was a total rejection of popular participation in government, of the forces of science in particular and of modern knowledge in general. It was a determinedly traditionalist force which after the Russian revolution, especially with the rise of European fascism, maintained a policy of cooperation with the forces of the ultra right in Europe and elsewhere. Under Pope Pius XII the church extended its support to Mussolini, Franco, the clerical fascist regimes of central Europe and to a degree even toward the Nazis. In occupied France the Catholic church played a central role in the home-grown Petain regime which existed during world war 2.

Jews were hardly the only ones who suffered under such regimes. In Croatia, for instance, some 500,000 Orthodox Serbs were allegedly murdered by the Croatian Ustachi under the benevolent gaze of the Catholic church. Despite the heroism of some of its priests the church did not make any sustained effort to 'save Jews' (or any one else) from the Nazis and their allies.

Its hundreds of millions of followers were encouraged everywhere to oppose whatever left wing forces existed. The church sustained its reactionary social policies - from opposition to birth control, opposition toward labour unions, opposition to public schools, and opposition to modern science wherever it held sway. None of that is really debatable.

After the reign of Pope Pius XII (1939-1958) there ensued a brief interlude when comparatively progressive Popes occupied the throne of St. Peter. The position then fell into the hands of Cardinal Woitilla/Pope John Paul II, who soon proved himself to be a Polish reactionary. John Woitilla had been born in 1920 into a Polish middle class family in the vicinity of the ancient city of Cracow. He was an actor for a few years during the late 1930s but he enrolled in training to become a member of the Catholic clergy in 1940. In that way he escaped any serious consequences during world war 2. He became a priest during the late 1940s, gradually rising to the status of archbishop and then to a cardinal under the Communist regime in Poland. At the beginning of the 1980s he was selected by a conclave of cardinals in Rome to become the next Pope, probably because of his anti-Communist credentials. He renamed himself John Paul II and lasted for 24 years.

The responses of Jewish activists toward that Pope and his church indicates their readiness to take on the head of the most durable organization in the Western world. Needless to say, some of them were soon proclaiming the Pope and his church to be anti-semitic. This allegedly applied in spades to the Polish church and its leaders. Such charges came to a head during the mid to late 1980s when they were flying fast and furiously. The following account is not so much about the failings within the Catholic church as about those who attempted to systematically malign it for their own propaganda purposes.

What was wrong with Pope John Paul II? The Jewish charges against him were *not* that he was a reactionary but that he didn’t support Israel and Jewish claims sufficiently. The church did not recognize Israel diplomatically and the Pope made supportive comments about the Palestinians, especially after the Beirut
massacres. Moreover, he did not ostracize Kurt Waldheim after he had been 'tried and convicted' in the court of public/media opinion during the mid to late 1980s. Furthermore, he did not abase himself or the church sufficiently about that organization's anti-semitic acts in the past. He did not recognize Jews as the most sinned against people on earth with special rights to act as they pleased. Although these charges were not spelled out they comprise, in outline, most of the charges against John Paul II and his church.

However, before the full panoply of charges could be mobilized against the Pope he was the victim of an assassination attempt. On May 13, 1981 a crazed, right-wing, Turkish gunman shot him twice as he toured a Roman plaza. It was touch and go but he survived. The Italian secret police immediately manufactured a plot involving two Bulgarian diplomats stationed in Rome who were said to have hired the Turkish assassin. These claims turned out to be transparently ludicrous. Even the CIA didn't believe that story, although it got a lot of play in the American rightist press. Finally, after five years of investigation, these charges had to be dropped because the gunman turned out to be quite insane and the so-called 'evidence' had made a laughing stock of the Italian police. The Pope emerged from these events not only as a world paladin of anti-communism but as a martyr and saint.

After a brief interval the Jewish charges against John Paul II started up again.

**Pope John Paul II and Charges of Anti-Semitism**

The *Vancouver Sun* of September 13/82 reports that 'Vatican rips 'Nazi' insult by Israel'. It tells us that "The Vatican issued an angry reply today to an Israeli accusation that the Roman Catholic Church kept silent about the massacre of Jews in Europe during the Second world war... The Israeli charge was made by a senior official in Jerusalem on Sunday who was commenting on the scheduled meeting between the Pope and Palestinian Liberation Organization leader Yasser Arafat. Israel says the meeting set for Wednesday at the Vatican is a grave development and officials of the Jewish state said they will try to prevent it."

A senior Israeli official, who was not identified, said 'The same church that did not say a word about the massacre of Jews for six years in Europe and did not say much about the killing of Christians in Lebanon for seven years, is ready to meet the man who perpetrated the crime in Lebanon and is bent on the destruction of Israel, which is the completion of the work done by the Nazis in Germany."

This was a charge made particularly against Pope Pius XII, who had held the office during world war 2, but was now directed at Pope John Paul II, who was charged with being a collaborator of those who planned a 'new Holocaust.'

On September 14/85 the *Globe and Mail* reports that 'Israel's top rabbis slam Pope.' It tells of an outraged telegram sent by the Chief Ashkenazi and Sephardic rabbis of Israel to Pope John Paul protesting his upcoming meeting with Yasser Arafat. They said that "....the meeting would profane God's name by giving moral acknowledgement to a terrorist whose hands are drenched with Jewish and Lebanese Christian blood." Israeli newspapers gave prominence to the telegram, which papered over the bloody massacres and pogroms committed by Israel in Lebanon just a few years previously.

The following Saturday the Pope/Arafat meeting occurs and the *Globe and Mail* letters-to-the-editor page is filled with letters condemning the Pope for his meeting with an alleged 'anti-Semitic terrorist'. (As an aside, one may note that Arabic is a Semitic language and that Arabs are at least as much Semites as are the Jews, but without the genetic admixture of 1,800 years spent in European lands.)
John Paul II nevertheless planned to visit Israel. One rabbi, Marc Tannenbaum, the international affairs director of the American Jewish Committee, said he hoped that the visit would lead to the Vatican's diplomatic recognition of Israel but that at present Israelis were of two minds about his policies. "We are wondering: Who is the real Pope John Paul? Where does he really stand toward Jews and Judaism?" (New York Times, March 20/86)

On April 14, 1986, the New York Times reports the full text of a homily delivered by the Pope in a Rome synagogue; it fills an entire page. In it the Pope says of the Jews that "You are our elder brothers" and that "Jews are the beloved of God." He also raises the issue of Jewish genocide and his abhorrence of it. He admits that the church had made certain errors in its relations with Jews in the past. The Pope ends with the proposition that Jews and Judaism are not extrinsic to Christianity but part of it. He then ends with a psalm in Hebrew.

Jewish leaders in Italy hold out hope that this may be the beginning of a new relationship between the church and world Jewry, a relationship of mutual respect. But others dredged up snippets of history from the distant past - such as the fact that a Pope in 1555 had enforced a ghetto on Rome's Jews, causing untold misery, a condition which had only ended 115 years previously. (New York Times, April 14/86)

On November 7, 1986, the New York Times reports that "The head of a major American Jewish organization asked Pope John Paul II today to visit Jerusalem and lead a day of prayer against terrorism. Nathan Perlmutter, national director of the (Anti-) Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, made the appeal during a papal audience for participants in a Catholic-Jewish theological seminar held here [Rome] today."

"Despite the religious focus of the meeting a prominent topic of discussion was the Vatican's refusal to establish diplomatic relations with Israel. Another point of controversy was an accusation, by some Jewish scholars, that liberation theology, an important school of Catholic thought in Latin America, was tainted with anti-Semitism and anti-Zionism."

As well as being unAmerican and anti-capitalist.

"While endorsing the link between religion and the search for social justice, which is the core of liberation theology, several of the Jews in the meeting sharply criticized its attitude toward Judaism and Israel. Rabbi Pinchas Peli of Ben-Gurion University in Israel said that some proponents of liberation theology fail to see Zionism as 'the actual liberation movement of the Jewish people, and often identify themselves with those elements out to destroy Israel'."

The Pope also castigated liberation theology for its proposition of class struggle as a way to achieve social justice.

The Case of Cardinal-Archbishop John O'Connor

During this period of shmoozing between the Pope and those Jews ready to settle for his apologies about the church's past mistreatment of Jews, a tempest in a teapot blew up in America. In mid 1986 the very Archbishop John O'Connor of New York urged that a sovereign Palestinian homeland be established from the occupied territories. He bent over backwards to support the legitimate demands of Israel for peace and security and trotted out the claims made by the Holocaust revivalists. However he stressed the appalling conditions of Palestinian refugees in their own land. (New York Times, June 19/86) He was about to visit Israel but the Vatican warned that he was not to meet with any Israeli officials formally since
this might imply recognition of that state. The Israeli government replied that its
officials would not meet with him at all unless they were met officially.

Archbishop O'Connor, who was also a Cardinal of that church, then visited
Amman, Jordan. Sympathetic observers noted that he had simply been caught up
in a tangle of Vatican politics. "At this stage, however, it has become a question of
pride for Israeli officials, and it is highly unlikely that any of them would meet the
Cardinal on such terms. The Israeli public would not be sympathetic to such a
compromise" (New York Times, December 29/86). Shimon Perez and Yitzak
Shamir, by now virtually indistinguishable in Israeli politics, had invited
O'Connor to meet with them a year previously.

Seymour Reich, president of B'nai B'rith International, and rabbi Alexander
Schindler, president of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, said that
the Cardinal's "visit had been 'tainted by Vatican politics' and urged him not to
visit Israel unless he could formally meet with its leaders" (New York Times,
December 30/86).

However, on January 4/87 O'Connor did meet with the then current President
of Israel at his official mansion in Jerusalem. This meeting had not been cleared
with the Vatican. "The deadlock was broken Saturday night in a compromise that
some Israeli reporters described as Talmudic and one priest close to the Cardinal
described as ingenious," The Vatican described O'Connor's visit as a courtesy
which in no way implied recognition of the state of Israel, noting previous
occasions when Popes had met with Israeli leaders. O'Connor was treated to a
lengthy lecture by Israeli President Chaim Herzog about the history and place of
Israel in the world.

As a consequence for his stand, which mainly supported Israel, O'Connor was
severely criticized by leading Jewish organizations in the US. "The statement by
the major Jewish organizations emphasized three issues - the status of Jerusalem,
the plight of Palestinian refugees and his response to the Nazi Holocaust - and
said that the Cardinal's comments left them 'disquieted and distressed'." As
usual.

Cardinal O'Connor replied by wrapping himself in the American flag and saying
that he had been a US navy chaplain for 27 years, that he had marched in the
recent New York parades to 'Save Soviet Jewry', that he had always denounced the
unAmerican and unChristian acts of the Nazis. and had written a personal letter
to President Reagan the previous year urging him not to attend a wreath-laying
ceremony at the Bitburg cemetery. Moreover he had always been careful of the
sensitivities of Jews. All this groveling did not deflect the charge of insufficient
philo-Semitism.

An opinion piece in the New York Times of January 9/86 by one Harlan
Wechsler, president of the Manhattan region of the Rabbinical Assembly
(Conservative) and rabbi of a Park Avenue Synagogue, tells readers the following:
"...the Cardinal's persistent statements of sympathy for the Palestinian
refugees strike us as odd at best and counterproductive at worst. They are odd
not because these refugees do not deserve decent treatment - of course they do -
but because the Cardinal's comments reflect and reinforce the distorted notion
that displaced Arabs are where they are because some bad Israelis have put them
there,"

"No one should forget that the presence of Arab refugees is a direct
consequence of Arab attacks on Israel, first in 1948 and then, to a lesser extent in
1967. Nobody asked the Arabs to attack."

What can one say to such an utter fabrication of the historical facts.
Some prominent Jewish leaders do, however, support Cardinal O'Connor's stand of deepening the ties between the Catholic church and Israel. They blame the Pope or the Vatican curia for all the troubles which have ensued.

On January 12/86 the New York Times letters-to-the-editor page is filled with letters about the Church's 'Schizophrenia about Jews', being unable to decide whether to pursue its age old anti-semitic polices or to follow the precepts of the 'Vatican II' decisions which curtailed such attitudes. There are also the usual claims about the host countries refusing to integrate Palestinian refugees into their populations and thereby creating the 'refugee' problem, which they utilize in their claims against Israel. There is as well the usual demands that the Vatican recognize its role in helping to perpetrate the greatest crime against humanity ever recorded - the Jewish holocaust.

O'Connor later falls afoul of major Jewish organizations in the US over his rather lukewarm support of the Palestinian people and their rights to their own state. When he dies, some years later, his funeral is boycotted by a number of Jewish leaders in New York.

John Paul II Again

In the fall of 1986 the Pope has remembered the presence of The Devil in the world and sets about warning his flock of his wiles. He is so clever that he has convinced many men to deny his existence. Possession of humans by evil spirits is also a real problem. The Pope later said that "he wanted to prepare followers for the end of the world as promised in the Bible. "The Pope said he wanted to 'clarify' the true faith of the church against those who pervert it by exaggerating the importance of the devil or by denying or minimizing his malevolent power. The devil is still in the world, 'tempting men to evil ... to turn them away from the law of God." "He invoked biblical images that portray the devil as an unclean spirit, tempter, evil one, anti-Christ, lion, dragon or serpent" (Globe and Mail, October 25, Oct 29/86). No one suggested that prolonged psychiatric care was called for.

To return to Pope John Paul II and his relations with Israel and the Zionists.

On May 1, 1987, during a four day pilgrimage to Germany the Pope condemned Adolf Hitler and his 'death machinery' but defended the conduct of the Roman Catholic church and the Vatican during that era. He did not mention what role Pope Pius XII played during that period. He also beatified a Catholic nun who had been Jewish and who had perished during the 2nd world war. (Globe and Mail, May 1/87)

On June 26, 1987 the American Jewish Congress places a full page ad in the New York Times addressed to Pope John Paul II. It sternly takes him to task for planning to receive Austria's president, Kurt Waldheim, after a world-wide campaign had been mobilized to demonize him. Waldheim, against whom no criminal acts have ever been proven despite intensive investigations, is portrayed as an Adolf Eichman shipping Jewish children off to the crematoria. That campaign turned out to be one of the most wide-spread and well orchestrated ones recently witnessed.

"Is it possible, Your Holiness, that in Waldheim's forgetfulness there is an echo, however distant, of the Church's forgetfulness as well? Has Your Holiness dealt with the indifference of the Catholic churches in Europe to the fate of the Jews during World War 2? Not a word on the subject has been uttered in any of your Papal visits to various European countries and to the Death Camps. Despite the extraordinary heroism of so many individual Catholics, isn't it true that, along
with so much of the rest of the world, the official churches were largely silent and abandoned the Jews in their agony?" (*New York Times*, June 26/87)

Evident here is a combination of the chauvinistic moralizing along with the contemporary view that the 40+ million Europeans who died in the conflict - the great majority of them as innocent as the Jews - do not really count.

On June 25/87 the *Globe and Mail* reports a small number of Jewish protesters arrived in Rome to denounce the visit of Kurt Waldheim with the Pope. "Rabbi Avi Weiss of Riverdale, NY led the protestors at the Vatican in reading Jewish prayers and singing songs in Hebrew. Wearing prayer shawls over replica black and white pinstriped concentration camps shirts and yellow Stars of David, they slowly walked up the steps of St. Peter's Basilica."

From June to August of 1987 the Simon Wiesenthal Center (Hollywood) is busy bombarding the Pope with full page ads calling for the Vatican's recognition of Israel. In part its ads say, "For 20 centuries the Church has isolated the Jewish people. Through pogroms and persecution it extended its hand more often to the perpetrators than to the victims. It was too long in coming before Pope John Paul II reached out across the abyss with the comforting words, 'I am Joseph, your Brother.'"

"But today these words ring hollow, not only because of the trumpets that heralded the arrival of Kurt Waldheim to the Vatican, but even more so because of the deep silence signifying refusal to bear witness to the ultimate sign of Jewish renewal, the creation of the democratic State of Israel."

There then followed assorted demands that the Pope recognize Israel. (*New York Times*, August 31.87)

This followed an earlier ad by the Simon Wiesenthal Center which reminded President Reagan that when he sits down to discuss world matters with the Soviet Union's Gorbachev, he must first ask him to divulge the whereabouts of Raoul Wallenberg, the Swedish diplomat who single handedly saved a hundred thousand Jews but who was incarcerated in a Soviet prison in 1945.

It is difficult to find anyone who tops this organization in denunciatory fantasy.

At an August 31/87 meeting between top American Jewish leaders and senior representatives of the Catholic church in Rome, some differences between the two are raised. The Jewish leaders include Henry Siegman, the executive director of the American Jewish Congress, Rabbi Henry Waxman, president of the International Jewish Committee for Inter-religious Consultations, Rabbi Alexander Schindler, president of the American Hebrew Congregations of America, and Marc Tannenbaum, director of international relations of the American Jewish Committee. Also included are Gerhart Rieger, co-chair of the World Jewish Congress, Rabbi Gilbert Klaperman, president of the Synagogue Council of America, Geoffrey Wigoder, of the Israel Interfaith Committee, and Rabbi Leon Klenicki, director of Interfaith Affairs of the (Anti-) Defamation League of B'nai B'rith. There are also nine prominent officials of the Catholic church present.

The Jewish participants charged the Pope with holding Jews responsible for the death of Jesus and that the reception of Kurt Waldheim had been "the capstone of revisionist tendencies' in the Roman Catholic Church that 'minimize or obscures' Jewish martyrdom. This includes the erection or rebuilding of Catholic churches and convents near one time Nazi concentration camps. One Seymour Reich, president of B'nai B'rith International, said that the Vatican's failure to extend full diplomatic recognition of Israel 'is perceived by Jews as a refusal by
the Catholic church to acknowledge the essence of their identity’ (New York Times, September 1/87).

They are laying down the policies which they demand the church take. But the Roman Catholic church is not the American Congress. That meeting was scheduled a week before the Pope's intended visit to the US, and the church probably hoped to deflect some of the charges which the Jewish leaders have made against the church and its leaders.

The following day the Pope himself meets with this cabal, an event covered by an almost two full page account in the New York Times (September 2/87). Pope John Paul doesn't admit to any of the charges made by the Jewish representatives and seemingly no shift in position occurs on either side. However the Pope tells them that a study of church documents relating to the Holocaust and of the nature of anti-Semitism in the 1,800 page history of the church is under way and when competed will be published. This meets with the Pope's interrogators' satisfaction. "It is one of the rare instances in which John Paul has agreed to meet with people he knew would criticize him", says the New York Times. Having overplayed their hand the previous day most of the Jewish delegation are ready to heal whatever breaches have occurred.

On reflection, it is somewhat puzzling that a reactionary Pope and a set of reactionary Jews do not get on better - they both loath communism and socialism, they both despise working class struggles and any form of social liberation, they both support right-wing dictators around the world. I suppose it is partly a struggle over who will have moral-propaganda dominance in the United States.

On September 11/87 the Pope holds a special meeting with a group of Jewish leaders of Jewish American organizations in Miami. It was an exchange which was marked by "impressive candor", as the New York Times characterizes it. No new ground is broken and the Pope defended the role of Pope Pius XII during world war 2 and noted that the Palestinian people have a right to a homeland.

Rabbi Mordecai Waxman, president of the Synagogue Council of America, delivered the formal reply. Waxman referred to the Second Vatican Council of 1965 which opened up a dialogue with the Jews and raised the recent reception of Kurt Waldheim by the current Pope, which raised such burning indignation among Jews around the world. It almost seemed to them that the church had reconciled itself with Nazis. He also noted the alleged rise of anti-Semitism in some parts of the world and hoped that the Pope would continue to monitor the schools and parishes under the direction of the church as to their commitment to oppose anti-Semitism. The rabbi once again underlined the unparalleled suffering which the Jewish people experienced in the Holocaust and hoped that its lessons would be taught in all schools. He noted that many Jews in the Soviet Union were beginning to recover their Jewish heritage and learn that the covenant between God and the Jewish people is 'irrevocable'. Right.

He also mentions the lessons of the 'Shoah' must be understood by every nation. He cited the 'religious refugees among the Jews from the Soviet Union, and stressed their inherent right to emigrate from any country in which they do not feel themselves welcome. Finally, he noted the inherent right of Jews to a homeland of their own, the land of Israel. "For the Jewish people who live in the State of Israel and who preserve in that land such precious testimonies to their history and their faith, we must ask for the desired security and the due tranquility that is the prerogative of every nation and condition of life and progress for every society." This, of course, does not apply for the Palestinian people. (New York Times, September 12/87)
Like so many Jewish spokespersons, Waxman sounded like he was reading a list of conditions in the capitulation of states to a triumphant Israel.

On September 26/87 the New York Times Op Ed page is graced by a long missive from Edgar Bronfman, the former Canadian billionaire booze baron, born-again Zionist, and president of the World Jewish Congress. He was the man who manufactured, launched and sustained the campaign against Kurt Waldheim. His piece is entitled 'Once Again, the Pope Has Disappointed Jews'. It partakes of the view that all organizations must be fundamentally concerned with whether their views and actions are acceptable to Jews or not.

Bronfman quarreled with the Pope’s recent beatification of one Sister Theresa Benedicta, who was a Jewish convert to Catholicism and who died in a concentration camp during world war 2. Bronfman writes "There is a wide perception among Jews that the beatification was an attempt to universalize the Holocaust and becloud the issue of the Church's responsibility for it." He then goes on to tackle the Pope on a number of other topics, one being the alleged rise of anti-semitism in Austria and the Pope's meeting with Kurt Waldheim.

The next Catholic spokesperson to fall under anathema was Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger, another conservative who became Pope in 2005. He was alleged to have said the 'Judaism finds its fulfillment in Christianity.' On top of that he was German!

Ratzinger, was the head of the Vatican's Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, and was said to have considerable influence with the Pope. Rabbi Marc Tannenbaum, director of Interfaith relations for the American Jewish Congress, held that with Ratzinger's view there was no possibility of having a dialogue. Various Catholic officials in America held that Cardinal Ratzinger's comments had been misquoted and misrepresented. But Rabbi Mordecai Waxman, who had recently delivered a joint understanding of Jewish leaders to the Pope in Miami, said that he would seek further clarification from the Pope. "Ratzinger is a man of considerable authority", he said. "We want something more from Rome to clarify this." "Several Jewish leaders said that if the remarks were accurately quoted, the interview could signal a setback in 20 years of Catholic-Jewish cooperation" (New York Times, November 18/87).

On December 18/87 the New York Times publishes a letter-to-the-editor by Raul Flacks, Vice president of the Zionist Organization of America. It notes that Christian-Jewish dialogue in the US has previously been carried out between the American Jewish Congress and specific Christian groups. While this was acceptable in the past it is now time to include specifically Zionist groups in this dialogue. "I agree the dialogue must not be used for proselytization. But if discussions relative to Zionism are perceived as a threat to the dialogue then the dialogue between Jews and Christians will have no further relevancy." 'Fine', one might say.

The Globe and Mail of October 10/88, carries a report entitled the 'Pope denounces anti-Semitism, racism and moral decline'. At a rally of 40,000 in Strasbourg, France, he says "In Europe, a Christian continent, the sense of morality is weakening. The very word 'commandment' is often rejected. In the name of liberty, the rules are rejected, the moral teaching of the church is ignored." Encouraging words, but unfortunately I don't believe it.

On May 30/89 the Globe and Mail reports that Canada's Roman Catholic bishops have accused Israel of repression and violence against Palestinians in the occupied territories and have urged Ottawa to become more involved in the Middle East. "The statement from the Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops
brought an immediate protest yesterday from the Canadian Jewish Congress, the
largest organization representing Canadian Jewry. The C.J.C., which has worked
closely with the bishops on other issues, accused the Christian groups of bias and
said the Vatican's failure to recognize Israel 'colors' any statements by the Roman
Catholic Church on the Arab-Israel conflict."

Referring to the Palestinian people, "Archbishop James Hayes, president of the
conference, said yesterday that 'Arbitrary arrests, detention without trial, destruction
of homes, the wounding and killing of hundreds of persons, often the
young, have been added to the difficult living conditions which have lasted over
numerous years.'... He called for an end in the armed conflict and a change of
attitudes on the part of all parties, especially of the Israeli government" (Globe
and Mail, May 30/89).

On June 14/89 the Globe and Mail is filled with letters to the editor accusing
the Catholic Church of hypocrisy and anti-Semitism, noting that it had received
Kurt Waldheim, had not protested the massacre of Palestinians by Christians in
Beirut [with Israeli facilitation], had remained silent during the Iran-Iraq war and
had not raised its voice about genocide during world war 2. "When the Catholic
Church stood by silently and allowed the slaughter of the Jews of Europe in the
1930s and 1940s, it lost all rights to pass judgement on the actions of Jews and
the State of Israel" (Globe and Mail, June 17/89). Indeed, because of the Holocaust
no one can pass judgement on Jews ever, for anything.

A week previously the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church (USA) had
adopted a resolution calling on Israel to end its 20 year occupation of the West
Bank and Gaza. "The resolution said that Israel has ruled the territories with a
repressive policy. It also asked the United States to end aid to subsidized Israeli
settlements in the two territories" (New York Times, June 13/88).

On December 7/89 a letter-to-the-editor of the Globe and Mail, one Bert
Raphel, then president of something called the Jewish Civil Rights Educational
Foundation of Canada, continues to belabor the Pope. In part he writes "As an
affront to world Jewry, the Pope visited and greeted Austrian President Kurt
Waldheim notwithstanding the overwhelming aura of suspicion [manufactured]
surrounding his wartime activities. He then kissed and embraced Palestine
Liberation Organization leader Yasser Arafat and now he announces the
establishment of diplomatic ties with the epitome of atheism and religious
persecution, the Soviet Union. Neither he nor his predecessors have seen fit to
recognize the existence of the State of Israel, a tiny island of democracy in the
midst of a sea of totalitarian regimes and religious oppression. ... The Vatican
stands accused of closed-mindedness, discrimination and bias when it comes to
the Jewish people." Is that the sort of thing the Jewish Civil Rights Educational
Foundation teaches?

The Vancouver Sun of June 15/91 reports that the Pope's remarks on abortion
made in Poland recently have 'deeply outraged Jews'. "Jewish leaders in Germany
and France reacted with outrage after the Pope said killings of the unborn ranked
alongside the genocide of the 20th century, including Hitler's onslaught against
Jews in which six million died"... "The criticism may puzzle John Paul who
passionately believes the estimated 600,000 abortions carried out annually in
Poland are a monstrous evil and an inexcusable offence against God's
commandment against killing. "He also thundered against the presence of the
devil in the world, against 'free love' and against assorted 'debaucheries' -
whatever that may mean.
It is time to cut away from events in the Vatican and the denunciations of the Pope and the church by assorted Jewish organizations.

**Poland, Auschwitz and Cardinal Glemp**

On February 1987 the *New York Times* reports that 'A Convent at Auschwitz Will Be Closed'. This convent had housed a dozen Carmelite nuns for the previous three years but has garnered the condemnation of the European Jewish Congress and, allegedly, Jews around the world. "Many Jewish groups in Western Europe insisted that the convent be closed to preserve Auschwitz as a monument to the mass killings of Jews. But Catholic groups, like the Aid to the Church in Distress in West Germany, have solicited money to renovate the convent. They argued that the Carmelite sisters were praying and doing penance for people of all faiths who died there." Quite a few hundreds of thousands of non-Jews also died at Auschwitz. The camp was leveled before being seized by the Soviet army near the end of world war 2 and was largely rebuilt by the Polish government.

On June 27/87 the *Vancouver Sun* runs a story on Auschwitz originally in the *Los Angeles Times*. The reporter summarizes the emerging conflict between Jews and Catholics over the presence of a small Catholic nunnery at the outer edge of Auschwitz is beginning to boil over. "In an impassioned statement to Catholic officials at the Geneva meeting, Ady Stein, a French Jewish leader, said 'Do not try to drain the meaning out of the symbol that is Auschwitz by placing crosses there'."

"Jerzy Turowicz, editor of the Polish Catholic newspaper 'Tygodnik Powszechny', wrote at the height of the controversy that Auschwitz was both the monument of Jewish destruction and a symbol of martyrdom of the Polish people in the Second world war. 'We do not draw a parallel between the destruction of the Jews and the fate of the Poles during the war, but do these two symbols really have to divide our two nations; could they not bring them closer together, unite us?' Apparently not.

The British right-wing Zionist historian Martin Gilbert, holds that 2 million Jews and 2 millions Poles died at Auschwitz although other serious studies claim that the Jewish toll there was about a million dead. In either case, a great many. The Polish government's official guide book to Auschwitz lumps Jews and Poles together as the main victims of that camp. "Jewish anger is prompted by the fear that the official Polish line obscures the reality of what happened to the Jews of Europe" (*Vancouver Sun*, June 27/87).

In early March of 1988 the Polish United Workers party (Communist party) admitted there had been a wave of anti-Semitism throughout Poland under the reign of Wladyslaw Gomulka, twenty years previously, during which 13,000 to 20,000 Jews left the country. Mr. Gomulka (then a hero in the west) had charged that there was a 'Zionist fifth column' in Poland and purged Jews from many leading positions. The current Communist party denounced all such acts. Jerzy Urban, a government spokesperson, said that "anti-Semitism no longer exist in public life and that such attitudes are practically nonexistent among younger people" (*Globe and Mail*, March 13/88).

The *Globe and Mail* of July 15/89 runs and article entitled 'US Jewish protesters attacked in Auschwitz.' It relates a tale of a handful of Polish workers at the Carmelite nunnery near the site of Auschwitz who allegedly attacked and beat up seven Jews, including Rabbi Avraham Weiss of the Hebrew Institute of Riverdale, New York. Polish policemen allegedly stood by while the workers punched and kicked the seven US protestors.
What was involved was that the protestors had attempted to storm the convent and were doused with buckets of water and later had their placards torn from them by five Polish workers. The Poles shouted "Leave the souls of our holy martyrs in peace". Rabbi Weiss shouted "Polish Nazis, get your hands off me... America sees this and the world is watching us." Jews claim Auschwitz as an exclusively Jewish memorial site.

A couple of days later "... Rabbi Weiss returned to the convent with four supporters dressed in concentration camp uniforms while the Rabbi shouted "Get out of Auschwitz. The blood of our brothers and sisters cries out for justice." The Globe and Mail writes that an estimated 4 million persons died at Auschwitz, some 2.5 million of who were Jews."[Figures vary wildly by source.] "Rabbi Weiss said his group would protest to Polish Primate Jozef Glemp, march on the Sjem, or lower house, today and return to the convent with more supporters on the weekend. Several dozen Jewish tourists from Canada joined the protest from outside the gates yesterday" (Globe and Mail, July 17/89).

Maybe the solution would be to move Auschwitz and its sacred earth to Israel, where all the buildings and gas chambers could be reconstructed for the pilgrimage trade.

On July 26/89 the Globe and Mail reports that there is a large demonstration of about 100 Jewish students from Western Europe at the gates of the Carmelite convent. A Polish bystander shouts "They are praying for the people who died here ... They are praying for everyone." The protesters signs read 'Carmelites leave Auschwitz' and 'Today's prayers cannot atone for the silence of the past'."

"On July 18, a delegation of American Jews from the Simon Wiesenthal Center in Los Angeles, led by Rabbi Marvin Hier, traveled to Rome to present a letter to the Vatican Secretary of State, Agustine Cardinal Casaroli, saying the dispute 'continues to erode relations between our faith communities. Rabbi Hier, who demanded that Pope John Paul II intervene to force the convent's removal, later said Vatican officials had urged patience, arguing that the matter was in the hands of local Polish church officials" (New York Times , July 27/89).

The (anti-)Defamation League of the B’nai B’rith, feeling it is being left out of this propaganda opportunity, becomes angered by comments made by the Pope during one of his homilies. The Pope spoke about alleged prophetic allusions 'to the coming of Jesus and how by his sacrifice he had carried God's atonement for all the evil's in the world'. Or something like that. Implying, to some, that earlier religions such as Judaism saw their fulfillment in the message of Jesus.

Two rabbis who were members of the (anti) Defamation League, one David Rosen and another Leon Klenicki, fired off an angry letter to representatives at the Vatican. It said "Anyone reading these words may fairly conclude from them that God’s covenant with the Jewish people is superseded by the Christian covenant as the only everlasting covenant" (Globe and Mail, August 14/89). Who the hell cares.

**The case of Cardinal Jozef Glemp**

Cardinal Jozef Glemp was born in 1931, the son of a Polish farmer who initially had worked as a miner. He had entered a seminary at the beginning of the 1950s and was ordained as a priest in 1956. He became a personal secretary to a Polish Cardinal, on whose death he was himself named a Cardinal in 1981 by Pope John Paul II. Glemp proved himself to be an arch-conservative, opposing an alleged moral laxity among younger Poles who had stayed so far from the church teaching that some actually used birth control devices.
In an account entitled 'Poland's Primate Criticizes Jews in Dispute on Auschwitz Convent' the New York Times August 29/89 reports that "Asserting bitterly that national sovereignty and the 'feelings of the Poles' are under attack, Poland's Roman Catholic Primate has accused Jews of fomenting anti-Polish feeling by objecting to a convent at the site of the Auschwitz death camp. The remarks prompted not only objections from Jewish organizations but also a critical front page editorial today in [Poland's] Solidarity newspaper."

His charges were directed at the latest group of Jewish demonstrators who had entered the convent in protest to their presence. The comments by Cardinal Glemp were the most bitter so far in the conflict. "Addressing Jews, Cardinal Glemp said 'Your power lies in the mass media that are easily at your disposal in many countries. Let them not spread anti-Polish feeling.' ... Cardinal Glemp said Christians had their 'failings toward the Jews but '...do not talk with us from the position of a people raised above all others, and do not dictate conditions that are impossible to fulfill.'"

A number of Polish archbishops backed up Cardinal Glemp on the matter. Others noted that the Carmelite sisters were praying for all those who had died at Auschwitz, which included hundreds of thousands of Poles. The Jewish Committee on Inter-Religious Consultations said they will ask the Pope to intervene.

William Pfaff, writing in the Vancouver Sun of August 28/89, tells us, "A former grand rabbi of France, Rene Samuel Sirat, recently wrote: 'No one in the world has the right to transform into a place of prayer this place where the most appalling idolatry was practised, by man proclaiming the death of God and striving to make himself divine by reducing other human creatures to the condition of objects, non-persons. Such prayers risk becoming, according to the biblical expression, 'an abomination'. Auschwitz must absolutely become a place to absolute silent, non-prayer, non-testimony, evidence of a paroxysm and havoc.' I suppose that means that Jews claim extra-territorial rights to the place.

By August 30, 1989 the New York Times notes that there is a storm of professional indignation and outrage issuing from Jewish groups around the world. "Kalman Sultanik, a vice president of the World Jewish Congress, called Poland's charge d'affaires in Washington yesterday and demanded that he forward a request to Polish President Wojciech Jaruzelski and Prime Minister Tadeusz Mazowiecki that they disavow the remarks as anti-Semitic. Mr. Sultanik said Cardinal Glemp's comments were 'grotesque and hate-filled' and added that they 'reveal an ugly vein of anti-Semitism [that] runs through the Polish church'"(New York Times, August 30/89). All this venom triggered over a convent with 11 sisters, built beyond the edge of a rebuilt Auschwitz.

Another comment in the same issue of the Times says "In an interview yesterday, Elie Wiesel, the author and Nobel laureate, said Cardinal Glemp's language 'encourages and justifies anti-Semitism. Words such as these have in the past provoked violence and led to pogroms.' Mr. Wiesel called on the Pope to break the deadlock. 'Tell the nuns to go and pray, but pray elsewhere', he said."

The chief rabbi of Poland, one Menachem Joskowicz, says that he will not attend the ceremonial marking beginning of world war 2 in Poland because of the convent at Auschwitz. "I personally will not participate in the joint prayers', said the rabbi. 'When I go to Auschwitz I cannot pray because I am disturbed by a cross and the Carmelite convent there '" (New York Times, September 1/89).

The New York Times (September 1/89) carries a half-page opinion piece by one Abraham Brumberg, a writer on Polish affairs. He notes that "There are, of course, plenty of people in Poland who will have no truck with anti-Semitic
demagogy. Nevertheless, the primate's words will again revive the image of Poland as the country of classic, unregenerate anti-Semitism - and this at a time when the Polish Government is desperately in need of Western aid and good will."

He notes that "The Church’s main concern has been to wrest territorial concessions - in the shape of new churches - from the regime and to disseminate doctrinal orthodoxy to its flock. The latter has included campaigns against abortions and divorce..." "The Cardinal's admiration of Poland’s pre-war chauvinistic and anti-Semitic National Democratic Party, his rancorous complaints that Solidarity was infiltrated by 'Trotskyites' (an unmistakable code word for 'Jews') and similar denunciations elicited from groups of intellectuals - but not from Solidarity proper."

Brumberg ends with the proposition that 'elementary morality' demands that Solidarity break with the Polish church and proceed separately to rebuild Polish democracy.

On September 4/89 Cardinal Glemp repeats his views about the scandal involved in requiring the Carmelites to move their nunnery to an 'Inter-religious Faith Center' yet to be established. The Archbishop of Crakow backs him up (New York Times, September 4/89). But three French Cardinals, who signed a pact guaranteeing the removal of the nunnery in 1987, tell Glemp that their promises must be honored. "They said that if the Jewish delegation led by Theo Klein, then president of the European Jewish Congress, was not competent to negotiate the pact, 'then who would be?' (New York Times, September 4/89)."

In a letter-to-the-editor in the Globe and Mail, September 8/89, Rose Ehrenworth of Toronto writes that "It is clear that Poland and the Catholic Church have learned nothing from the Holocaust. Poland was rife with anti-Semitism before the war when it had three million Jews and its ideology has not changed now that there are only 5,000 Jews."

"The agreement entered into by Jewish leaders and their Catholic counterparts must be honored. Auschwitz must remain an eternal memorial to the depths of depravity human beings are capable of."

A New York Times article of September 5/89, notes that Rabbi Avraham Weiss, who had led the assault on the Carmelite nunnery the previous month, intended to sue Cardinal Glemp for defamation when Glemp comes to America to visit Polish parishioners there." Alan M. Dershowitz, who is representing Rabbi Weiss, said by telephone that they would seek to present Cardinal Glemp with papers 'as soon as he leaves his plane' on arrival in the United States..."

In a long letter-to-the-editor in the Globe and Mail of September 9/89, one Larry Shapiro ends a diatribe against the Polish church and Cardinal Glemp with the following, "If Cardinal Glemp is not disciplined by the Vatican for his statements, how sincere should we consider the Vatican's repudiation of anti-Semitism."

On September 20/89 the Globe and Mail reports that senior officials at the Vatican back the plan to remove the nunnery from the proximity of Auschwitz. Elan Steinberg, executive director of the World Jewish Congress (recently run by Edgar Bronfman), hailed the Vatican decision. "We welcome this as a significant step in helping to restore the church's good word." Cardinal Glemp is thoroughly unsatisfied by the decision.

On February 27/90, the Polish government re-established diplomatic relations with Israel after a hiatus of 22 years. With Lech Walesa and the Polish nationalists in power in Poland it was only a matter of time before they dredged up the Katyn forest massacre (New York Times, April 2/90).
On September 12/97 the *Vancouver Sun* reports that the Vatican has refused to open its archives to Jewish researchers pursuing the claim that the church aided the escape of anti-Jewish war criminals after the end of World War 2. Simon Samuels, the European director of the Simon Wiesenthal Center in Paris, had broached the matter with Pope John Paul recently but had no response.

A Vatican secretary of the Committee on Relations with Judaism said the request was 'out of the question'. "Samuels said he was 'very taken aback. It is a serious omission to address 2,000 years of history, including the Crucifixion and medieval times, if [this] burning question is not touched... Unless there is transparency in this respect, the Pope's desire to wipe the Roman Catholic slate clean with Judaism will lose all credibility. We are going to take the matter further."

The Simon Wiesenthal Center claimed the Vatican had set up 22 committees after the war to help spirit Nazis and their collaborators out of Europe with Red Cross passports. It said that a network of European monasteries had been used to harbor war criminals waiting to go abroad. It sounds like a Hollywood movie script.

On March 15/98 the Catholic church releases a 14 page declaration, ten years in the making, apologizing for the failure of Christians to do enough to save the Jews during the Holocaust, but specifically exempting any failure on the part of Pope Pius XII in this regard. "The Pope must publish a clear statement on his behalf that would condemn unequivocally the silence of the Christian world and those who headed it during the Holocaust", said Rabbi Israel Meir, Israel's chief rabbi and a Holocaust survivor. Efraim Zuroff, head of the Israel office of the Nazi-hunting Simon Wiesenthal Centre, said 'the statement is far less than what was hoped for.'

Once one starts down the road of apologies they are never ending; this lot always expands its demands.

"Last month the Vatican issued its controversial document on the Holocaust, called *We Remember, a Reflection on the Shoah*. The document was an apology for individual Roman Catholics who failed to help Jews persecuted by the Nazis. But it fell far short of satisfying some Jewish leaders" ( *Vancouver Sun*, April 11/98).

On June 5/98 the *Globe and Mail* reports the US State Department has re-released old charges it had to the effect that the Vatican had helped smuggle 'Nazi leaders' out of Europe to South America after the end of World War 2. During the recent civil war in Yugoslavia the Ustachi forces had reemerged and had participated in the massacre and wholesale deportation of almost a million Serbs from Croatia. Neither the Catholic church nor Jewish spokespersons had much to say about this.

The *Vancouver Sun* of August 29/98 reports statements by Jewish leaders who "insist that the church must go further in bearing its share of responsibility for Adolph Hitler's war against the Jews ... The church apology, they say, minimizes the role of anti-Jewish Christian teachings that, at the time, promoted secular anti-Semitism. It also exaggerates the number of Christians who assisted persecuted Jews, they claim."

I will leave the account of Pope John Paul II, Cardinal Glemp, the Polish church and anti-Semitism here. We may note that the Carmelite nunnery near Auschwitz was shut down by the Pope's order and its residents moved elsewhere on May 25/93 ( *Globe and Mail*, May 26/93).
On July 3/1999 Marvin Hier, 'dean' of the US Simon Wiesenthal Center, said that its researchers had discovered a leather-bound letter in the US Archives in which Pius XII held that it was not fitting to reestablish Jews in Palestine simply because they had lived there 1,900 years previously. However given the vast number of archival forgers about and the nature of the Simon Wiesenthal Center, I would require a careful check by reputable outside sources on the validity of any document from that Center before accepting it as genuine.

Switzerland, Jewish Gold and Nazi Loot

Switzerland has a three hundred plus year history of neutrality in the conflicts going on around it. This also held during World War 2, when it served as a listening post and a silent partner in deals made by various forces engaged in that struggle. It had even allowed a modest number of refugees to enter the country before the conflict broke out in earnest. Switzerland had done quite well out of World War 2, when it served as an entrepot for a number of wartime materials banned for trade with Germany. It also served as the repository for the funds of various well heeled Europeans. It was later claimed that it also had been the repository of Nazi funds funneled out of Germany, taken from gold and valuable artwork stolen from Jewish owners.

For thirty and more years after the end of World War 2 Switzerland had the reputation of a small, conservative but fundamentally democratic society which had remained free when all those around it were falling prey to fascism. It specialized in costly resorts, spectacular mountain scenery, banking overseas funds and an industry based upon highly skilled crafts. It did not permit many non-Swiss to become citizens of that country.

Throughout the 1970s and the early 1980s Switzerland was still in the good books of international Jewish organizations. This may have been because it had looked the other way when the plans for a Mirage II fighter aircraft being produced in Switzerland were secretly copied and conveyed to Israel, becoming the basis for its own military aircraft industry. Although the Swiss businessman who had facilitated this transfer was apprehended, all the Israelis involved got away. The tale of this illegal transfer was long retold in the Israeli press. France was outraged by the loss of the still secret technological features of this aircraft.

Switzerland fell into Israel's and international Jewish bad books in the 1990s, over what the burgeoning Holocaust revivalists termed its 'past collaboration with the Nazis.' A sea of charges were made against Switzerland - in particular that it had taken the funds deposited by Jews who had died in the Holocaust and sunk them into their banks' holdings. It was never asked how so many Jews had the funds to invest in Swiss banks, at the end of a decade long depression. Such funds were quickly multiplied with fervid fantasy into billions of current dollars. Jewish publicists demanded investigations of old bank records, by those they trusted, to reveal how much was owed to former Jewish clients or their survivors. The Swiss were aghast at seeing their previous status as members of a neutral and democratic state collapse.

This campaign goes back to the late 1980s but we will pick up the story in mid 1996. In July of that year Britain decided to auction off about 5 million dollars worth of goods it had taken from vaults in Austria at the end of World War 2 and to donate the proceeds to Holocaust survivors. These items were part of a formerly larger collection which had been stored for more than 40 years in a monastery in Austria. Meanwhile, British Foreign Secretary Malcolm Rifkind agreed to open an inquiry into allegations that the Allies and Swiss government
struck a deal in 1946 to divide up Nazi booty, including several hundreds of million dollars worth of gold probably stolen from Holocaust victims and deposited in Swiss banks. The stolen gold was said in an Allied document to be worth at least 300 million. This figure grew astronomically over time.

On November 13, 1996, the Vancouver Sun reports 'Nazi victims' Swiss assets found.' It tells of a Swiss ombudsman who discovered $1.3 million in undisclosed assets of 11 clients, including three Jews, who are believed to have perished in the Holocaust. "The discovery of the lost assets was the first time Swiss banks have admitted they may been sitting on more money in dormant accounts than previously claimed. After a thorough search the Swiss banks have discovered some $32 million in abandoned deposits made before and during world war 2. These amounts paled in comparison to the $7 billion dollars in hidden funds estimated by the World Jewish Congress. Hanspeter Haeni, a Swiss banker hired by a consortium of some 400 Swiss banks to investigate the claims, noted that only $9,000 of the $1.3 million of discovered funds had belonged to Jewish account holders. "The World Jewish Congress called his findings 'pathetic fabrication'."

In order to appease critics, the Swiss banks agreed to sponsor another commission headed by former US Federal Reserve (Bank) head Paul Volcker and two international auditing firms to scrutinize the Swiss files.

On January 14/97 the Vancouver Sun runs another piece in its weekend opinion section by one Rabbi Abraham Cooper, an editor for the Simon Wiesenthal Center in Hollywood. Cooper paints a picture of Nazi Germany running on the gold it stole from occupied countries and seized from Jews bound for the gas chambers [?]. He holds that Switzerland continued to accept gold from Germany until the end of 1944. In early 1945 the United States blocked all transfer of funds to Swiss accounts unless the question of Nazi-held gold in Switzerland was resolved; whereupon Switzerland agreed to part with some $50 million dollars worth of holdings in its accounts and the American government waived further claims in the matter.

Rabbi Cooper claims that the Swiss banks, after the end of world war 2, raised such stringent requirements for proving that former depositors were Jews who had died and that the claimants to their accounts were entitled to receive them, that few of the deposits were ever paid out. The Rabbi then presents a list of stipulations which the Swiss banks must follow if they are to be relieved of the charge that they stole the deposits of Holocaust victims. These stipulations include that a group of 'historians' be appointed, with a full staff, to review and report on all Swiss government and banking activity during the relevant period. And also to convene a "Truth Commission" which can grant full immunity to all people who come forward to "openly and candidly discuss the issue of Swiss financial involvement with Germany from 1933 through 1945." It reads like an order from an occupying power - which the Simon Wiesenthal Center apparently thinks it is.

The Wiesenthal center had then filed a class action lawsuit against all Swiss banks on behalf of Holocaust victims and their heirs in the United States, Canada and Great Britain. Cooper noted that of the $330 million dollars in gold available for distribution at the end of world war 2, some still remains in American and British vaults, some $25 million was utilized for displaced persons, while "The victims families and survivors were left out in the cold", said the Rabbi.

On January 8, 1997, Swiss authorities promise that the Swiss banks will provide a fund of $343 million dollars as a 'goodwill gesture' to repay any Jews
who may have lost money in Swiss banks during and after World War 2. The Swiss government also said that it would thoroughly investigate allegations that Switzerland laundered billions of dollars in funds which the Nazis had looted throughout Europe. Jewish groups were not satisfied.

Avraham Burg, head of Israel's Jewish Agency, said "They are trying to buy us with money that is not theirs." Swiss president Jean Pascal-Delamuraz had recently portrayed Jewish demands for compensation as 'blackmail'. "Leaders from the Jewish Agency and World Jewish Congress have threatened boycotts and class action suits against Swiss banks unless the government disowns Delamuraz' statement." "It will be almost impossible for us to sit together around the same table with people who did not deny, who did not reject, who did not oppose the president calling me a blackmailer', Burg said after meeting with the Swiss ambassador to Israel to protest Delamuraz comments." However, the blackmail is just beginning.

Jewish groups are by now claiming some $10 billion in assets held in Swiss banks belong to Jews killed during World War 2 (Vancouver Sun, January 8/97). Ten thousand million deposited by European Jews during the depression era.

On February 6/97 a 'historians commission' with nine members has been set up to investigate the scope of Switzerland's wartime relationship with Nazi Germany. The three largest banks in Switzerland have contributed the first 71 million dollars to a fund for the restoration of Jewish funds lost during and after World War 2. Edgar Bronfman, then the head of the World Jewish Congress, which had initiated the charges against Switzerland, says he is satisfied with the results so far, holding however that the 70 million dollar must be seen as only the initial repayment to Holocaust survivors (Vancouver Sun, February 6/97).

Bronfman, the inheritor of his father's booze empire, has expanded his assets into holdings worth well over a billion by then. He now lives in New York and is an American citizen. He was elected to head the then senescent World Jewish Congress in 1981, which he has turned into one of the leading Jewish witch-hunting organizations in North America. In 1995 he determined to apply his money making skills into the pursuit of 'Jewish gold' hidden in Swiss banks.

"In September 1995 Bronfman confronted the [Swiss] banks' directors, who offered to settle with a $40 million compensation package. He was outraged. Since then he has demanded that the banks uncover all records of the Jewish accounts and pay back the money."

"The US Congress remained a lead player, and finally persuaded Switzerland to lift its historic banking secrecy laws to begin investigation of the lost assets... He [Bronfman] has not been deflected, however. Like Wiesenthal, Bronfman has never allowed niceties and diplomacy to obscure his goal. Of Switzerland he bluntly maintains 'They acted as the agent of the Third Reich'.

At the same time, Jews in the US were lobbying for the US government to pressure Switzerland to surrender to Jewish demands. In New York state, governor George Pataki, a right-wing Republican, said he is sending that state's head bank inspector to Switzerland to investigate those banks' past holdings. They have been ordered to surrender all their records dealing with the transactions of the American branches for the years 1939-1945 (Vancouver Sun, February 8/97). The Vancouver Sun reports that of 800 cases of long untouched Swiss deposits, only three had belonged to Jewish families.

On March 6/97 the Vancouver Sun reports that the Swiss government is planning to deposit over a billion dollars in a special fund to help compensate victims of the Nazi Holocaust and to repay funds of those who had had money in
Swiss banks. The Swiss National Bank offered to donate $97 million to a separate fund to provide short term help for Holocaust survivors. Many Swiss have come to hold that they are being unfairly milked of government funds to pay those who have made unjustified charges against Swiss banks. (They probably are all anti-Semites.)

"Switzerland has been under increasing pressure from the World Jewish Congress and its political allies in New York and Washington to atone for both its wartime dealing with Nazi Germany and the resistance of private banks to helping relatives gain access to bank accounts and other assets belonging to Holocaust victims." "... this proposal could further deepen a rift in Swiss society, particularly between younger people who believe their country played an ambiguous, if not collaborationist, role toward Nazi Germany and older Swiss who see outside pressure for atonement as a Jewish conspiracy. 'The Federal [Swiss] Council has lost its head', said Christoph Blocher, a leading right winger. 'These are public assets, not just any money.'

On May 6/97 the Vancouver Sun reports that a 200 page study done for Stuart Eisenstat, then the under secretary of the US Department of Commerce, strongly rebukes five neutral countries for their dealings with the Nazis during world war 2. These include Sweden, Switzerland, Spain, Turkey and Argentina. And it blames the Allied nations for not requiring the complete return of all funds lost by victims during that war. "Singling out Switzerland, the report notes that 'Swiss actions after the war are the least understandable'. It claims that of the $550-700 million in German funds held by Swiss banks at the end of world war 2, only about $40 million were returned to their clients after the war." The study makes no mention of American financial transactions with Nazi Germany in the two war years before 1942.

The Vancouver Sun of May 29/97 runs an article entitled 'Swiss arms aided Nazis, historian says'. "Still reeling from charges that it helped prolong the Second world war through financial dealings with the Third Reich, Switzerland faced newly presented accusations on Wednesday that its wartime arms industry profited from - and favored - Hitler's Germany in a weapons trade worth millions of dollars." They allegedly made up a significant proportion of the Swiss foreign trade during the war years.

On July 11/97 another Vancouver Sun report from the World Jewish Congress reveals that Portugal utilized Swiss banks to launder Nazi gold during world war 2. World Jewish Congress president, Kalman Sultanik, said that "...Portugal has cooperated in tracing Nazi gold movements and an investigating commission headed by former Portuguese prime minister is making progress."

On July 25/97 the Vancouver Sun reports that Swiss banks have released the names of 1,872 individuals whose accounts have not been touched since world war 2. This list includes both Jewish names and those of possible Nazis. Rabbi Marvin Hier of the Simon Wiesenthal Center, Hollywood, says he has written to Swiss authorities to determine if those individuals listed actually were Nazis and if so that their accounts should be transferred to a fund established for Holocaust victims. The Canadian Jewish Congress is also investigating charges that the Bank of Canada may have trafficked, however unwittingly, in stolen Jewish gold. The sources for reparations claims are growing. However it is not at all certain that the "recovered" funds will actually go to Holocaust survivors or to some Jewish agency established to receive them.

A Vancouver Sun report of July 28/97 notes that hundreds of phone calls were logged against a number in Israel where a bank of operators provided
information about how to lay claims against the Swiss deposit recuperation funds. In Canada, reports suggest that the Bank of Canada knew the source of gold it purchased from Swiss banks during World War 2. Irving Abella, former president of the Canadian Jewish Congress and leading Holocaust historian is investigating the matter. (Vancouver Sun, July 29/97)

On August 16/97 the Vancouver Sun runs an article entitled 'Xenophobia, anti-Semitism are behind resistance to Swiss Fund' by one Bernard Kaplan. Kaplan tells us that Switzerland is fundamentally a conservative country. His diatribe, which so readily demeans an entire nation, revolves around one Christoph Blocher, the owner of a chain of stores and the leader of the Swiss political right. He has opposed Switzerland's entry in the European Union, and "now appears to have struck another 'chauvinistic' chord among the Swiss by accusing the government of 'buckling under' to foreigners". This indicates an appalling upsurge of anti-Semitism in Rabbi Kaplan's estimation.

There is a gap in my records but on March 11/98 a Thomas Borer, "Berne's special ambassador for Holocaust issues, said he opposed a lump sum settlement of Jewish claims against Switzerland. He "added his voice to skepticism among Swiss banks about the World Jewish Congress' proposal of a 'global solution.' World Jewish Congress president Edgar Bronfman has pushed for such a payment, in the billions of dollars, to close a range of claims that have emerged in a three year dispute over how much money is owed to Holocaust survivors and their heirs".

On June 15/98 the World Jewish Congress comes out with a provisional estimate of the value of losses sustained by Jews during World War 2, between $23 and $32 billion dollars, or the equivalent of $230 billion in current values. These break down into (a) $12 billion in gold, art works and insurance policies, (b) $10-$15 billion in lost earnings and (c) $1-$5 billion in underpayment for work in 'slave labour' camps. Germany has been making payments on such claims for decades and now there is a move afoot to recover unpaid insurance policies from German firms. Elan Steinberg, executive director of the World Jewish Congress holds that it is now time for those who collaborated with Nazi Germany to begin making their repayment to Holocaust survivors and their heirs. (Vancouver Sun, June 15/98)

On June 20, 1998 Jewish groups, headed by the World Jewish Congress, held that the offer of $600 million dollars in repayments made by the three largest banks in Switzerland is a 'paltry offer'. A Yoram Dori, head of the Israeli World Jewish Restitution Organization (set up by the W.J.C.), says that the Swiss know that such an offer was offensive to Jews. "Edgar Bronfman, president of the World Jewish Congress, said last year that Switzerland should be paying billions of dollars in restitution". The Swiss banks risk punitive sanction by various state courts in the US if they do not settle claims with the Jewish claimants - who now have that kind of power in the US.

On July 3/98 the Vancouver Sun reports that New York State, firmly under the control of Jewish lobbyists, announced its intention of escalating sanctions against Swiss banks until they come to a satisfactory agreement with Jewish claimants. They will start by barring Swiss banks from selling New York State and city bonds and two months later, if an agreement has not been reached, bar state institutions from using Swiss banks in any way.

In New Jersey, Governor Todd Williams ordered state pension funds to stop making investments through Swiss banks. The Senate of that state is considering a bill to divest itself of stock holdings in Swiss banks. The Swiss government replied,
saying that its banks have taken unparalleled measures to address past problems and that the "Sanctions endanger implementation of these measures".

On August 13/98 the Vancouver Sun reports that the two parties seem to have reached agreement, with the Swiss banks agreeing to pay out some 1.25 billion dollars in compensation for assets unreturned to Holocaust survivors and their descendants. This will bring to an end the series of class action law suits launched against Swiss banks in the US by some ten thousand Holocaust claimants, with a nominal demand for $20 billion dollars.

The following day (August 14) the Vancouver Sun runs a full page article on the topic which notes that many Swiss were apprehensive about this "Holocaust pact." "The Neue Zuericher Zeitung, the nation's most influential newspaper, said many Swiss may have a hard time digesting the accord as they have become exasperated with seeing their prosperous nation transformed into a pariah. It will be difficult to explain to Swiss citizens why one is yielding to blackmail', the newspaper said in an editorial." The funds are to be transferred to about 30,000 claimants over the course of three years. The World Jewish Congress grudgingly goes along with the deal.

On August 22/98 the Swiss central bank (the Swiss National Bank) says that it welcomes the private settlement between the two biggest commercial banks and the Holocaust claimants but that it would not contribute money to the fund. It held that would impart an 'official character' to the claims, 'which were not in the interests of the country as a whole'.

Ultimately, most of the 1.25 billion dollars were raised and passed on to Jewish claimants; these largely go to the organization spun off from the World Jewish Congress. As well, the complete audit of all Swiss bank deposits between 1933 and 1945 has cost over $500 million. Not a bad extraction rate from a country of 5 million inhabitants which was a neutral during world war 2. Now on to Sweden, Portugal and other formerly neutral states.

The Swiss Gold extraction project is dealt with at length in Norman Finkelstein's The Holocaust Industry (2000).

Nazi Stolen Art

Not being content to enslave entire nations and to murder others, the Nazis systematically stripped the countries they occupied of their irreplaceable art masterpieces - paintings mainly. When the Russians and the Allies occupied Germany they returned the favour and stripped that country of everything, from art masterpieces to furniture. In a few cases these were returned fifty years after the end of the war, but in many cases the items taken, by both sides, were simply lost or destroyed in the process.

Wealthy Jews being famous art collectors were of course one of the first to demand the return of their lost treasures. Throughout the entire post-war period there were sporadic discoveries of stolen art and sporadic new claims made. Any formerly Jewish-owned artwork discovered was usually promptly returned to their former owners while pieces formerly held by German national galleries were also finally returned - usually grudgingly.

The New York Times in a full page article on May 27/92, writes about 'Evidence Fuels Hunt for Nazi Art Trove'. This 'Art Trove' is said by researchers to be hidden in underground vaults in Weimar, in the German Democratic Republic. 'The evidence is becoming stronger and stronger' says Joachim Vogel, a representative of the Weimar city government. It is felt to be the collection of one Erich Koch, a senior Nazi governor of East Prussia who looted artwork from throughout Eastern and Central Europe and squirreled it away in Germany. It is
not known which artists might be represented in this collection but its center piece were items taken from the Amber Chamber, a room designed for King Frederick the 1st of Prussia in 1701 as a gift to the Russian Czar. When German troops captured the Catherine Palace on the outskirts of Leningrad during world war 2 they removed the 22 wall panels and shipped them back to Koenigsburg in East Prussia. When the Russians were closing in on that port near the end of the war the collection was sent to central Germany and hidden. It has not surfaced since, but the researchers have every hope to discover it in the lower vaults of Weimar."

In a Vancouver Sun report of September 21/96, we read that 'Nazi war loot stashed in Switzerland now estimated at $90 billion'. The subtitle tells us "Suspicion grows that the matter has been subjected to cover-up." Ninety billion, well fancy that.

Senator Alphonse D'Amato, the vile and venemous Senator from New York, has made such charges to the Senate banking committee. This claim was originally made by the London Jewish Chronicle which estimated the original value of the objects was 5 billion but had soared in value to over 90 billion today. Much of the property was expropriated by the Nazis from their Jewish victims who were later to die in the concentration camps. It is claimed that Jewish owned art treasures worth $30 billion dollars were seized during the war. But there is no suggestion as to where all this art may be.

Once claims of this magnitude are made, they soon mushroom into fantasy-filled figures.

On December 1/98 the Vancouver Sun reports a world-wide conference of government officials and museums from forty countries to winkle out the unreturned artwork once owned by Jews. Elan Steinberg of the World Jewish Congress said "there must be real restitution, whether to individuals or to Jewish and humanitarian groups [such as the W.J.C.] that help the survivor community, he said. ... We are going to ask that the last prisoners of war be released to the rightful claimants or heirs."

It is claimed that almost 2,000 artworks in French government custody were stolen from or sold under duress by European Jews during world war 2. Stuart Eizenstat, an American undersecretary of state and the organizer of the conference noted two paintings which had been recently displayed in the Modern Museum of Art in New York and which had been borrowed from an Austrian museum were blocked by a New York court order from being returned to Austria because of claims made against them. The lesson of that should be clear - let no one send any valuable articles to America for display lest some group uses the American legal system to get its claws on them.

The National Gallery of Canada has also uncovered about 100 works of art in its collection which may have been stolen from their original owners by the Nazis. All these items have gaps in their provenance sometime between 1933 and 1945 and it has left gallery officials wondering whether they might have been ransacked by the Germans or the Russians during the war. The National gallery has posted images of the works on its Web site so that people around the world, particularly European Jews, can peruse them. "The move is part of a growing worldwide effort in recent years by museums and other institutions to re-examine their acquisitions and return Nazi looted art to its original owners or their descendants." Or to those who can make a legally viable claim to them.

Two weeks previously the National Gallery in Washington, DC announced that two Flemish paintings on display had likely been looted by the Nazis from a
Jewish family. It has agreed to return the paintings to the family after it learned of their present location through a listing on a Web site. The previous year the Montreal Museum of Fine Art returned a 16th century painting by an Italian master to its original Hungarian owner (Globe and Mail, December 7/2000).

The Vancouver Sun of January 4/2001 reports the head of the Beaverbrook Art Gallery in Fredricton, NB saying that the Nazis who stole the art may have saved it from destruction during the war. A gallery official, Ian Lumsden, said "It's not the worst thing in the world' that some art works stolen from European Jews have ended up in galleries and museums around the world. I don't believe that people have the right to ownership of a major work of art."

His comments outraged the Canadian Jewish Congress, part of the growing global effort to return 'Nazi-looted' art to their original Jewish owners and descendants. "It was a perverse comment and I find it an incredibly unacceptable comment by anyone who would think that way, that looting, theft and murder would be a route to saving or popularizing art or putting art in the public domain, inadvertently or otherwise", said Jack Silverstone, the organization's [Canadian Jewish Congress] national executive vice-president. One wonders how these owners acquired such expensive works of art in the first place.

That is all I have on Jewish-owned gold and artwork looted by the Nazis or sold by their owners during times of trouble and now recovered.

Conrad Black and Gutting the Jerusalem Post

Conrad Black is the nefarious Canadian newspaper baron who from the 1960s until the end of the 1990s built up a newspaper empire in Canada through borrowing and buying up a great many papers. On taking over a newspaper he normally gutted it of anything but right-wing commentators and cut the costs of reporting to the bone. He became a multi-multi millionaire, launched his flagship newspaper the National Post in Toronto, extended his chain into Great Britain and ended up marrying Barbara Tuchman, a right-wing Jewish newspaper columnist. Together they went on to loot many millions from that newspaper until brought up short by various public investigations acting for the firm's stock holders. They ultimately forced Black to divest himself of control over his newspapers. Tuchman, however, went right on spewing out her right-wing Jewish chauvinism. Conrad Black is not Jewish but is rather a member of an old upper class Anglo-Ontario family.

Founded in 1932, The Jerusalem Post was a quite liberal Israeli newspaper publishing in English. Since the 1940s it investigated and held the doings of assorted Israeli governments and officials up for public scrutiny. The Post had a small but dedicated band of readers, both in Israel and abroad, as well as a dedicated and rather amazing group of reporters and editors.

On March 7, 1989 the Jerusalem Post published an article assessing Israeli prime minister Yitzhak Shamir's dealings with the Nazis in 1941. The Stern gang, of which he was a leader, asked for Nazi help in returning all the Jews under their control to Palestine while they would work to oust the British from that region. In return for Nazi aid they proposed establishing a pro-German, totalitarian state in Palestine. This fact was generally known in Israel but was not talked or written about. The Jerusalem Post reported that Shamir claimed he was in charge of 'field operations' at the time and was not part of the leadership making those proposals.

Despite its international status the Post was always in financial difficulties with no rich patrons to bail it out. For years it was on the point of closing until it was finally put up for sale and, sadly enough, bought by Conrad Black. An Israeli
newspaper was far outside his range of operations but the price was peanuts to him. He then owned some 204 newspapers and in April of 1989 paid $175 million for seventy-five percent of the Post's shares. Its 25,000 copy daily run was supplemented by its 70,000 international weekend edition, which was widely read in America. Black had developed a commitment to supporting the right in Israel, like so many of his American neo-Conservative counterparts.

Almost immediately Black installed a new publisher of the Post, a right-wing former Israeli army officer, one Lt. Colonel Yehuda Levy. "The Post, which has been highly critical of the government's handling of the Palestinian uprising, had vigorously opposed bids by potential buyers - including those of British publisher Robert Maxwell - who it felt would infringe upon its editorial freedom. Tension rose last month after Mr. Levy objected to and removed an editorial in which Mr Frenkel [the newspapers editor-in-chief] criticized Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir for accusing the Post of harming Israel's image" (Globe and Mail, December 27/89).

Two weeks later the publisher, Mr Levy, applied for membership in Israel's Editors Committee, noting that he intended to become the Post's 'responsible editor'. Mr. Frenkel said that this was a step to remove him as editor of the newspaper and on December 27, 1989, he resigned. He had held that post since 1975. A week later some 20 of the senior editors and reporters of that newspaper also resigned over the issue of "what they called the publisher's moves to turn the liberal daily into a platform for right-wing views". They had pledged to resign unless Mr. Levy was fired and Mr. Frenkel rehired.

The resignations left the paper without most of the senior editorial staff, including the managing editor, David Landau. "Only one reporter now remains in the business section... 'I'm sure we'll overcome this and the paper will be published as usual' Mr.Levy said. 'Maybe we'll be even a better paper in the future'." Three more reporters had resigned that day and another 15 to 20 might do so in the near future. Mr. Levy went on to say that "he disagreed with the staff members who had resigned but that this might be a 'corrective of certain distortions in coverage in the past few years.' He declined to elaborate."

"Many people in Israel, especially settlers living in the occupied West Bank and Gaza Strip, refuse to buy the paper because they associate it with leftist views of the Arab-Israeli conflict" (New York Times, January 3/90).

Reporting in the Vancouver Sun of January 5/90, Carol Rosenberg notes that some 28, or one third of the Post's full-time staff, had resigned by then. The new Publisher cum Editor in chief, Yehuda Levy, 54, had no newspaper experience other than a brief stint acting as a press spokesman for the Israeli army in Beirut during 1982-83. He had since toured North America as a salesman for Jewish National Fund bonds and had operated a travel agency in Jerusalem for three years. According to Rosenberg, the twenty eight members who resigned from the Post include some of the most respected names in Israeli journalism. Mr. Levy responded by giving twelve of the staff who threatened to resign 30 minutes to clear out their desks and cancelled their access to the newspaper's computers. Jerusalem Mayor Teddy Kollek and Israel's former chief Rabbi Shlomo Gornen both delivered letters of support to the staff who were fired or had resigned. But Mr. Levy averted a more general strike through a mixture of bluster and promises (Vancouver Sun, January 5/90).

On January 12/90 the New York Times reports that Mr. Levy has promised to pursue an 'independent' policy in the Post while the remaining journalists, now represented by one Greer Fay Cashman, a former left-wing journalist who has
seen the light, said 'The dispute is at an end... It is not as much as we would have liked to get but it is far better than we hoped'. Ms. Cashman vowed to fight for editorial freedom from within. Sure!

On January 13/90 the Globe and Mail publishes an account of barely suppressed anger by one Patrick Martin. He calls the former Jerusalem Post one of if not the major newspaper in the region. "...the Post has remained detached, moderate, credible. It has not hesitated to criticize government policy and to report military excesses, without sacrificing its devotion to the security of the Jewish state. Its very existence was a good example of Israel's political freedom ..." This now seems to have come to an end, Martin suggests.

David Radler, a senior executive of Hollinger Inc., the company established by Black to oversee his press holdings, said "This is not Romania .... A group of dissidents cannot simply demand that its leader be replaced. We're not playing that little game."

In a previous interview Mr. Levy complained about "'the way many major newspapers blow up events relating to Israel', citing his experience of the Sabra and Chatila massacres some years earlier. He complained that hardly forty civilians were killed there [ i.e. in the Palestinian camps] yet it was blown up into an international case." Actually, the estimated number of deaths in these two refugee camps runs close to a thousand.

"One of the publisher's latest crusades, according to disgruntled editorial staff, has been to promote the 'Jordan-is-Palestine' idea. This concept, favored by right-wing Israeli circles, holds that since Palestinians already have a home in Jordan they do not need the return of the occupied territories" (Globe and Mail, January 13/90).

A week or so later Conrad Black himself enters the fray, saying that those who charge the Post is becoming a propaganda sheet for the Israeli right are totally mistaken. (If that were true the Post would have to be different from all the other newspapers which Black owns.) As for the almost 30 senior reporters and staff who have left the Post during the previous two months, "He described them as belonging to a 'perfectly legitimate but not representative extreme left faction that wanted to kidnap the newspaper to the exclusion of other points of view" (Globe and Mail, January 22/90).

Also to be noted is a letter to the editor the following day from one Harry Rachlis. He writes that events at the Jerusalem Post were fully predictable as soon as Black obtained majority control. He ends with an extract from a recent issue of the the Wall Street Journal.

"A newspaper is a private enterprise, owing nothing to the public, which grants it no franchise. It is therefore affected with no public interest. It is emphatically the property of its owner, who is selling a manufactured product at his own risk" (Globe and Mail, January 23/90). It is perfectly true that Black is selling a 'manufactured product'.

On December 6, 1990, the Globe and Mail reported the first strike in the Jerusalem Post's 58 year history. It began when another 27 editors and reporters were to be laid off to cut costs and ending with the firing of 80 reporters and editors. This amounted to most of that newspaper's writers. "The management has come to the decision that the damage is irreversible,' said Yehuda Levy, president and publisher."

After that one heard little more of the Jerusalem Post, or of its reporters and writers. It rapidly became what Black promised it wouldn't, just another right-
wing daily supporting right-wing Israeli governments. Its original readership gradually fell away as it became the rag it is today.

Black soon moved to Great Britain and became a British subject in order to accept a peerage. After that he became involved in a knock down and drag out battle with his companies' stockholders about the way he was squandering and using his company's money for himself. He actually lost that fight and the majority control over Hollinger Inc. Most recently (2005) he has been involved in suing novelist-historian Peter Newman about a sentence in a book which touches on Black's career. His tribulations continue.

Joe Clark and the Canada-Israel Committee

Joe Clark was a Conservative party loyalist from Alberta who succeeded Robert Stanfield to the leadership of that party in the late 1970s. He was relatively young and moderately progressive when he headed a minority Conservative government at the beginning of the 1980s. It lasted only nine months before being replaced by a reelected Trudeau-led Liberal regime. A year or two after that Clark lost the leadership of the Conservative party to Brian Mulroney, who swept into power in Canada during the mid 1980s. Clark then served as Minister for External Affairs in the Mulroney government, being favorably inclined to the needs of Third World countries. He began to meet with and, to some extent, support the claims of the Palestinians to their own homeland. This is what got him into trouble with organized Canadian Jewry.

An article entitled 'Lobby group outraged as Clark attacks Israel' outlines events at a public meeting of the Canada-Israel Committee held on March 10, 1988, in Ottawa. Addressing the group Clark used words such as 'shocking' and 'unacceptable' when referring to Israeli actions during the Palestinian intifada which was then emerging. "Let me speak plainly', Mr. Clark said to the representatives of the Canada-Israel Committee, 'human rights violations, such as we have witnessed in the West Bank and Gaza in the past agonizing weeks, are totally unacceptable and in many cases are illegal under international law.'"

At this point a number of Jewish students and delegates leaped up and began to disrupt the meeting, shouting 'Walk out. walk out,' later pounding at the door of the auditorium. Many of those who remained booed and heckled Mr. Clark. This was captured on television coverage, in which one could see and hear some of the Jewish students and others going berserk. (Globe and Mail, March 11/88)

The following day Mr. Clark said that he was willing to listen to alternate evidence but that he had irrefutable proof, some of it from reliable US sources, which document attempts by Israelis to starve the Palestinians into submission. This was totally denied by the CIC.

"The CIC has condemned Mr. Clark as ill-informed, saying that he had 'treated myth as fact'. Spokesmen for the committee said yesterday that their paramount concern was the 'fundamental shift' in Canadian policy expressed by Mr. Clark when he said the Palestinian problem in Israel lay at the root of the problems in the Middle East." (Globe and Mail, March 12/88)

On March 15/88 the Vancouver Sun reports that the B'nai B'rith has lashed out at the Toronto Star newspaper whose March 12 editorial had supported Mr. Clark on the Israel-Palestine issue. One Mr. Ralph Snow, the president of B'nai B'rith Canada has converted that editorial into a charge of Jewish dual loyalties and has mobilized a Jewish world war 2 veteran "who likened the editorial of the worst sort of Nazi propaganda." "It's a hateful, invidious article that sneaks up on you
like the works of [Nazi propaganda minister ] Josef Goebbels." The author of the editorial said that it was intended to 'remind Canadians that its Government had the right to take an independent point of view from the Government of Israel." To many Jewish organizations that is an open admission of anti-Semitism.

The Globe and Mail of March 26/88 reports that "A week of fence-mending has failed to completely heal a rift between External Affairs Minister Joe Clark and members of Canada's Jewish community who are angry about his criticism of Israel."

To soothe the resentment among Jewish leaders Prime Minister Brian Mulroney sent out letters to select Jewish spokespersons assuring them of the unqualified, unending and unchanging support of Israel by his government. In the meantime Mr. Clark held a special meeting with leaders of the Canadian Jewish Congress, the B'nai B'rith and the Canadian Zionist Federation. "But several members of these groups proclaimed themselves unappeased yesterday." (Globe and Mail, March 16/88) The lesson behind that is that one shouldn't try to 'appease' groups like these.

On March 28/88 the Globe and Mail published a very long letter-to-the-editor from one Joel Rabinovich which excoriates Mr. Clark by presenting a long list of mythical proposals about what is actually going on in Israel. He then demands that Clark join other supporters of Israel in standing on their heads to observe these 'facts'. Clark's alleged fallacies are that (1) he has accepted myths about the intifada being a form of national resistance to occupation, (2) that soldiers in the Israeli army are shooting and killing those who throw stones at them, as well as others who haven't, (3) that these attacks are unprovoked by Israelis. Mr Rabinovich demands that Mr. Clark provide compelling proofs on a number of points. (4) where are the Arab governments willing to sign a comprehensive and lasting peace treaties with Israel? (5) finally, "If Mr. Clark can provide information as to why Arabs have permitted their brethren to rot in camps for 40 years when Jews always assisted their brothers to move to Israel, then I wish he would put pen to paper and express himself on that subject." In short, he blames the Palestinian victims for their condition.

The April 5/88 letters to the editor section of the Globe and Mail are filled with a series of letters which denounce the murderous bestiality of the Iraqis and other Arab regimes, including the Palestinians, and contrast it to the 'selective toughness' of Israel's responses. They denounce the world press for blaming Israel for 'merely defending itself' (against those it has dispossessed and oppressed). They once again raise the charge that "The world is as silent today as it was 40 years ago when six million Jews were murdered by the Nazis. In fact, the conscience of the world is sicker today than during the Nazi era, because it is more hypocritical" say Joel Hirchberg and Morton Rapp.

In short, Israelis have a perfect right to act like Nazis.

On April 9/88 the Globe and Mail runs an article by Irving Abella and Paul Sniderman who hold that Mr. Clark's speech to the Canada-Israel Committee would have the consequence of unleashing anti-Semitic emotions across Canada. They say that "Major newspapers in both English and French Canada allowed anti-Jewish slurs to creep into their editorials and commentaries. Jewish organizations were inundated with hate mail." They point to a study recently done at York University which found that 63.3% of French speakers and 60.3% of English speakers in Canada demonstrated medium to highly anti-Semitic attitudes in their replies to questionnaires. Another 18% to 32% refused to answer. One wonders what counts as anti-Semitic to York University sociologists.
The *Vancouver Sun* of April 11/88 reports that former Conservative party leader Robert Stanfield and three other respected experts on East-West relations have urged Clark to expand Canada's contacts with the Palestine Liberation Organization. Clark did not accept these suggestions because "...he did not want to alienate the Jewish lobby here." When asked why Clark rejected the proposed shift in recognizing the P.L.O., John Sigler, laughed and said, "Oh come on. It's domestic pressures ... you have a very active Jewish lobby in this country, why would you take them on." So ultimately Clark backed down and pledged his undying fealty to that lobby.

At a meeting addressed to 500 members of the Edmonton Jewish community, Clark said at least six times that Canada is "a firm and unyielding friend of Israel. Canada will protect, defend and endorse the State of Israel forever." That is quite a turn around and quite a promise to make. (*Globe and Mail*, April 20/88)

That ended Joe Clark's moment of independence. His retreat once again underscored how influential the Jewish lobby is and how weak-kneed most politicians in Canada are in the face of its demands.

**Acceptable Anti-Arab Racism in the US**

Distrust and dislike of noticeably different others is probably near universal and exists as much in Third World countries as in modern industrialized ones. One must note that the United States, one of the worst perpetrators of racism a little over 50 years ago, has made great strides in overcoming it, even if it has replaced racial discrimination with heightened class discrimination. So, the racist sentiments aimed at Moslems in America are not at all unusual. They have been exacerbated by the systematic imagery applied by the mass media, and indeed by a great many Jewish organizations. One of the ironic aspects of this campaign of hate mongering is that many of the images utilized by anti-Semites of an earlier era are now applied against Arabs. Very little changed. One might think this would give Jewish racists some pause.

'Arabs', 'Moslems' and 'Islamic extremists' have all become roughly comparable in the American mind. There are possibly 5 to 6 million persons of Arab and Islamic origin in the United States today, some deriving from an original emigration at the end of the 19th century, others descendants of more recent immigrants. This population is about as large as the entire Jewish population in America but is of little influence. There is, so far, no effective Arab lobby in the US, certainly nothing comparable to the Jewish lobby which supersedes all else. Since 'Arabs' pass as easily as do Jews into the maelstrom of the general population, racial characterizations might be thought not to be compelling. However, virtually any sector of the general population can be singled out and treated as the inheritor of unique racial characteristics.

What are some of the 'Arabic' characteristics portrayed in the popular media? Greedy, cruel, religiously fanatic, bloodthirsty, members of inwardly loyal sub-groups who are virtually closed off to assimilation into broader American society. Moreover, they are cunning, sly and capable of amassing money but cowardly and militarily hopeless. 'Arabs' and Moslems are pictured in cartoon-like caricatures, with large hooked noses and thin mustachios, their women veiled and committed to their own subjugation. Typically they are seen rioting or whining about some alleged mistreatment. It is an image which is long established in American public media, one which has seen a recent recrudescence. Just watch some of Spielberg's *Indiana Jones* movies. It is also remarkably similar to the Nazi characterization of Jews before the rise of the State of Israel.
Few accounts seem to notice that the Arabs are as Semitic as are the Jews, probably more so since they do not have a 2,000 history of mixture with European populations. The term "anti-Semitic" could just as well apply to anti-Arab sentiments as anti-Jewish ones, although it never is. To repeat, a great many of the earlier anti-Semitic images have since been transferred to Arabs, and not the least by Jews themselves. Imagery which would today be totally unacceptable when portraying Blacks, or Chinese or native Americans is still applied to 'Arabs' and other Moslems.

On October 12, 1985, the Vancouver Sun reports the murder of forty-one year old Alex Odeh, the heroic head of the California section of the American Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee. He was killed by the explosion of a parcel bomb which destroyed that organization's offices in Los Angeles and wounded seven others. It was rigged to go off when he opened the office door. No one took responsibly for that bombing but the F.B.I. strongly suspected it was the work of the Jewish Defence League, or one of its many offshoots, since they had threatened Mr. Odeh earlier with death. He had just given an interview with a Los Angeles television station in which he defended the Palestine Liberation Organization and its chairman, Yasser Arafat. Odeh had previously been involved in publicizing bombings and threats against a host of Arab-American individuals and businesses in the US, crimes which rarely were solved but which bore the marks to Jewish extremists. (Vancouver Sun, October 12/85)

The National Guardian of October 23/85 (a socialist weekly) carried an article entitled 'Victim of anti-Arab lynch mob.' After recounting the facts above it mentions that Mr. Odeh had been the recipient of numerous death threats in the months before his murder. He was described as a moderate, soft-spoken man, born in Palestine but an American citizen for the previous 8 years, who profoundly opposed violence and was the West Coast director of the Arab-American Anti-Discrimination Committee.

Its Boston offices had been bombed some 3 months earlier by a group proclaiming itself to be the Jewish Defence League.

"Odeh was highly respected by moderate and progressive Jewish organizations, as well as the Arab community. Odeh actively worked to build bridges between Jews and Arabs. (A number of mainstream Jewish groups)...joined progressive Jewish organizations in condemning the assassination." (National Guardian, October 23/85)

On December 2/85 a fire destroyed the offices of the American Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee in Washington, DC. "James Zogby, former executive director of that committee, said he thought it unlikely the fire was accidental. 'We've seen too many for it not to be a pattern' he said.'" (Globe and Mail, December 2/85). This event merited only the most obscure mention in national newspapers, in most cases none at all.

A series of articles about Arab-Americans carried in the Globe and Mail, January 27-29/86, began with the recent murder of Mr. Odeh. It says "The crime received little coverage. The New York Times carried a nine inch wire service report on page five the next day, many papers ignored the event. As a result, few people learned of the tragedy, [but] not of the bomb planted a few weeks earlier at the ADC's Boston office which injured two policemen attempting to disarm it."

"Fewer still heard of the earlier comments made on October 12 by Irv Rubin, then head of the Jewish Defence League, who denied any involvement in either bombing but praised the fact that it had been carried out. 'No Jew or American
should shed one tear for the destruction of a PLO front in Santa Ana or anywhere else in the world. He [Odeh] got what he deserved.'"

The American newspapers that weekend were aghast at the high-jacking of the Italian cruise ship, the Achille Lauro, by Palestinians and the death of an elderly Jewish passenger named Klinghofer. That event is still being memorialized in Jewish circles 35 years later.

James Abourezk, a former US senator and then the head of the Anti Arab Discrimination Committee, held the lack of coverage of Odeh's death "cannot help but contribute to the sense that Arabs are subhuman and that their lives are not as valuable as the lives of non-Arabs." "In their investigations, yet to produce a suspect, the Federal Bureau of Investigation stated that 'there is a possible link between the bombings and a branch of the J.D.L'. On November 28/86, a fire destroyed some of the offices of ADC headquarters in Washington and F.B.I. director William Webster warned that 'Arab individuals or those supporting Arab points of view have come within the zone of danger and are targets of violence by a group seeking to harm enemies of Israel'."

"The American-Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC), the influential Jewish American lobby, has certainly not ignored them [i.e. American Arab lobbyists]. Two years ago it published a controversial book on the still nascent Arab network, exposing what it called 'the campaign to discredit Israel'. Two staff researchers were assigned to study the opposition, using a nation-wide network of workers - mostly students and professors - who monitored the public activities of Arab-American academics and other leaders'.

AIPAC charges that "...such 'Arab' organizations are closely linked to the Palestine Liberation Organization and should not be trusted" (Globe and Mail, January 28/86). As opposed to the Jewish lobby which one can trust - to hate monger and to extort money from the national treasury to support Israel.

Writing in the August 7/86 edition of the Globe and Mail one Muna Salloum reports that 'Arab Canadians feel the heat of being labelled the villains'. She outlines the hoary stereotypes still in use and notes the bigotry which still effects distinguishable Arabs in Canada and assorted slights to the 'Arab community' in Greater Toronto.

Salloum says "Today, no one would dare refer to Jews, blacks, Chinese, Italians or Germans the way he refers to Arabs." She is wrong there - anti German racism is as alive on television as it was fifty years ago. As for the others, should their former homeland become embroiled in the conflict with 'American' interests you will see all the racist stereotypes about such people immediately reemerge. In Canada as in the US.

**Jesse Jackson and Black anti-Semitism**

Jesse Jackson was born in the mid 1940s into a single parent household in the American south. He grew up poor and in a totally segregated society. By the mid 1960s he had joined and placed himself center and fore of the Black civil rights movement and was at Martin Luther King's side when King was assassinated in Tennessee in the spring of 1968. Following that Jackson's star rose quickly; he was prominent in the Poor People's March on Washington the following year and a prominent supporter and symbol of Black demands throughout America in the years which followed. By this time he was a preacher and was sometimes reverentially referred to as The Reverend Jesse Jackson. He was militant, but not too militant, a vocal proponent of Black rights, but not exclusively for Black
rights. He was not a 'Black nationalist' or separatist, as those terms were then understood.

For a full decade Jackson was an authentic national figure, especially during the Reagan presidency, which he unalterably opposed and against whom he ran as a presidential candidate on his own 'Rainbow Coalition' ticket in 1988. He didn't win, of course, but he did garner more than a sprinkling of black and white support from disparate sources and made a noticeable splash in American politics. He was also a 'peace' candidate, opposing America's endless wars abroad, its financial ties to countries like Apartheid South Africa, and the oppression of the Palestinian people. That was when his difficulties with the American Jewish lobby emerged. He didn't convey his total support of Israel. He did the unthinkable and actually held discussions with Yasser Arafat, head of the P.L.O. That was utterly outrageous and unforgivable to many Jews. That would have been in the mid 1980s.

How Jesse Jackson became tagged as an anti-Semite happened like this. It started out with scandalized accounts of the venom being peddled by Louis Farrakan, a black racist and hate monger comparable to but not as violent as the Jewish Defense League. Just as the members of that League hate everyone other than reactionary Jews, so Farrakhan despises everyone in the world other than Black people, mainly his followers. He claimed himself and his followers to be Moslem and members of the Nation of Islam (a black separatist movement which soon broke with Farrakhan). He was openly anti-Semitic and had supported Jesse Jackson's candidacy for the presidential office. (National Guardian, October 9/85)

It was following that election campaign, while Jackson was speaking privately to a Washington Post reporter, that he had used the epithet 'Hymie-town' when referring to New York. This became national news overnight. There followed a deluge of recriminations and self-righteous outrage from all quarters of the American media and political world. One wonders how they would have reacted over some of the private exchanges that New York Mayor Edward Koch had had with his Jewish supporters. His comments would have been considerably more offensive.

On December 23, 1987 the New York Times reported on Jackson's comments on why it was inappropriate for him to extend Christmas and Hanukkah greetings - to wit the bloody crisis in Palestine. They quote him as saying "We call for a new Middle East peace formula - a mutual recognition policy on the part of Israel and the Palestinians. Israel must be guaranteed security within internationally recognized boundaries, and the Palestinians must have the same rights as others to self determination and a homeland or state. ...We call upon Israel to end its repression of the Palestinians and to withdraw its troops from the occupied territories as soon as possible. Democracy and occupation are not compatible" (New York Times, December 23/87). It was an outrageous proposition by an American Black. In the upcoming Democratic primary race for the candidacy as presiden, Jews at a large rally held in Brooklyn were split between their support for former governor Michael Dukakis and dark horse Al Gore. They are however unanimous in their loathing of Jesse Jackson because of his reference to 'Hymie town' some four years previously. They are also outraged for his dealings with P.L.O. leader Yasser Arafat and his meetings with Fidel Castro.

Gore visited the house of and talked with one Rabbi Solomon Halberstam, the head of the largest Hassidic sect in Brooklyn, and later met with Dov Hindkind, a Brooklyn Assembly man. Hindkind [a former member of the Jewish Defence League] said, "Dukakis people say a vote for Gore is a vote for Jackson... That is a
total, total outrage. To reward Governor Dukakis for his silence on a crucial issue for the Jewish community [i.e. Jackson's candidature] and to penalize Al Gore - is immoral" (New York Times, April 11/88). So now it is offensive not to denounce anyone who says the Palestinians should have rights too.

Three days later the New York Times ran an article surveying the results of a round-table discussion which had been arranged among upper middle class Jews in Brooklyn. As distinct from the reporters' expectations of liberal support from this sector, all the participants fundamentally opposed Jackson as an alleged anti-Semite. One participant, a teacher by the name of Edna Ritzenberg, summarized Jackson as follows: "Castro is a Communist, and he is his friend. Qadafi is his friend. Assad is his friend. ...We're all judged by the company we keep and that's quite a gang." These voters were all 100% American patriots.

Even the more liberal among them were totally opposed to Jesse Jackson. They repeated charges that he had supported Arafat and various Arab dictators abroad while he had been supported by Louis Farrakan at home. His four year old allusion to 'Hymietown' never failed to be mentioned. (New York Times, April 14/88) However, "one rabbi said that he had often heard the term 'Schwartze' - translatable as somewhere between 'Black' and 'Nigger' - used by his parishioners but we don't think that made them racists."

Jackson's candidacy has run up against organized Jewish opposition, especially in New York. 'His Honor de Mayor' Edward Koch, has recently said that "Jews would be crazy to vote for Mr. Jackson for President." That seems to be a prevalent opinion in that city but some of Jackson's Jewish supporters reply that Koch is full of hot air, if not other material, and that they are as Jewish as anyone. "Representative Charles B. Rangel of Harlem said the Mayor's [Koch] remarks about Mr. Jackson showed a lack of sensitivity and demanded, 'How dare this man declare himself king of the Jews'." Rangel was then probably the single most impressive member of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Jackson's campaign "...rejected invitations from several prominent Jewish organizations for Mr. Jackson to speak, concluding that the candidate would suffer much sniping but win few supporters." Probably a wise decision, although it immediately brought charges from Jews still proffering their simulated outrage over Mr. Jackson's allusion to 'Hymie town', made four years previously in private.

The New York Times of April 9/88 runs an article entitled 'Koch Defends Attack on Jackson', saying 'He evades the issue of Israel'. In New York city any candidate who wishes to win an election must be at least 200% in support of Israel and anything which it does or claims. However, "Mr. Koch does not speak for Jews', said Robert K. Lifton, president of the American Jewish Congress, calling Mr. Koch's language 'infelicitous'," Al Gore, in the running as a Democratic candidate for president, also attacked Jackson and would soon become Koch's personal bum boy.

The candidates were milling around New York's ethnic enclaves eating pizza, gorging corned beef and cabbage, and knoshing on chitlings and kreplach. Jackson is actively campaigning for the American working class vote and was utterly opposed to Reaganomics. (New York Times, April 8/88)

On April 15/88, the New York Times runs a half page advertisement placed by one Dov Hinkind, the former member of Meir Kahane's Jewish Defense League, who is now assemblyman for Borough Park, Brooklyn. It is entitled 'Do You Know Jesse Jackson' and consists of a string of the most slanderous charges imaginable. It claims that Jackson is an out and out anti-Semite and is preparing, symbolically,
to barbecue all the little Anne Frank's and serve them to his anti-Semitic supporters for lunch. Hinkind claims that Jackson has supported all the massacres carried out by all the military dictators in the middle east and that he is funded by a shadowy international cabal of Arabs. The ad oozes with Jewish racism.

On April 18/88 the *New York Times* in an almost full page article notes the rising tide of black support for Mr. Jackson throughout New York, something which it attributes to Koch's attack on him. Many hold that if he does not win a place on the Democratic ticket they probably will not vote. Blacks comprise almost quarter of the votes in New York city, approximately the same as the Jews.

On May 11/88 Jackson referred to the continual insults he had endured from many Jewish leaders in his bid for the presidential nomination of the Democratic party. "Mr. Jackson spoke with anger about the 'aggressive and bitter attacks' against him by Major Koch and other leaders."

"'You had the Council of Presidents [of major Jewish organizations] who were constantly demanding the we meet with them', Mr. Jackson told reporters. 'The demands were not based on any desire for reconciliation or any desire to ease people's fears. They were leaders who were demanding that I meet with them so they could have the forum to further attack me"' (*New York Times*, May 10/88). Yes, that sounds about right.

On May 19/88 Jackson meets with representatives of the Jewish community in Southern California, although the B’nai B’rith’s Defamation League and the Los Angeles Jewish Federation Council rejected any talks with him. Jackson however extended his apology for calling New York 'hymie town' some four years earlier.

Irv Rubin, the national chairman of the Jewish Defence League, turned up at the Jackson-Jewish meeting with a sign which read 'I love Hymie-town'. He said that "Any Jews who sit down with a Jew hater like Jackson might as well be sitting down with Hitler or Qadafi" (*New York Times*, May 19/88). Anyone defamed by that right-wing Jewish terrorist outfit must have something worthwhile about them.

On May 30th of that year Jackson makes an appeal for Jewish support at a speech-performance given on the Statue of Liberty island. He described the liberation of Dachau by Black troops at the end of world war 2, presenting an account of their encounter with bodies stacked up beside buildings and smoke coming out of the crematoria. He attempts to climb aboard the Holocaust Revival band wagon by ending his speech with 'It must never happen again"' (*New York Times*, May 31/88). However the mass murder of millions has already happened a number of times since the Jewish Holocaust.

The *New York Times* of June 23/88 reports that 'Democrats Back Palestinians at Seven State Party Conventions'. What is meant by this is that Jackson supporters and others in seven states have persuaded platform committees to adopt a plank endorsing "the rights of the Palestinian people to safety, self-determination and an independent state."

"Irv Silverman, executive vice-president of the American Jewish Committee said today, 'We're deeply troubled by the outcropping of the kinds of views we are seeing in some of these states. But I am confident they do not reflect American opinion in general nor the mainstream of the Democratic party." Senior Democratic party officials worked tirelessly to have that plank consigned to limbo as early as possible.

On July 13/88, at the Democratic Convention, the Palestinian issue is put aside, although not before considerable lobbying on the floor. The America-Israel Public Affairs Committee, a senior Jewish lobby group for Israel, is extremely
active and rounds up the support of most the senior Democrats at the convention.  
(New York Times, July 20/88)

The New York Times of July 27/88 prints an indignant letter to the editor by one Thomas Neumann, the Executive vice president of B'nai B'riyth International. It vehemently opposes the alleged harassment of one Professor Julius Lester by his colleagues at the University of Massachusetts because of his criticism of Jesse Jackson in his tussle with organized Jewry. Neumann raises 'the standard of free speech, free enquiry and freedom of thought' - which is supposedly being endangered by the 'radical' liberals who have taken over American academies of higher learning. "This intimidation amounts to a crude attempt to silence and censor a man whose published views are not dictated by an ideological agenda, but flow from the time-honored scholastic method of critical investigation and analysis." Coming from a spokesperson of the B’nai B’rith, whose fundamental activity has been to harass and suppress free investigation and expression of opinion, it is downright humorous.

In a letter to the editor, one Thomas Homburger, a director of the Chicago regional office of the (Anti-)Defamation League, sets about defaming the Black population of that city. "The expression of hard-core anti-semitism by some members of Chicago's black community and the conspicuous silence of many others, particularly in the week when the fate of Steven Cokely as a mayoral candidate was unresolved, have indeed created a troubling environment in this city."

Cokely, a local Black politician, had been charged with anti-semitism by various Jewish groups. Homburger closes with an admission that anti-semitism does not grip the entire Black community in Chicago, but only some visible parts of it. That's big of him.  (New York Times, August 9/88)

On July 26/88 the New York Times runs a half page article by one Eugene Kennedy entitled 'Anti-Semitism in Chicago: A Stunning Silence', with subtitles screaming 'Why doesn't Jackson speak out' and 'Some black leaders stir the embers of hate'. The article begins with the following... "Virulent anti-Semitism has gripped Chicago's black community. Nobody morally powerful enough to try to combat it, including the Rev. Jesse Jackson who lives here, has attempted to do so." The furore revolved around one Steve Cokely, a former aide to Chicago's mayor who had made assorted anti-Jewish comments. (Actually he is a black reactionary, in a city in which everyone hates or distrusts his neighbour.) National Black leaders have not spoken out against this horrendous example of Black anti-Semitism. Another tempest in a teapot.

A few days later the New York Times (July 29/88) runs another long article entitled 'Blacks and Jews in Chicago are Torn by Tension'. "Mr. Jackson, then living in Chicago, said that he and other black leaders had spoken out time and again against anti-Semitism but no one had asked Mayor Koch to apologize for the offensive things he has said about black people."

In Canada, 'Irwin Cotler, a professor of law at McGill and Harvard Law School and an international 'authority on human-rights law' warned the conference [held at McGill university] that 'while classical, traditional anti-semitism is declining, there is a growing international [support for] legal sanctions for a new anti-Semitism which has evolved from the UN condemnation of 'Zionism is racism'. 'Anti-Semitism is being carried out under the mask of 'human rights law' he said. 'Israel and Jews are being portrayed as being fundamentally anti-human rights' ...'Human rights is the new secular religion and Israel is portrayed as the human rights violator', he said" (Globe and Mail, February 20/89). Well, isn't it?
A March 24/90 article in the *New York Times* once again proclaims 'In Chicago, Renewed Uproar on Bigotry'. It deals with statements made by one Gus Savage, a Black member of the House of Representatives. "Mr. Savage, who is headed for a sixth term in Congress, spent nearly two hours today on a black talk radio station repeating his view that a white controlled press in Chicago, and groups of Jews who are ardent supporters of Israel had tried to defeat him in the Democratic primary on Tuesday." Mr. Savage is a frequent critic of Israel but had the support of the American Federation of Labor and assorted liberal organizations.

"The Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith and the Simon Wiesenthal Center in Los Angeles, a center for the study of the Holocaust and anti-Semitism [sic], both accused Mr. Savage of making anti-Semitic remarks. In a statement issued today, the American Jewish Committee in Chicago said 'Hatred of this sort has no place in American politics.' Hate mongering against other targets is perfectly acceptable however.

On March 30 /90 the *New York Times* again reports that Mr. Savage has a video tape of the speech in which it was claimed he made anti-Semitic comments - in which none of the remarks attributed to him appear. None of the organizations which had maligned him are interested in seeing or hearing this video. He did say, however, that AIPAC [America-Israel Political Action Committee] had provided more than 90 percent of his opponents election funds and that there was something fundamentally wrong when a basically foreign organization like that can attempt to swing elections in America. He also referred to the Jewish lobby in America, under various synonyms, at least six times. It is allegedly anti-Semitic to say that a Jewish lobby exists in America.

So ends my discussion of Jesse Jackson and the alleged upsurge of anti-Semitism among Black leaders and their followers in America.

**Mordecai Richler and the Charges of Quebec anti-Semitism**

Mordecai Richler was a Jewish Montrealer born in 1931; he came of age during world war 2 and published his first book while in his early twenties. He may not have been a Great Writer but he could be a mordantly humorous one. Some of his earlier writings, such as *The Incomparable Atuk*, a tale of an Eskimo rescued from an ice flow and brought south, only to quickly learn how to exploit his kinsmen by churning out 'Authentic Eskimo carvings' en masse in a Toronto sweat shop, and his *Cocksure*, about the sexual and other doings of a group of middle-aged Jewish entrepreneurs in London, are triumphs of farce about groups which usually are only treated with high sanctity. On a more sober, but still humorous, scale are his *The Apprenticeship of Duddy Kravitz* and *St. Urbain's Horsemen*, two novels about the youth and initial entry into entrepreneurship of a young Jewish hustler from a Montreal working class neighbourhood. There were even touches of left-wing sentiment in some of his earlier works. All of these were initially written during the 1950s and the 1960s. By the end of that decade Richler was acclaimed as one of Canada's major writers.

One of the problems which Richler had was with alcohol - he was an enthusiastic boozer but his body wasn't up to it. He went to Great Britain during the height of his fame in Canada but apparently didn't accomplish much there. So he returned.

Back in Canada he spent the better part of a decade trying to write a both salacious yet appreciative novel about Sam Bronfman, the founder of the billionaire Bronfman clan - *Solomon Gursky Slept Here*. However, that book got him into trouble with both the Bronfman's and with organized Jewry in Canada.
Some claimed his work was thinly disguised anti-Semitism and that Richler was a 'self-hating Jew' catering to the goyim. Richler was somewhat taken aback by the venom of the charges against him and his novel. It didn't sell all that well either.

He began work on a more appreciative account of the Bronfmans. (although I am unsure if it ever appeared in print). By this time, the mid 1980s, Richler was in the process of recovering his 'Jewish heritage', one bourbon at a time, and began lambasting the Quebeccois for their burgeoning nationalist sentiments and for their alleged anti-Semitism. And that was the tenor in which he lived out the remainder of his life, not really writing anything of worth but launching repeated barbs at French-Canadians and Quebec nationalism until his death at the end of the 1990s. A sad come down for what began as such a promising career.

As a bit of context, reporter Ray Conologue explores the explosion of the Hassidic population in Montreal, especially in Outremount, and the conflict this has created with French-Canadians living there. Despite the best face which Conologue puts on it, it is clear that the original Quebeccois population find the Hassidim arrogant and unwilling to mix with or even talk to the goyim. They may laugh and jest when they are among themselves, as Conologue suggests, but in public they are both pushy and stoney-faced, clearly contemptuous of others. They dress in black, surround their yards and houses with brick walls and are gradually driving out those who have lived there all of their lives. Conologue holds that there is a certain parallel between the claims of English-speaking charges against the Quebeccois and the Quebeccois views of the Hassidim. (Globe and Mail, September 11/91)

In a report entitled 'Richler stirs up a storm' the Globe and Mail of September 18/91 notes that Richler has just published a long article in The New Yorker magazine in which he attacks most of the recent Quebec leaders, from Robert Bourassa to Jasques Parizeau. "Richler devotes a few pages to the thorny question of anti-Semitism, quoting such prominent Quebeccois as publishing magnate Pierre Peladeau to support his belief that Quebec nationalism has not yet freed itself from a racist past. 'Rene Levesque was not an anti-Semite; Richler says. Neither is Jasques Parizeau. All the same, Jews who have been Quebeccois for generations understand only too well that when thousands of flag-waving nationalists take to the streets roaring 'Le Quebec aux Quebeccois' they do not have in mind anybody named Ginsburg - or, for that matter, MacGregor'."

As an example of the Quebeccois hostility to outsiders, Richler notes that of the circa 500,000 immigrants who had arrived in the previous decade, 312,000 had already departed to elsewhere in Canada. Doesn't that have more to do with the lack of jobs and the lower wages in Quebec?

French-Canadians nationalists were of course outraged by being characterized as xenophobes. Jean Dorion, president of the St. Jean Baptiste Society, said that Richler longed for the 'good old days when the English ruled the roost' and that he thought that Richler 'fundamentally doesn't like French Canada'. "He misses the good old days. He fears us. He doesn't like us. He is not someone who is capable of understanding French Canada." Dorion called Richler a 'talented writer whose skill is being used to serve petty hatreds and prejudice'."

A number of other prominent Quebeccois, both Liberals and Nationalists, found Richler's attack on the French language law, the province and its people, as both sad and outrageous. Mr. Richler received $40,000 from the New Yorker for the article.

The Vancouver Sun of September 20/91 chimes in with the not unreasonable suggestion that Canadians think too much of what others think about us. However
it then goes on to validate Richler's crusade against the French language law and suggests that if Quebec wants to halt Mr. Richler's complaints it has only to repeal that law. A rather unreasonable suggestion catering to a tiny percentage of Quebecois.

On March 18/92 the Vancouver Sun prints a page-long extract from Mr. Richler's Oh Canada! Oh Quebec! Requiem for a Divided Country. In it he tells of meeting Quebec Premier Rene Levesque in 1978 at a cocktail party.

"Levesque and I clashed at the cocktail party preceding his lecture. It began by my addressing him as 'Mr. Premier' only to be immediately cut short. 'You Bum' he said, 'You know my name. Use it!'...His anger stemmed from an article about Quebec that I had recently published in The Atlantic Monthly, an article in which I had been guilty of an embarrassing gaffe. Elaborating on Jewish community fears I had written about '...and nobody was reassured when joyous PQ [Parti Quebecois] supporters sang a French version of 'Tomorrow Belongs to Me', the chilling Hitler Youth song from 'Cabaret' at their victory rally.'

Richler himself must have known how ridiculous a fantasy this was but he decided to present his charges to the American readership of that journal.

"Not only had I got it badly wrong but it served me right because I had cribbed the fact without checking it out. The truth is, the song is different from the one sung in Cabaret" [a Hollywood hack film about the rise of Nazism as seen in an early 1930s nightclub].

Richler goes on to say, "I was brought up in a Quebec that was reactionary and church-ridden, a stagnant backwater, its chief for most of that time, Premier Maurice Duplessis, a political thug and even its intellectuals sickeningly anti-Semitic for the most part."

"However, when I first registered for school (at age six in 1937), within the sheltering confines of a largely self-contained working class Jewish community, I was, of course, unaware that Le Devoir had advocated that Jews be denied civil rights or that one Anatole Vanier had already written in the influential L'Action Nationale 'By their dispersing and their persistent habit of elbowing others out of the way, (Jews) are the authors of their own misfortune, ...What is happening in the new Germany is germinating everywhere where Jews are considered as intruders. And where, one might well ask, are they considered otherwise'".

Richler goes through another half dozen charges like the above portraying French Quebec society as an unending series of anti-Semitic sentiments - at children's camps, in summer cottage country, at the universities, at "...any place where Jews displayed their alleged 'lust for life, love of display'." Richler also makes a passing sweep at British Columbia, where he dishes up a bit of mythology fashioned from his own fevered brain - "And out there in Vancouver, the indolent natives who once tied Chinese coolies together by their pigtails and tossed them over cliffs into the sea..."

Serve up another helping for the borscht belt Morti.

Richler's article ends with the following: "Look at it this way. Many of the Quebecois pure laine or de vieille souche [pure Quebecois] are, in fact, the progeny of les filles du roi, or hookers imported to New France by Jean Baptiste Talon to satisfy the appetites of his mostly illiterate soldiers. And those United Empire Loyalists from whom Walter Stewart has written in True Blue, from whom one out of six English-speaking Canadians are descended -were either obdurate reactionaries or - pace Mrs. C.M. Day, Eastern Townships historian par excellence - "refugees from justice, men without fixed principles, or designing and unscrupulous adventurers" (Vancouver Sun, March 18/92)."
No one answered Richler with the suggestion that being a French prostitute is still infinitely superior than being a Jewish venom pedlar or that most Jews in North America are descendents of illiterate Jewish prostitutes brought over to America by Jewish men who were bootleggers and money changers?

A French-Canadian nationalist member of the Quebec legislature, one Pierrette Venne, called Richler's book a sustained racist diatribe and requested that it be banned for sale in Quebec as 'hate propaganda'. Richler replied that his charges of Quebec racism and anti-Semitism are totally factual and that he did not apologize for making them. (Vancouver Sun, March 18/92)

A few days later Richler conducts an interview with Barbara Frum, the smarmy Jewish hostess of the CBC evening news commentary show 'As it Happens'. She accepts Richler's comments about Quebec without a word of question. Lise Bissonette, the publisher of the Montreal Le Devoir responds in an editorial, which in part says, "A more Rhodesian scene would be hard to imagine." It goes on to say of the Richler-Frum interview, "You would have thought it was a villa in old Salisbury with a disaffected neighbour sharing tea with a high society matron (Richler to Frum). He complains the servants are ingrates, that they were given everything, that our children even play with theirs, that our laws civilized them - and yet they remain tribal, grudging and wanting emancipation." "Her eye misty, the hostess sympathizes with his misfortunes and attempts to reassure him that these unhappy people are nevertheless evolving a little despite their continued attachment to some idols and superstitions. Forgive them, they don't know what they're doing." That is a pretty good satire of the Richler-Frum dialogue.

The CBC won't apologize for having called Le Devoir (a mainstream newspaper in Quebec) a 'Nazi journal' on air. All this tends to convince Quebeckers of the malevolence of English-speaking Canada toward them. After all, said publisher Bissonette, "Not one voice has been heard denouncing the perversion of the Richler method" (Vancouver Sun, March 20/92).

In an article entitled 'Charges by Richler ricochet' the Vancouver Sun of March 23/92 notes the furor which Richler's interview on the CBC's The Journal program has stirred up in Quebec. "Now Quebecers are troubled about Canadians' silence since March 11 when Richler appeared on CBC's The Journal and denounced Quebec as a 'paranoid and tribal' society." His article in the previous September issue of The New Yorker "...recounted examples of Quebec xenophobia and anti-Semitism. It also attacked the newspaper Le Devoir for its 'long and disgraceful' history of racism, comparing its editorial stance in the 1930s with that of Nazi Germany's Der Sturmer."

A number of influential Quebec leaders noted that if English-speaking Canada does not denounce Richler for his views the strong imputation will be left that they agree with him.

On March 27/92 the Vancouver Sun runs an opinion piece by Denny Boyd, one of its in-house know-nothings. Boyd enthuses over Richler's latest work, a compendium of his previous anti-Quebec writings entitled Oh Canada, Oh Quebec. He claims that "Richler has been called 'an imbecile' by La Presse and Lise Bissonette, the cheerless publisher of Le Devoir has suggested legal action which is bizarre. Other papers have gleefully quoted Quebec politicians who say the book should be banned and Richler charged for inciting hatred." Also "Quebec editorialist goes purple at Richler's assertions that Quebec has long treated Jews with suspicion and loathing. Miss Bissonette threatens to sue over his claim - backed up with actual quotes from old editorial pages - that Le Devoir of the
1930s was anti-Semitic but she offers no refutation only outrage that he has said it."

A John Lazarus, an aspirant playwright, writes a letter to the editor in the Vancouver Sun of April 2/92 saying he agrees fully with Richler's characterization of Quebec society, noting however that the Anglophones of Quebec were often as anti-Semitic as the Francophones. "Like Richler, I grew up Jewish and Anglophone in Montreal, I go back for family visits, but Montreal no longer feels like home. Bill 101 [the French language law] makes it abundantly clear that I am unwanted." Ah well, Quebec's gain is BC's loss.

There is a gap in my record of Richler's doings over the next few years, although he is still on the hustings denouncing the Quebec nationalists. But on May 27, 1994 the Vancouver Sun reports that Richler had launched another attack against the Quebecois. In another New Yorker article he had written that Quebec was rife with "a climate of subtle, nonviolent ethnic cleansing, Quebecois style." It presumably relates to the fact that more Jews are leaving Quebec than are coming into it. "It is an analogy from the Balkans he's made before in the high brow magazine [The New Yorker]. Two years ago, Richler argued that Quebecers were subjected to 'linguistic cleansing' after the French language charter was passed in 1977."

His vitriolic article is fleshed out with a series of unflattering, thumb-nail sketches of Quebec leaders of the period. However this time the article does not seem to raise many hackles in Quebec. They have come to expect that sort of slander from Richler and only wonder why he doesn't leave a place he dislikes so much.

Two years later the issue of Quebec nationalism is still a hot topic in some parts of the country. A reformed 'Liberal' Member of Parliament adds her two cents worth in backing Richler's charges. Mrs. Anna Terrana was born in Italy in 1937 and claims to have "known Nazism first hand" - as a child aged six or seven. This is the sort of transparent malarkey that got her elected to Parliament.

In a series of articles running from late July 1996 to early August of that year, Barbara Yaffe, another one of the Vancouver Sun's resident reactionaries, quotes Terrana in saying that the PQ leaders and premier are 'reminiscent of Nazis'. "She says she also sees parallels between Adolf Hitler and Quebec Premier Lucien Bouchard." "Terrana does not for a second believe the Parti Quebecois would murder people. But as a political force it is employing a strategy similar to that used by the Nazis during the Second world war. And she wants Canadians to be aware of that." (Vancouver Sun, July 31/96) It later turns out that she is a co-founder and front for a Vancouver Holocaust Centre.

"A coalition of ethnic groups said Terrana had both wounded their fight to keep Quebec in Canada and has cheapened the suffering of Holocaust victims. Such comparisons of the Quebec government with the Nazi regime belittles the tragedy which befell millions of victims during the Second world war" Reisa Teitelbaum of the Canadian Jewish Congress' Quebec branch, said in a joint statement from three prominent Quebec groups. "Such irresponsible comments are especially unhelpful in dealing with some of the real problems currently facing the country, in particular the relations between the various communities."

Barbara Yaffe complains that it is outrageous that Members of Parliament cannot speak their own minds on national issues. (Vancouver Sun, July 31/96) Right - a conspiracy of silence.

By August 2 Terrana had apologized to Parliament for the comments she made about Nasties and Quebec Nationalists but a number of Reformed MPs have by
then climbed aboard the band wagon and support her anti-Quebec charges. She had also charged that the Quebec language law act was comparable to 'ethnic cleansing', gradually casting out of Quebec all those who do not speak French. (Vancouver Sun, August 2/96)

Between November 5 and November 21, 1996, the Vancouver Sun is filled with articles and letters to the editor about Quebec's new Lt. Governor, who is charged with past anti-Semitism. As a teenager Jean-Louis Roux had participated in an anti-Jewish demonstration during world war 2 (some 54 years previously). When asked to comment about this he apologized to Quebec's Jews but said that he didn't want to go over his youthful indiscretions on a radio talk show. The Parti Quebecois immediately calls for his resignation since he is an ardent federalist.

"Representatives for the Canadian Jewish Congress and B'nai B'rith, while welcoming Roux's explanation, say it doesn't go far enough and called for a full and direct apology to the 100,000 member Jewish community. 'It's a starting point, but not sufficient as it stands', said Jack Jedwab, Congress executive director, Quebec region." Apparently they require more grovelling apologies and self-abasement.

One Esther Delisle, a social historian who specializes in anti-Semitism and fascism in Quebec during the 1930s and 1940s, opines that fascist sentiments were quite common among Quebec university students of that period. She said "...the whole subject is a huge taboo. The generation of Pierre Elliot Trudeau is a generation without a past, when it comes to that period." Presumably she's got some score to settle with Trudeau. (Vancouver Sun, November 5/96)

A day later Mr. Roux resigned the post he had newly been sworn into. John Bryden, reporting to the Vancouver Sun says that it "...has as much to do with present-day politics as it does with any alleged Nazi sympathies he might have exhibited 54 years ago."

Irving Abella and Esther Delisle get into the act and proclaim that Quebec historically was an anti-Semitic society, especially during the 1930s and 1940s. "Irving Abella, a York university 'history' professor and past president of the Canadian Jewish Congress concurs [with Delisle's view]. "These activities were not frowned upon. They were part of the land of that period.' Abella says Quebecers are clearly not proud of their racist past, and many nationalist leaders have tried to portray Quebec as a tolerant society. ' But for much of the 20th century, that has not been true.'"

"The anti-Semitic influence came from all quarters, says Delisle, whose 1992 The Traitor and the Jew, paints a disturbing picture of the province. For example, she says young men like Roux were the product of classical colleges that 'fed a steady diet of anti-Semitism and anti-democracy ideologies'." And so on and so forth. (Vancouver Sun, November 6/96) One has to wonder, if the discrimination was so intense, why the Jews and non-Francophones did not simply pick up and move elsewhere?

On November 7/96, the Vancouver Sun reports a tear-stained apology by Mr. Roux to Quebec's Jewish community. "I ask my fellow citizens to have the generosity to excuse and pardon me' Roux said as he read the statement in French in slow, deliberate tones flanked by eight Jewish leaders who had sought a full apology." By doing so it would seem to suggest the Roux was unfitted for his position.

"The apology followed a 60 minute closed meeting with the leaders, representing the Canadian Jewish Congress and B'nai B'rith Canada. At the meeting, Roux 'expressed his profound personal regret with great emotion', said
Robert Libman, head of the B'nai B'rith's 'League for Human Rights.' 'We asked for a full and public apology and we got a full and public apology' said Reisa Teitelbaum, Congress chair for Quebec. 'If any good can come of this, it must be to give us the courage to look fully into this sad period of our history and the role it played in shaping Quebec society', Teitelbaum added" (Vancouver Sun, November 7/96).

This pathetic dust-up is followed by a flutter of letters to the editor in the Vancouver Sun. Apparently Sun columnist Trevor Lautens had a piece defending M. Roux in the Sun recently. One Cinny Bubber, from Coquitlam BC, writes "To excuse and defend the fascist activities of Jean-Louis Roux is tantamount to excusing and defending fascism itself. Mr. Lautens descriptions makes the Nazi activities of Mr. Roux sound as if he were simply acting as a young juvenile in the throes of new idealism [in 1942]. The attempt to annihilate an entire race was already well under way in the extermination camps. ...It is naive to think that Mr. Roux and some other Quebecers were not aware of the face of fascism as late as 1942. That fascism was the choice for the intelligentsia adds insult to injury. It is incredibly dangerous to excuse fascism, then and now" (Vancouver Sun, November 14/96).

Miss Bubber is under the mistaken impression that fascism and mass murder were events limited to the early 1940s and restricted to Germany and its partners in Europe. It is not a question of standing ever-ready to block its possible return but rather what to do about the murderous activities carried out by regimes, including Israel, throughout the world during the last 60 years.

John Lazarus, a self-promoting playwright, arises once again to put in his two cents worth. He tells us that as a boy in Montreal he was thrilled by Mr. Roux's many acting roles and The Plouffe Family television series. "As a Jew, I feel that there is no question that Mr. Roux had to resign and apologize. I am not surprised that he did so promptly and honorably. As a Canadian, I am outraged at the hypocrisy of the Bloc Quebecois' indignant posturing, when the Quebec separatist movement has so strongly been identified with anti-Semitic attitudes. As a playwright, I think the whole mess is just tragic" (Vancouver Sun, November 14/96).

Finally, as an end piece to all this slander let us listen again to Irving Abella, the university professor who has built an active career around it. Writing a long piece in the Vancouver Sun of November 21/96, he says, in part, "Without question, Quebecois have to confront a sordid record of anti-Semitism and racism in the years before and during the Second World war. It was real, it was palpable and for its victims it was cruel and painful."

"But frankly, English Canada's record was not much better. And we ought to be reminded of the same shameful period in our history. Though English Canadians did not participate in the anti-conscription demonstrations they were almost as avid in their anti-Semitism and racism as their Quebec neighbours."

Abella then runs through a long list of restrictions and discriminations faced by Jews across Canada during the decades before the late 1940s - of the quotas placed upon Jewish entry into medical schools ('only' 25% Jews), of the elite clubs which excluded Jews, of the restrictive covenants applying to Jews in some prestigious residential districts etc, etc. "And while Jean-Louis Roux's friends were throwing stones at Jewish store windows, there was a far worse anti-Semitic violence on the streets of Toronto during the Christie Pit riots, and in Winnipeg where local brown shirts confronted Jews and in other English Canadian cities. Who will ever forget the sign on some Ontario beaches, 'No Jews or Dogs
allowed?" (Vancouver Sun of November 21/96) Canada was clearly an open cess pool of anti-Semitism from sea to sea. The depression and all the other evils present in Canadian society are as nothing compared to this anti-Semitism.

As usual, Mr. Abella has taken events out of context to totally misconstrue the important processes of the 1930s and to make Jews the center of all of them. Abella also charges Prime minister McKenzie King and assorted dark federal bureaucrats for not actively saving Jews fleeing from fascism during that era.

While I have never encountered any anti-Semitism in Canada I certainly have run across more than enough anti-French Canadian racism. That doesn't count of course, nor does the racism encountered by many other minority groups in this country. For that matter, what of the endemic Jewish racism which prevailed in the past as well as today?

In a final comment, Mordecai Richler delivered an article to the Vancouver Sun entitled "How I let my people - or at least our rabbis - down" (July 31/97). He begins by noting a raft of books which have appeared recently warning about the threatened disappearance of the Jewish people through intermarriage and by their acceptance in North American society. He notes claims that from 40 to 50 percent of Jewish marriages in the US are with non-Jews, whose children by non-Jewish mothers are non-Jews by Israeli and Orthodox reckoning. Since Richler's wife is non-Jewish neither are their children. "Meyer Lansky can claim Israeli citizenship by birth but my children can't", he moans.

"Worried, rather than gratified, by American and Canadian acceptance of Jews, some rabbis predict that we will disappear within 50 years." Don't bet the farm on it.

Referring to an as yet unwritten 21st century Oxford English Dictionary he suggests how the Jews may be described. "The new OED entry might read, 'A tribe that flourished in ancient times into the early 21st century, worshipping a ferocious God, his wrath easily kindled, enjoining them to march here, there and everywhere, putting cities to the torch, slaughtering every man, woman and child therein, as well as livestock. This God, who sometimes went by the name of Jehovah, had a disconcerting appetite for Philistine foreskins... In a footnote to the Canadian edition, it could add 'In a bizarre backwater, once the province of Quebec, this practice led male separatists, familiar with the Old Testament, to tread carefully in Montreal neighbourhoods where Jews were predominant."

And so a little of Mordecai Richler's mordant humor returned a few years before his death.

A.M Rosenthal and the New York Times

This commentary is largely drawn from Joseph Goulden's Fit to Print. A.M. Rosenthal and His Times (1988). The book briefly touches on A. (Abraham) M. Rosenthal's youth and his early experiences as a newspaper journalist but revolves mainly around his 20 years as editor in chief of the New York Times. Also used was Harrison Salisbury's A Time of Change. A reporter's tale of our time (1988). Of central importance, however, were editorials and commentaries penned by Rosenthal himself over twenty years and printed in the New York Times.

Joseph Goulden (1988) chronicles how Abraham Rosenthal attempted to shape the New York Times into his own image, that of a Jewish-American chauvinist, during twenty years of his editorship. He did this through selective firings and hiring, through his personal editorial control over whichever stories mattered to
him, and by making his views and biases clear to anyone who wrote for the *Times*. He did this from 1968 to 1986.

Apparently the Sulzberger family, which had owned the *Times* since the beginning of the 20th century, accepted his actions and allowed him to continue over all those years. That the *Times* retained a certain modicum of quasi-liberal opinion makers (along with a large number of reactionaries such as William Safire) was in spite of Rosenthal's efforts to remove them. For at least a dozen years after he retired as Editor-in-chief of the *Times*, Rosenthal still filed his columns in that paper, eulogizing the wonders of 'American civilization' and conveying a monomaniac anti-German/anti-Communist hate mongering. In fact, it would appear that there were few people on the face of the world who he did not know to be or suspect as being anti-semitic and unAmerican. He was the Louis B. Mayer of the American newspaper world and the *Times* became his MGM.

Abe Rosenthal was born in Sioux St. Marie, Canada, in 1921 but was brought down to live in the Bronx by his parents in the late 1920s. His father was a thoroughgoing atheist and his elder sister a supporter of the Communist party in the 1930s who married the former commander of the Abraham Lincoln brigade, of Spanish civil war fame. Although Rosenthal was always violently anti-Communist, according to the old *NY Times* reporter Harrison Salisbury, he admired his brother-in-law and other veterans of the Abraham Lincoln brigade (possibly because he viewed the Spanish civil war as the prelude to the coming war against the Germans).

Harrison Salisbury describes him as first and foremost a neo-Conservative Jew, with the emphasis on 'Jew'. A total supporter of Israel in whatever it did who asks one thing of all developments - "Is it good for the Jews?" (Salisbury, 1988:290) Apparently he didn't ask "which Jews?" and didn't care about how those developments effected the other 98% of humanity. It has become a common sentiment.

Rosenthal attended City College of New York in the later 1930s where his hatred for Communists emerged, allegedly because they were invariably cloaked in front groups and disrupted his education. But surely for more fundamental reasons than that. (Goulden, 1988:32-33) It may have been because the Communists at CCNY were mainly Jewish (as were most of the other students there) and because they created an unAmerican image of Jews. This was something which Rosenthal clearly loathed. Although he was vehemently against the Nazis (read 'Germans') he apparently never participated in any anti-Fascist demonstration, so prevalent in that city at that time. Nor did he join the American armed forces when America entered World War 2. Instead, in 1943 at 22 years of age, he took a job as a reporter with the *Herald Tribune* and joined the staff of the *New York Times* at the start of the next year. (Goulden, 1988:33)

Rosenthal gradually rose in influence at the *New York Times* not only through his reporting but through his skilful playing of office politics. He was ambitious to rise to the editorship of the newspaper and played his cards well, gradually by-passing the more senior non-Jewish reporters of the *Times* such as Harrison Salisbury, Clifton Daniel, Sydney Gruson and James Reston. Ultimately, as editor-in-chief, he replaced them all, largely with graduates from CCNY. (Globe and Mail, April 1/89)

The *New York Times* had a long history of being an Anglophile newspaper, seeing the British Empire as the guide for the rising American Empire. It was also one of the more Germanophobic newspapers in America during World War 1, when it published spy scare stories, British manufactured atrocity stories, and
accounts about defending western civilization from the barbaric Hun etc. This is a tradition which it revitalized during World War 2 and the one which Rosenthal reinvigorated when he took over the direction of the Times.

Throughout most of its history the New York Times was not a particularly liberal and certainly never an even vaguely a 'radical' newspaper, although it gained an undeserved reputation for being such among the American right. It broadly supported, or at least did not oppose, the initial drift toward American reaction which started during the Great Red Scare of 1919 to 1921 but later supported the candidacy of F.D. Roosevelt. It sometimes was a somewhat liberal journal which occasionally championed some good causes, such as the early black civil rights movement during the late 1950s and early 1960s. Ultimately, very late in the game, it came to oppose America's war against the Vietnamese people - something which most American newspapers never did. Throughout it all it served as the voice of the middle to upper managerial class; it had become the newspaper of the American establishment.

Moreover, the Times increasingly came to act as a spokesperson for organized Jewry in America, especially during Rosenthal's editorship (1968-1986) filling its pages with the comings and goings, doings and fund raisers, and the organizational campaigns of prominent American Jews and their varied causes.

The Times had also become the 'newspaper of record' of the American nation. It was, quite wrongly, presumed that if anything of importance occurred it would be recorded in that journal and, alternately, if anything was recorded there it was not of importance. For more than a generation producers of television news programs kept a close track of what was being reported in the Times in order to check their coverage of events.

Even given the changes and sackings of reportorial staff the newspaper was written in a formally polite, pseudo objective, and balanced manner. None of the monosyllabic headlines one finds in many contemporary 'newspapers', very little scandal mongering appeared in it. Its propaganda was neatly hidden in it's 'presentation of the facts'. It was, and still is, an extremely influential newspaper.

The New York Times' final edition appears on the streets of New York at about 10 p.m. every evening and is available on newsstands in most of the major cities of the eastern seaboard early the following morning, on the date printed on the paper. It also, simultaneously, prints a West Coast edition in Los Angeles, which is available in the major West Coast cities the following morning. It is an impressive distribution system, which adds to its reputation as being America's national newspaper. It has an awful lot of clout.

Noam Chomsky, America's preeminent radical for almost 40 years, says that each morning he grits his teeth and tries to make it through the reporting, misreporting and calculated propaganda of the Times - knowing it, along with the Wall Street Journal, is probably the single most important source of 'information' for those who make decisions in America.

How Rosenthal got to be editor-in-chief of the New York Times is not really clear. The member of the Sulzberger family who was publisher of the Times died unexpectedly in 1963 at the age of 50 and the family was thrown into a debate about who was to replace him. The Sulzbegers are a Jewish American family which has been wealthy since at least the late 19th century. They had carefully held on to the New York Times since they acquired it near the end of the 19th century. Finally the family named 37-year old 'Punch' Sulzberger as publisher. He apparently ran the Times in a comparatively 'hands off' manner. As a result of 'Punch' Sulzberger's accession to the role of publisher, after some years, Rosenthal
was chosen to act as editor-in-chief of the newspaper despite the fact that some family members had opted for James Reston.

A year previously, Harrison Salisbury, who had been one of America's leading reporters since World War 2, was publicly castigated by his own newspaper because of his reporting from Viet Nam. It held that he was being 'non-objective' since he reported the resilience and deep roots of the Viet Cong forces there. On Salisbury's return from Hanoi, Turner Catledge (the then senior Times editor) posted a newsroom announcement that Rosenthal would be assistant editor for news and that Salisbury would henceforth be working on 'special projects.'

"Abe Rosenthal did not weep. He saw Salisbury's collapse as a reaffirming signal that Catledge and Sulzberger wished to purge the Times columns of reporting tinged by ideology [of the wrong kind]. Rosenthal would now proceed to pursue what he considered lapses of objectivity elsewhere in the Times. But in terms of career advancement, the demise of [the older] Sulzberger meant that one less person stood between A.M. Rosenthal and the managing editor's office." (Goulden, 1988:145).

One of Rosenthal's very first acts as Editor-in-chief was his coverage and vilification of the student anti-war protestors who took over Columbia University in 1968 and barricaded themselves in the Chancellor's offices on campus. While the New York Times had recently drifted into a polite criticism of that war, the actions of student activists enraged Rosenthal. That it occurred in a prestigious university in his own backyard, one which he felt mis-educated the American elite, was all the more outrageous. There wasn't any love lost between Columbia and nearby CCNY anyway. His reporters played the Columbia occupation as a group of 'spoiled, upper class youths vandalizing and barbarizing one of the great treasures of human learning', littering the Chancellor's office with their sleeping bodies and God know what else. Although the Times didn't say so in so many words, the reportage suggested that these callow youths were the pawns of nefarious troublemakers undermining the bases of American civilization. Myself, I was extremely proud of my fellow Columbia students.

The final police assault to clear the administration building, the cracking of heads, the bloodied demonstrators being dragged out or leaving with their heads held high and offering the 'V for victory' sign, was conveyed in the US press and undercut much of the Times vilification. This however was just the start of Rosenthal's career as Editor-in-chief.

Rosenthal's attack on militant students brought a savage rebuttal from writers on the Greenwich Village Voice. "Columbia marked the the beginning of a permanent estrangement of Rosenthal from what he called the 'left-wing know-nothing press' (Goulden,1988). Like J. Edgar Hoover and Spiro Agnew, he saw the Columbia occupation as part of a sinister, left-wing plot to destabilize America. Besides being a Jewish racist he turned into being a reactionary buffoon.

Some three years later, completely out of character, Rosenthal decided to publish the Pentagon Papers in June of 1971. They contained the secret information given to select members of the US cabinet on the military actions in Viet Nam and those cabinet members' discussions on how such material was to be handled or hidden from the American public. These accounts had been put together by a former Defence Department analyst, Daniel Ellsberg, and there already was a history of secret attempts to seize and suppress them. To publish them in the Times was to risk serious court action since they were categorized as secret documents.
They became front page news for a half year and were transformed into a best-selling book. The Nixon presidency attempted to have all those involved in making them public tried for a variety of offenses. However the American courts were not very helpful in these actions and soon the Nixon white house had more pressing concerns about cover-ups, and let the matter drift. Why Rosenthal published these papers is anyone's guess. Maybe it was simply the threat of another American newspaper scooping the *Times* in this matter. But it was the very last even vaguely 'liberal' action he ever took.

Rosenthal began to fill his staff with young Jewish reporters, especially those from CCNY, who rapidly replaced non-Jews on the newspaper (Salisbury, 1988:291, 292). Even very prestigious older reporters were sidelined into obscurity as his new continent took the lead and filled the headlines with articles printed under their names. Over the years, Rosenthal became perpetually aggrieved and angry at most people and developments in the world. This seems to fit the emerging tenor of much Jewish sentiment in America. In his off-hours Rosenthal was becoming an arrogant, foul-mouthed lush. He even tried to lord it over members of the Sulzberger family, such as Cy Sulzberger, a senior foreign correspondent for the *Times*.

"During his first years of power Rosenthal, intentionally or not, reserved his most vehement outburst of rage for persons on the paper. He would savage the occasional cab driver or slow waitress, but the dark side of Abe Rosenthal seldom was seen outside the newsroom. People outside the *Times* who witnessed these emotional squalls wrote off Rosenthal as the classic New York nut, the ranter who is shouting at enemies unseen by the rest of the world. He was known to the public neither by face nor by name. After an especially ugly taxi scene one evening a subordinate editor tried to make peace with the driver. 'Just who is that little shit?' the cabbie asked. Being told, he blurted 'You mean that guy works for the *New York Times*. Sweet Jesus!' He shook his head and drove away with a grinding of gears" (Goulden,1988: 259). Actually, Rosenthal was quite well known by then.

He also was involved in directing the *Times* coverage of Central America during the early 1980s, covering (or rather not covering) Guatemala and El Salvador where the military and right-wing death squads were running rampage. By this time many of the editors of the *Times* had become completely 'proAmerican,' regardless of what it did and who it did it to. He and they helped spike the flood of reports coming in about American (and Israeli) agents helping to train the armies of those two countries in techniques of torture (Goulden, 1988: 329-336).

Rosenthal had always viscerally hated the Germans, not just Nazism. As a young reporter he had resisted suggestions to cover any story in West Germany. As editor-in-chief he rewarded any reporter who expatiated on the roots of Nazism, allegedly still prevalent in Germany. It didn't matter what the story was, it was always possible to work that theme into it (Goulden,1988: 326-327). He was an irredeemable racist and hate monger.

In 1985 the *New York Times* initially ran a three line report of President Reagan's plan to visit the German military cemetery in Bitburg. Rosenthal read that account, was enraged that an American president should be visiting a grave site of 'Nazis', and launched a full scale *Times* campaign against this visit, drawing in like-minded chauvinists as Elie Wiesel and similar worthys. For the better part of a two months the *New York Times* was filled with accounts of the bloodthirsty monsters the American president was going to exonerate by his visit.
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to the cemetery. Actually, the overwhelming majority of those buried at Bitburg had been ordinary German soldiers who did not require any exoneration from Ronald Reagan and certainly not from creatures like Rosenthal.

This campaign activated newspapers like the *New York Post* and others across the country - always eager to have something uncontroversial to vituperate about. But Reagan made the visit anyway. According to one survey, one third of Americans approved of it, another third didn't know and didn't care about it, and another third were opposed to it in some way (Goulden, 1988: 17). This was taken as an indication that the country wanted to let the past rest, but in fact it indicates a substantial success on resurrecting old war hatreds.

By the end of his career Rosenthal had a salary of $600,000 per year, plus a bottomless expense account which he utilized lavishly. His expenses included the salaries of his two round-the-clock body guards and his armour plated limousine (*Globe and Mail*, April 7/89)

Rosenthal did not expect to be retired from the editorship of the *Times* when he reached 65 in 1986, but he was. He had outlived his welcome among the Sulzbergers, according to Salisbury (1988: 302). He was an exemplification of Lord Acton's aphorism that 'power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely'. I am not sure that the *Times* has yet recovered from the sorts of people Rosenthal hired and the attitudes he fostered in that newspaper.

Following his dismissal as editor-in-chief Rosenthal contributed a frequent column as well as guest editorials to the *Times*. These almost invariably found some reason to charge Germany with not demonstrating sufficient guilt about their past. It didn't matter what the topic was, it was rare that Rosenthal couldn't drag in Nazi crimes from the past. Non-existent poison gas making equipment in Libya and the Sudan had allegedly been constructed by German companies under cover of making fertilizer and pesticide plants. Viewing almost any kind of movie or reading any kind of book invariably reminded him of Auschwitz and the irredeemable blood guilt of the Germans. The actions of the Palestinians, Syrians, Iraqis or almost anyone else in the Middle East outside of Israel were often connected with Nazi ideology in some way. And so too the Nicaraguan Sandinistas.

It was like members of the John Birch Society discovering a nefarious Communist plot in plans to fluoridate public water supplies. Said one wag, "Serve Rosenthal a lamb chop he doesn't like and he'll find neo-Nazis hidden under the asparagus." It is possible that he was in the grip of a slowly developing senile dementia, but probably that would just be an excuse for his views. Thankfully, he died some years ago.

*The 'Liberty' Incident. The Power of the US Jewish Lobby*

The *Liberty* was a US naval spy ship rigged up with advanced electronic listening devices cruising off the coast of Egypt and Israel in early June of 1967. It was capable of warning the US and Egypt of any Israeli first strike against Egyptian military targets. This is what the Israeli Labour government was concerned about when they decided to sink or to knock the *Liberty*'s surveillance gear out of action. They did this in preparation for their sneak attack against Egypt at the beginning of Israel's 1967 war against its neighbors. That was the war which led to their seizure of the entire West Bank, the hilly region in southwestern Syria, and the entire Sinai peninsula.
One might think that an unprovoked attack on an American warship, cruising in international waters, which led to the deaths of some 34 American seamen and the wounding of 171 others, would have been met with a strong American response. It certainly would have had an act been carried out by any other nation on earth. But under President LBJ, already then sunk deep into the Viet Nam quagmire, it was barely mentioned officially. This undoubtedly had to do with the power of the Jewish lobby in the US and Johnson's fear of offending it.

Initially there were two close inspections made by Israeli aircraft on the morning of the attack, sometimes flying as low as 200 feet above the Liberty. Then shortly before 2 p.m. the Liberty was struck by Israeli aircraft. Not a single time, which might be just possibly explainable as 'mistaken identity' on the part of Israeli pilots - although quite impossible since no other nation had such a ship in the general vicinity and Israeli intelligence kept close track of anything within its periphery.

However, the Liberty was struck by two separate waves of Israeli aircraft using rockets and bombs, knocking out its electronic gear, shattering its decks, and coming close to sinking that ship. In the course of these attacks over the course of two hours 34 American crewmen were killed and the ship pierced by some 820 shell and rocket holes. Israeli torpedo boats also attacked, opening a forty foot gash in the Liberty's hull. Later, other Israeli aircraft came to survey the results of the bombing. Although the US flag was prominently displayed on the Liberty, none of the Israeli planes or war ships offered any assistance. By 3 p.m. the Liberty was dead in the water and listing badly. Then and only then, the US carrier in the area, the USS Saratoga, which knew of the attack a few minutes after it had commenced, was permitted by Washington to launch its aircraft to defend the Liberty. The initial launch of aircraft from the Saratoga was called back under direct order of the US Secretary of Defense, Robert McNamara. A very strange response indeed (see Paul Findley, They Dare Speak Out 1985: 166-168).

In the course of that and the following day some 80% of Egyptian military aircraft were destroyed while still on the ground. This and the massive attacks on Syrian, Jordanian and Egyptian ground forces by Israeli armor won the Israeli victories in the famed 'Six Day War'.

Syrian resistance was strong in the region south-west of Kunetra but was finally overcome and the Golan Heights occupied until today. The Israeli attack witnessed the full scale destruction of Kunetra, the third largest city in Syria. Jordanian resistance was also determined in defense of its portion of Jerusalem, but was overcome with overwhelming Israeli force, generously armed with the most modern American weapons. The defeat of Egypt was probably the greatest triumph of Israeli arms, routing the Egyptian army in the Sinai, murdering some to the Egyptian prisoners taken, and moving to the Suez canal with General Ariel Sharon making preparations to push into Egypt proper. It was the war which consolidated Jewish support for Israel everywhere in the world.

The sneak attack on the Liberty was simply a small footnote to the Israeli military triumph which was little reported and soon forgotten. Except by the crewmen who were aboard and the kinsfolk of those who died on it. For fifteen hours the Liberty was not approached by any American ship, although there were one or two US aircraft carriers in the vicinity. Their captains had been specifically ordered not to intervene. For those fifteen hours the Liberty's crew desperately tried to keep the ship afloat and the wounded alive. By that time the Israelis had claimed they had attacked the ship because of mistaken identity, despite the close surveillance they had initially made.
In the official naval inquiry into the matter the seamen were ordered not to speak of the affair to anyone. However the account leaked out to the American press. It emerged that Israel had warned the US to move their ship 24 hours before they attacked it, so they can hardly claim they did not know its identity. Much of the rest of Findley's chapter is about the American government's cover-up of the event.

The full findings of the naval court of inquiry were never revealed. A legal investigation of the event was done by one Carl Salans, an advisor to the Secretary of State, but that study too was somehow 'lost'. The cover-up even extended to dead seamen who were buried at Arlington cemetery. Their grave markers say nothing about where they were killed and the letters of condolence sent to their families do not indicate under which circumstances they died (Findley. Paul 1985: 171-173, 175, 176). Moshe Dayan was identified in a CIA report as the man who personally ordered the attack on the Liberty, but he makes no mention of it in his memoirs. While Yitzak Rabin (later to be Prime Minister of Israel) declared in his memoirs that the Liberty was mistaken as an Egyptian ship.

What is truly remarkable in this incident was the assurance of the Israeli leaders that their attack on a US naval vessel and its near sinking could be deflected by the Jewish lobby in America. It was remarkable that the Israelis could count on Jewish voters in the US to back them in this endeavor. They correctly read the spinelessness of both President LBJ's Democratic party and also that of the Republicans.

Those members of Congress who raised the issue were soon charged with anti-Semitism. Of the few who did raise the issue many were targeted by the Jewish lobby and lost their seats in Congress or had to retire. It was a truly remarkable undertaking by Israel and the Jewish lobby. I don't know how the incident was treated in Israel.

In 1980 a book about the attack on the Liberty was published by James Ennes, who had been a junior officer aboard and was wounded in the attack, entitled Assault on the Liberty. He had a great deal of trouble in getting it published and distributed, despite the good reviews it received. "The Israeli Foreign Office charged that 'Ennes allows his very evident rancor and subjectivity to override objective analysis'. These charges, Ennes later says, were 'adopted by the (Anti)-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith for distribution to Israeli supporters throughout the United States.' A caller to the Israel-America Public Affairs Committee was told that the book was a 'put up job financed by the National Association of Arab Americans." The book was maligned on radio talk shows (Findley, Paul 1985: 176-177).

Shortly after his book was published Ennis went on a speaking tour of various western and mid-western universities. While he generally got a good reception for his account of the Liberty incident he was typically heckled by those who called him a liar and an anti-Semite. They protested against the universities giving him a venue to speak.

The American Jewish lobby's campaign against that book comprises the sixth chapter of Paul Findley's They Dare Speak Out. People and Institutions Confront Israel's Lobby (1985), for which he too was attacked as being anti-Semitic. Findley was ultimately defeated in his Illinois seat in the House of Representatives through an orchestrated campaign of innuendo, rumors and cash. He had been a member of Congress from Illinois for twenty-two years by then.

The Jewish lobby everywhere is tireless in attacking anyone who challenges either Jewish influence in America or Israel's actions abroad. Anyone who does so
is immediately identified as being anti-Semitic; any writing or commentary produced by such an individual is either uniformly maligned or sunk into a hole of silence. The majority of publishing houses in the US usually do their part.

On August 11/88 a long letter appeared in the New York Times by one Stephen St. John, memorializing the 20th anniversary of the attack on the Liberty. It notes that payments for the deaths of 34 American seamen and the 171 wounded came from Israel only after 13 years of haggling, and then only after the book Assault on the Liberty was published, which cast fundamental doubt over the Israeli claims of mistaken identity. St. John notes that none of the Israeli personnel who participated in the assault have yet been tried or reprimanded in any way.

On August 31/88 the New York Times carries an outraged rebuttal by Abraham Foxman, the national director of the (Anti) Defamation League. He utterly rejects any claim that the USS Liberty was attacked intentionally and that accounts of Israeli cabinet discussions at that time do not bear this out. He holds that alleged shelling of Israeli coastal areas had occurred before the attack and that the two jet fighters dispatched to investigate the source were not specialists in ship identification. They attacked with the weapons normally carried by military aircraft. Foxman says that "Had the attack been premeditated, the Israelis would have sent heavy bombers to wipe the ship out immediately." He also notes that Israeli marine assistance was offered as soon as the mistake was noted - also unreported by the Liberty, unless one includes the torpedo attacks by Israeli naval craft.

Foxman says that both Israeli and American naval courts have investigated the evidence and cleared Israel of any wrong-doing. This is probably the most damnable aspect of the case, that an American naval investigation could be so servile in following the directions of president LBJ. Foxman ends with the following, "History, however, is ill served by false accusations of premeditation." Coming from Foxman, that is a real joke.

The final account I have relating to the 'Liberty' incident is a New York Times report of January 6/89 entitled 'Liberty's name brings talk of anti-Semitism'. What else? A photo subtitle notes that "The naming of a library for the Liberty, a US.ship attacked by Israel in 1967, has caused protests by Jewish groups and counter charges that outsiders are stirring up trouble."

"More than a year ago, when the new library here (Grafton, Wisconsin) was being planned a local industrialist donated $400,000 for construction, asking that it be named for the Liberty as a memorial to her fallen sailors. The village council agreed, whereupon Jewish organizations in Milwaukee declared that the name was an insult to Israel and argued that a number of extremist groups had used the Liberty attack "as a rallying point for anti-Jewish sentiment." Mr. Grant [the mayor] says that abandoning the name now would be not only an offense to the memory of the Liberty sailors but also an admission that the choice was motivated by anti-Semitism in the first place. ...But Judy Mann, director of the Milwaukee Jewish Council, argues that the Liberty has become 'a symbol of anti-Semitism'. She also points out that in the 1930s Grafton was a stronghold of the German-American Bund, an organization with strong Nazi sympathies which staged parades down the village's streets to support the German cause." When caught out in some undertaking simply accuse the discoverers of being neo-Nazis and nefarious anti-Semites.

A village school teacher in Grafton also expatiated on the presence of a swastika her grade one son said he saw chalked on a sidewalk, some twenty years previously. Horrible. (New York Times, January 6/89)
So, memorializing 34 American sailors killed by an Israeli sneak attack is not only anti-Semitic but is in keeping with the dark undercurrent of German-American neo-Nazism.

**Holocaust tours, Holocaust memorial museums, and teaching the Holocaust in High Schools**

**Holocaust Tours**

Western tours of Auschwitz and other former concentration camps in Poland only started after the breakup of Communist control of that country in the mid 1980s. By that time Auschwitz had already been rebuilt after being totally destroyed in the retreat of the German army at the end of world war 2. Presumably its initial clientele were Poles memorializing their war dead. However by the end of the 1980s there were mass visits and demonstrations of touring Jews at Auschwitz. Especially noticeable were the tours of American high school students, mainly from middle and upper middle class backgrounds. Such tours are often linked to follow-up visits to Israel, where the 'lessons of the Holocaust' were driven home. These visitors were expected to return to their classrooms and give talks on and pontificate to their fellow high school students about 'what they had learned and experienced'. The aim was to recruit students while they were still young and pliable.

During the late 1980s and early 1990s Vancouver newspapers recurrently reported on Holocaust and concentration camp tours mobilized in the city's 'better' [i.e. wealthier] highschools, as well as presenting the comments of those who had returned from them. For a number of years Jewish pilgrimage tourists returned suitably outraged and ready to combat any new anti-Semitism which some were constantly discovering in Canada and America. They are all eager to oppose the forces of Nazism, even if it had perished some 50 years earlier. It was a thoroughly safe anger, one backed by all the powers that be. It allowed for endless self-glorification as members of a sinned-against people who have every right to do as they wished in a sinful, anti-semitic, world.

Some of the teenaged returnees from such tours, especially the young women, turned out to be loud mouthed, perpetually enraged, witch huntresses. I would hate to have been one of their teachers. Accounts of their comments on returning to Vancouver struck me as glib, simple-minded, and utterly chauvinistic. It was quite a coup for those Jewish organizations involved to capture sentiments of youthful rebellion and channel it into their own campaigns.

The *Globe and Mail* of April 15/88, reports on the celebration of the 45th anniversary of the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising. Some 4,500 foreign visitors have come to Warsaw to attend the five day ceremonies while 1,500 Jewish youths, many carrying Israeli flags, marched to the sites of Auschwitz and Birkenau concentration camps. A fifteen year-old visitor to the Auschwitz camp museum said 'it was emotionally wrenching to look at a room full of children's shoes' allegedly taken from Jewish victims 45 years earlier. "Catholic bishops and a spokesman for the Polish Foreign Ministry said they had attended to pay homage to the Jewish fighters, who had been Polish citizens and [had]...fought together with us against the Nazis." He, however, criticized Israel for its repression of the Palestinian people.

The same issue of the *Globe and Mail* carries a brief account of a speech given by Yitsak Shamir, still the prime minister of Israel, at the annual commemoration of the Holocaust dead. It is called 'Martyrs and Heros Remembrance Day' during
which sirens wail, a two minute period of silence occurs and when all restaurants and businesses are closed. Shamir said "We again face the phenomenon of eternal hatred for the eternal people. ...When will the nations learn that they can never overcome us and decide to leave us alone? Even today, when we dwell in our own land, evil-hearted and unfeeling people shoot poison arrows at our youngsters as they wander the countryside turning it into a valley of death" (Globe and Mail, April 15/88). However, it was the Jewish armed forces and gangs of armed Jewish settlers who have turned the countryside into a valley of death for Palestinians.

**Holocaust Museums and Pilgrimage sites**

On September 5/86 the *New York Times* reports on a new 'Jewish Heritage - A Living Memorial to the Holocaust' museum to be built at the tip of Manhattan at the Battery, overlooking the Statue of Liberty. It is "to be a cube and marked with a 60 foot tower to be permanently illuminated by a sacred flame. The museum is scheduled to be opened in the spring of 1989 and will provide extensive exhibit space for photographs and artifacts of Jewish civilization of Europe before the Holocaust, the Nazi extermination of Jews, and the flight of the survivors to America to begin a free life anew." Hurrah! The $60 million cost of the museum is to be partly paid by building luxury towers in the area cleared around the museum site. The rest of the construction and operating cost are to be raised through private donations and public contributions. Governor Mario Cuomo has turned over the site with a 99 year long lease to the New York Holocaust Memorial Commission. The Commission had been established by New York mayor Edward Koch.

"The Governor said the museum would generate 'the most chilling recollections' of 'the awesome, nearly inexplicable horrors of one of history's most shameful episodes. It will teach us that as long as there exists the capacity in any of us for barbarism, we will need memorials like this shouting Never again'." Obviously, only the Jews who died during world war 2 deserve a memorial. Elie Wiesel was on hand to express his gratitude for the museum but tempered his praise with charges that the American government had not responded adequately to the murder of the Jews during the Holocaust. "Why was this harbor closed to so many Jews who could have come? Why did the State Department not give out all the visas that were available?" Because America was anti-Semitic, seems to be the answer required. No amount of groveling and cash will ever satisfy the Elie Wiesels.

The museum’s initial chambers are to portray European Jewish culture of the late 19th and early 20th centuries while the next will concentrate on Jewish emigration to America. The last chamber is to be low and darkened and is given over to portrayals of the Holocaust itself - with the usual eternal flame. It is intended to be a sacred place. (*New York Times*, September 5/86)

The *New York Times* of April 11/88 runs a long article, appropriately in its business section, on this 'A Living Memorial to the Holocaust/Museum of Jewish Heritage'. It is to be opened in early 1989 and the museum staff are busy gathering collections of display items plus oral accounts of Jewish Holocaust survivors. Some of them say "the experience is indescribable and unspeakable", before speaking endlessly about it. Although the museum intends to collect other materials documenting the rich variety of Jewish life before the Holocaust, the displays will concentrate on that event and on Jewish immigration to America and Israel.

The *New York Times* of May 12/88 reports on another Jewish Museum in that city, one long established but in the process of being enlarged. Ironically, it is
housed in the former city mansion of the Warburg banking family, who were Jewish supporters of Fascism in the 1920s and early 1930s. The construction of an eight storey addition to the original museum is to begin in 1991 and will house part of a collection which includes 14,000 pieces of art and artifacts covering 4,000 years of Jewish history. This museum too will give priority to school tours and educational.

This Jewish Museum of New York (New York Times, April 4/89) had been established some 85 years previously and is under the loose direction of the Jewish Theological Seminary - it was not a Holocaust Museum. During 1960s it had evolved partly into a modern art museum but has since shifted its focus to Jewish society and culture. In 1987 it mounted a show around the 'Dreyfus Affair' in turn of the century France and it plans to mount an exhibit to be entitled 'Blacks and Jews. A Struggle for Justice' and 'Gardens and Ghettos', dealing with the mutual influences of 2,000 years of Jewish presence in Italy.

On July 29/88 the New York Times runs an article on the 1988 exhibit at the above Jewish Museum; a collection of films and videos dealing with the Holocaust and Jewish reactions to it. Prominent are two videos by one Barbara Rosenthal, 'Women in the Camps' and 'Leah Gluck - Victims of the Twin Experiments'. Another is by Beryl Korot, 'Dachau 1974', wordlessly portraying on four separate screens an observer's visit to the site of the rebuilt concentration camp in the year 1974. "Chilling and stunning" is the reviewer's comment. Since none of these video producers were yet born when the Holocaust took place, there obviously is room for endless future growth in that industry.

On October 6/88, the New York Times notes the ground breaking for yet another United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, to be built overlooking the Jefferson Memorial and the White House in the center of Washington, DC. It will be opened five to six years later with an operating budget of $50 million per year, $30 million of which will be picked up by the Federal government. It will prove to be a triumph of Holocaust memorializing, placing the Jewish dead in the center of events during world war 2, which will be treated as a war against the Jews. Oh yeah? President Carter had first endorsed the idea of such a museum in his reelection bid of 1979 and it was now being instituted by President Ronnie Reagan. Reagan spoke 'movingly' of the 'plight of Soviet Jews' and urged that nation to let this people go. Assorted speakers, such as Abraham Foxman, a professional Holocaust survivor and president of the (anti) Defamation League, intoned the requisite need to keep 'fresh and enduring' the memory of the six million dead. (But not that of the 40 million or so other world war 2 dead.)

Norman Finkelstein's The Holocaust Industry (2001) also mentions the US Holocaust Memorial Museum. He too notes that it largely excludes all victims except Jews and in no way recognizes comparable past American actions, such as the extermination of American Indians or slavery and Black segregation which lasted until the early 1960s. In general "The Museum's overarching message is that 'we' couldn't even conceive of, let alone commit, such evil deeds. The Holocaust 'cuts against the grain of the American ethos,' Michael Berenbaum [a holocaust writer] observes in the companion book to the museum. 'We see in [its] perpetration a violation of every essential American value.' The Holocaust museum signals the Zionist lesson that "Israel was 'the appropriate answer to Nazism' with the closing scenes of Jewish survivors struggling to enter Palestine." (Finkelstein, 2001: 73/74)

This indeed was the official ethos presented.
"During the museum's planning stages, Elie Wiesel (along with Yehuda Bauer of Yad Vashem) led the offensive to commemorate Jews alone. "Deferred to as the 'undisputed [and loudest] expert on the Holocaust period' Wiesel tenaciously argued for the preeminence of Jewish victimhood. 'As always, they began with Jews', he intoned. As always, they did not stop with Jews alone'. Yet not Jews, but the Communists were the first victims of Fascism, and not Jews but the handicapped were the first genocidal victims, of Naziism." (Finkelstein, 2001:75)

What a breathtakingly truthful comment!

The museum’s founding directors also excluded any Gypsy representatives who might apply. Finkelstein says "...acknowledging the Gypsy genocide meant the loss of an exclusive Jewish franchise over The Holocaust, with a commensurate loss of Jewish 'moral capital'. Third, if the Nazis persecuted Gypsies and Jews alike, the dogma that The Holocaust marked the climax of a millennium of hatred of Jews was clearly untenable. Likewise, if Gentile envy spurred the Jewish genocide, did envy also spur the Gypsy genocide? In the museum's exhibition, non-Jewish victims of Nazism receive only token recognition." (Finkelstein: 2001:77)

Another Jewish Museum is that of Yeshiva University in Washington Heights, NYC. It houses some 1,000 rare documents and 8,000 rare books on Jewish topics. The center of its current exhibit is a 600 odd page, 1478 manuscript of a prolonged trial of the 30 member Jewish community in Trent (England) on charges of ritually killing a Christian child. Most of these Jews were done to death after confessions were obtained under torture. The manuscript is presumably not a forgery and it documents one of the claims of past Jewish persecution. Its provenance is not known before 50 years ago and since it is written in flowery middle German its public exhibition does not convey much to the viewer. The museum is considering various scholars who might write a short book about the trial, placing the manuscript in context. (New York Times, September 26/89)

These are only the Holocaust and Jewish museums in the city of New York. A nation-wide count would undoubtedly be far larger.

It is impossible to even outline the films, television 'documentaries', plays and televised remembrances (and misremembrances) dealing with the Jewish Holocaust. After beginning to write such an outline I found it impossibly large. Therefore I present no comments on this topic other than to say that the great bulk of it seems to be on par with the 'propaganda of the world' war 2 'Why We Fight' series.

Public School Holocaust Studies

The eighth graders of Spring Valley, NY junior highschool were taken on a 'field trip' by their teacher to the privately operated Rockland Museum for Holocaust Studies. God knows how many dozens or hundreds of such museums have sprung up in America since the 1970s. The director of that museum, Bernard Weiner, welcomed them in and they were escorted through the newly opened facility by a guide. They had previously read The Diary of Anne Frank and Night as preparation. The group of 17 students is then shepherded into a narrow gallery which is outfitted to look like the inside of a boxcar, where they listen to recorded reminiscences of deportations by survivors, which focus on the smells, screams, feelings of despair. These recordings are played throughout the entire museum. The museum guide explains they provide the context for what is happening and what will happen to them.
There are rooms of photographic and other exhibits which the students examine in a stunned manner. Then on to a Survivors Theater where the students watch more photographs of people in concentration camps, taped oral accounts and running commentary. On the bus back to school no one talked.

Later, a girl called Catherine said that she now understood; the mock-up 'cattle car' "gave us the atmosphere of how it felt to be taken away." Also "Now that we understand exactly how it happened it would never happen here or anywhere" she said. However, it appears to me that they haven't learned anything in the exercise - how could they that quickly. They were simply repeating what they were being told by those placed over them in authority. (New York Times, June 7/88)

The Globe and Mail of July 11/88 reports that grade 11 students in New Brunswick will receive two to three weeks instruction on the Holocaust to be incorporated into their studies of Nazi Germany, the province's Department of Education announced. "Last week as a prelude to the new curriculum 30 history teachers from across the province attended an intensive course on the Holocaust. For five days they were led through 20 lessons on the roots of anti-Semitism, the mechanics of genocide, the motivation of denialists and other related subjects." Five whole days of instruction.

"We want students to understand it wasn't just Nazis, Canadians to a large degree were anti-Semitic", says one of the instructors. (Oh yeah?) "Richard Baltimore, a Woodstock teacher who took 13 of his students last year on a tour of West Germany, including a trip to Dachau, the site of a Nazi concentration camp, welcomes the course. "The Holocaust denial movement is alive everywhere" he said. He sounds like those who comprised so many of our teachers 60 years ago.

I would not be surprised if Holocaust courses in public schools do not become compulsory. To make sure that every child is getting a proper Holocaust education, as of 1998 17 states in America mandated Holocaust classes in their grade and high schools. Just like they used to mandate 'Americanism' and 'Know Your Enemy' classes in the same schools during the 1950s anti-Communist crusade. (New York Times, January 5/89)

A David M. Szonyi has issued The Holocaust: An Annotated Bibliography and Resource Guide (1985), produced by KTAV Publishing House for the National Jewish Resource Center, New York. It was published by Shocken Books, a major purveyor of Holocaust material to Americans. This bibliography, which does not include the last 20 prolific years of Holocaust writing, is selective and by no means exhaustive. It contains some 1,700 references to books, tapes, videos, movies, and teacher training resources. I am surprised that it is not vastly larger.

These titles can be grouped according to their main emphasis: 1) Children's Holocaust literature, 2) Holocaust movies and documentaries, 3) Holocaust slide kits, 4) Holocaust teaching aides for teachers, 5) TV and video rental movies on the Holocaust, 6) Visiting lecturers on Holocaust topics, 7) Holocaust museums, 8) Travelling holocaust exhibits, 9) Jewish music for Holocaust remembrance, 10) Holocaust survivors and survivor groups who are willing to share their reminiscences, 11) Teacher development programs for Holocaust studies, 12) Oral tapes on the Holocaust, 13) Funding and guides for Holocaust research, 14) Holocaust Remembrance Day services for groups, 15) Holocaust Memorial landmarks in the US, 16) Suggestions for highschool Holocaust curricula, 17) Holocaust scholarship and bibliographies, 18) Holocaust literature and reminiscences, 19) Holocaust Education Centers in the US, and 20)
'Brainstorming' suggestions on how to devise your own group's Holocaust studies program.

It does not contain any material on Song and Dance routines suitable to Holocaust appreciation, but does provide an overview of the range of materials available.

The area of focus is overwhelmingly Jews, only some 15 out of the circa 1,700 titles deal with Gypsies, homosexuals and 'slave labor'. There is naturally nothing about the oppression of the German working class and anti-Fascists, which in fact were the Nazis' primary concern during the initial 7 of the 12 years that they were in power.

The Szonyi volume contains a bibliography by one Robert Singer (1982), Anti-Semitic Propaganda: An annotated bibliography. This bibliography alone contains some 24,000 entries on anti-Semitic books and other works, in English alon. God knows what is listed, what his criteria were and how anyone could have perused 24,000 volumes. Many of the works of Will Shakespeare are presumably listed here. We do not know what may await a reader who peruses literature in languages other than English. Presumably this bibliography comes with a demand that all such loathsome books be purged from public libraries and people be warned about them - a noble undertaking.

Summation

Although the emergence of Jewish reaction can be traced to America's defeat in the Viet Nam war during the mid 1970s, the Holocaust Revival as an organized undertaking began somewhat earlier. The Holocaust had been prominent in the Jewish world view since the end of world war 2 but was replaced in the public mind by later events, mainly dealing with the cold war and the Soviet Union. During the 1950s some major Jewish organization were engaged in hunting unAmericans and in ferreting out 'communists' and 'communist sympathizers' within the Jewish American population. The B'nai B'rith and the (anti-)Defamation League are among the leading exemplars of this.

In the early 1970s the rabbi Marvin Heir, the founder of the Hollywood Simon Wiesenthal Documentation Center, was touring the country urging President Nixon not to withdraw American soldiers from Viet Nam. The Jewish Defence League, a grouping of Jewish thugs led by the fanatic Meir Kahane, also arose in New York during the early 1970s to defend Jews from Blacks and everyone else opposing their view of the world. But people like that did not seem to represent the broad cross section of Jewish opinion in America - indeed, many of the more militant opponents to the Viet Nam war were Jews.

This began to rapidly change with the election of the right-wing Herut movement led by Menachem Begin in Israel in 1977 and the triumph of the American right under Ronald Reagan in 1980. These two developments galvanized the Jewish right in America who rapidly multiplied their charges of anti-Semitism against almost everyone. The press normally treated such charges with high seriousness. These charges demonstrated the loathing and disdain which many Jews had for a great proportion of the people of the world. They came to include anyone who objected to deeds carried out by Israel or America. They were tarred with charges of anti-Semitism, if not in the present then in the distant past. As one wit claimed, 'Only the Pygmies of the Ituri forest and the Eskimo of the far north seem to have escaped the charges of anti-Semitism'.

The Holocaust Revival shifted into high gear with the Israeli invasion and occupation of Lebanon in 1982, especially when much of the world reacted with
horror and condemnation of the massacres carried out against the Palestinian refugee camps.

It was at this time that the Jewish lobbies mobilized their forces and supporters (and their new right-wing allies) to take on anyone or any organization which opposed Israeli actions, whatever they might be. A part of this counteroffensive was the resurrection of witch hunts for alleged participants in past war crimes. Their lawyers penetrated and took over a section of the US Immigration Service and analogous government agencies in Canada. They suborned courts and justices to initiate a new series of investigations into anti-Semitic crimes in North America. They launched a whole series of trials and deportation cases against their selected targets which still continues today. While many of those so charged were, or had once been, individuals with right-wing allegiances, they were not necessarily any more right-wing than those who now pursued them. The Jewish investigators generally made a farce of any claims to justice, truth and equity under the prevailing legal system. Whenever the courts did not satisfy them they resorted to the mass media, which was only too happy to oblige them in demonizing their current victims.

The 'Jewish Holocaust' was resurrected in order to support the right-wing government of Israel and its bloody deeds. It was an utterly cynical use of the Jewish victims in the Holocaust to support Israeli actions which became increasingly similar to those in which Jews had earlier perished.

Chapter 11. The Suborned Deschenes Commission

It began with charges from Simon Wiesenthal, backed up by Jewish lobby groups such as the Simon Wiesenthal Holocaust Documentation Center in Hollywood. Canada was charged with permitting the entry of 3,000 or 300 or almost a 100 suspected 2nd world war criminals to its shores following the end of that conflict.

As it soon turned out, on closer inspection, Wiesenthal had little or no documentation for these charges - although that didn't stop his followers from repeating his claims. Moreover, the specification of what 'war crimes' entailed was, on closer inspection, very broad ranging indeed, including even teenagers who had briefly acted as interpreters for the German army in wartime. They were all treated as if they had personally murdered little Anne Frank or had sent her brethren to concentration camps. All the other millions of victims of the 2nd world war were of no interest to these prosecutors.

The attempt to restart war crimes trials of alleged Nazis and wartime collaborators began in the 1970s but did not really bear fruit until the early 1980s. This process came to fruition in Canada in early 1985 with the appointment of one Justice Jules Deschenes to head a Royal Commission to investigate and pursue any Nazi or sympathizer who might now be living in Canada (some for forty years). Some had joined the police forces of collaborationist governments but had not been charged with any specific crimes. The Commission was empowered to suggest any changes in law which might be needed to pursue such evil. This was done under the Brian Mulroney Conservative government, then riding high in Canadian support.

In point of fact, when all the demands were heard and Canadian laws for the pursuit of 'war criminals' were rewritten, the number of individuals actually convicted under such new laws proved to be negligible. The vast majority of those
deported for alleged involvement in past crimes were dealt with through the non-judicial and extra legal mechanism of hearings and decisions by Ministers of Immigration and their attendant boards of inquiry. In such hearings all manner of extra judicial procedures were utilized. Proof and legal defence were minimized, and those charged were hustled through the various steps preceding deportation in secrecy. The range of what constituted a past 'war crime' grew progressively broader. By the beginning of the 21st century, those deported barely earned a mention in the Canadian press. But let us return to the Deschenes commission investigating anti-Jewish war criminals in Canada.

Needless to say, none of the wartime crimes of Americans, Britons, or anyone else under the umbrella of American protection, nor those of the Israelis, ever counted as a war crime, regardless of how brutal or murderous they had been. Charging them was unthinkable.

The Deschenes Commission sat from early in 1985 until late in 1987, heard a plethora of beady-eyed lawyers acting for relentless persecutorial groups, and came down with a whole raft of suggestions for new laws to pursue anti-Jewish war criminals. The chronology is only roughly sketched in here; following the testimony given and the charges made would comprise a book in its own right.

The Globe and Mail of February 9/85 reports that Justice Jules Deschenes had been appointed by Minster of Justice John Crosbie to head a commission to investigate the presence of 39 to 40 alleged war criminals who the government thought might be in Canada. Judge Deschenes as yet didn't know what the mandate of his commission was. (Crosbie was notorious for launching new omnibus laws during his reign, targeting vast numbers of people for potential legal action. Sometimes it turned out that Crosbie had not even closely read the laws he had promulgated.)

One of the difficulties was that the prosecution would require retroactive changes in Canadian laws in order to try their targets. New Democratic party justice critic, Svend Robinson, held that these alleged crimes were against the community of nations, and that war crimes cannot be hidden under the excuse that they were not illegal when they were committed.

On February 12, the Globe and Mail reports that lawyer David Matas of B’nai B'rith Canada holds that "specious legal arguments' raised for the purpose of making sure nothing was done have prevented Canada from bringing Nazi war criminals to justice." Since his days of slandering Ukrainian political candidates in Manitoba, Matas had been a full time lawyer for Jewish organizations involved in witch hunting. He excoriated the past Liberal government for not acting on a number of suggested avenues of pursuing alleged anti-Jewish war criminals. "Mr. Matas, a Winnipeg lawyer, said that because the Nazi offenders are so old, Canada must act now or 'have a permanent stain on its justice system.'" Matas proposed three avenues by which to proceed: 1) extradition to countries who will prosecute, 2) prosecution here in Canada, and 3) simply naming and publicizing the individual's crimes. It worked for Senator McCarthy so why not here?

"The other means [of exclusion] was administrative discretion. Indeed, the entire security process in immigration has rested not on legislation but on orders-in-council, cabinet directives and wide discretionary latitude by officers in the field, all of which had been wrapped in administrative secrecy" (Globe and Mail, February 12/85).

On April 10, 1985 the hearings get under way and begin with charges against Ukrainian collaborators. One Dmitry Kupniak, an alleged former Nazi collaborator in the Ukraine and now a Toronto restauranteur, is the initial target. "He is said
to have led a group of Ukrainian nationalists who, acting as a secret police unit, had killed Poles and those Ukrainians who had collaborated with the Soviet government in the western Ukraine between 1939 and 1941. One witness testified how Kupniak's unit had surrounded a barn in which about a dozen Poles had hidden, had set it on fire, and then killed all those who attempted to flee from it. All were killed, including the children."

This part of the Ukraine had been seized by Poland at the end of World War I and Kupniak testifies that he was only acting as a Ukrainian nationalist fighting the Communist forces in the early 1940s. Kupniak said that his anti-Soviet sentiments had crystallized in 1940 when the Soviets allegedly shipped his mother and father to Siberia, where they both eventually died. When the Nazis finally arrived the Lvov region he was already a leading member of the Ukrainian Nationalist underground which styled itself after the Italian fascists. After the Soviets reoccupied the region in 1944 there followed almost three years of guerilla war before the Ukrainian nationalist forces were beaten. Kupniak made his way to Germany with a forged passport and from there to Canada in 1948.

After his business success in Canada he stood for the Conservative party for election in the Lakeshore riding of Toronto but in 1969 was indicted by the Soviet Union for his war time activity. They pressed Canada for his extradition in 1969 and 1982. "I have nothing to hide" he tells the commission (Globe and Mail, April 10/85). He probably is a war criminal but what was that bit about the commission not making the names of those investigated public?

There were fireworks when the descendants of Stephan Bandera, a right-wing Ukrainian nationalist allied with the Nazi occupation of his country, vocally reject Sol Littman's characterization of Bandera as a Nazi war criminal. Littman had wormed his way into giving evidence at the Commission and was well on his way to becoming a leading Jewish 'Nazi hunter' (like the 'Communist hunters' of earlier years). "The most dramatic example of the passions such an undertaking inflame occurred after Nazi-hunter Sol Littman of the Simon Wiesenthal Centre told the commission that the late Ukrainian nationalist leader Stephan Bandera was a Nazi collaborator who joined in the expectation that Hitler would create a totalitarian Ukraine free of Poles and Jews."

The Bandera family denounced Littman, saying that judge Deschenes had previously ruled that names of individuals would not be named by the commission. Deschenes then cautioned Littman, but ultimately ruled that Bandera’s name was part of history and that it was permissible to mention him. (Globe and Mail, April 17, 1985)

Michael Meighen, a lawyer working for the Deschenes commission held that if the inquiry did not obtain information from the Soviet Union on wanted war criminals it may not be able to fulfill its mandate. Deschenes again stressed that his commission was an inquiry and not a court (ha ha), and that therefore no personal names of those under investigation would be permitted to be made public. Some one to three thousand Canadians of Ukrainian origin marched on Ottawa to protest the commission and the possibility that it will utilize Soviet information. (Globe and Mail, April 17/85)

In Montreal, throughout much of the first half of May 1985, the RCMP are questioned as what their role in investigating alleged war criminals had been. They replied that until the early 1980s they believed that the only action which could be taken was deportation of those they felt had belonged to some banned political tendency. They noted that Canadian law did not extend to acts committed by non Canadians in countries outside Canada. In 1982 the RCMP
operational manual was changed to read "Upon receipt of information that a suspected war criminal is in Canada, an investigation shall be conducted to substantiate the information."

Outside the courtroom David Matas trod the stage for the assembled newspaper reporters, saying "It's an admission of failure of the Government of Canada to deal with one of the most serious sets of crimes that mankind has ever seen." Several Jewish organization suggested that legal remedies exist through the War crimes Act and the Geneva Convention. (Globe and Mail, May 4/85)

On May 10/85 the Globe and Mail reports that a lawyer for the RCMP noted that that agency had investigated some 296 alleged Nazis who had entered or had planned to enter Canada since 1962. Only one of those investigations had so far been successful; that against Helmut Rauca, a former sergeant in the SS who became an Ontario businessman and who had been charged with war crimes committed in Lithuania. He was deported in 1983 but died of cancer while in a German jail awaiting trial.

An Albert Greening who had worked with the RCMP visa control unit from 1954 to 1962 noted that that organization had operated with information drawn from British, American, French and German sources. "Applicants [for visas] were usually approved unless the sources indemnified them as Communists or Trotskyites, or as Nazis who had belonged to the Gestapo, the SS, or the Waffen SS." Mr. Matas again belabored the RCMP and the Immigration branch, saying that "It was a system that could lend itself easily to possible Nazi war criminals coming to Canada" (Globe and Mail, May 10/85). And to possible Zionist war criminals as well.

In the Deschenes Commission hearings then being held in Winnipeg, one Alex Berkowits, an alleged concentration camp survivor, told the audience that Canada was filled with Nazi and other war criminals and that if anyone thinks otherwise they "are living in an opium den". David Matas, a lawyer and national chairman of the 'League for Human Rights' of the B'nai B'rith (a self-contradictory title) once again told the commission that if it does not find and punish all the alleged anti-Jewish war criminals in Canada it will 'blot the country's moral record'. He proposed that the nation's laws be changed to allow for the prosecution of world war 2 war criminals. One Philip Weiss, a "survivor of three concentration camps", said he had a list of alleged war criminals to submit but did not know if any of them were in Canada. He also stated that it was intolerable that those pursuing justice could be slandered as vilifying the identity of certain ethnicities. (Vancouver Sun, May 1985)

On May 28/85 the Globe and Mail devotes a half page to report the statements and demands of B'nah B'rith lawyer David Matas at the Winnipeg hearings of the commission. Matas had an eighteen point submission to place before the commission. He repeats his charges about the Canadian government and agencies being lax to the point of immorality in failing to prosecute Nazi war criminals in the past. He holds that all those charged must be deported for trial or tried in Canada.

A 21 year old Ukrainian-Canadian student tells the commission that no Canadian should be deported to face charges against them. "All Canadian citizens, regardless of the crimes of which they are accused, must be tried in Canada according to due process and must be allowed all legal resources available under the Canadian constitution and existing laws." That sounds fair enough. But what redress is there against those who make unsubstantiated charges?
"Bert Raphael, past chairman of the Canadian Jewish Congress's committee on war criminals, asked Judge Deschenes to urge the federal government in his recommendations that action be taken "to remove once and for all this terrible stain on the administration of justice in Canada." As for those who have been involved in murdering Palestinians or a host of others, he has nothing to say.

Deschenes reminded Raphael and others that his commission was one of investigation and not a trial (Globe and Mail, May 28/85). Right!

On June 7/85 the World Jewish Congress accuses Germany of reneging on pledges made in the 1950s which promised that it would accept all those deported for quasi Nazi sentiments or crimes. West Germany replies that it will not accept those who are not or were not German nationals at the time of their emigration. The World Jewish Congress replies to that by saying that it "is an unpardonable violation of its moral and legal obligation to assist in efforts to bring Nazi criminals to justice." To this lot everything German is an unpardonable offense.

David Matas, a Winnipeg lawyer acting for B'nai B'rith said all Nazi war crimes "were committed under German direction and control in German occupied territory and therefore Germany is responsible for all the accused's actions." The B'nai B'rith brief to the Deschenes commission recommended considering the denaturalization of suspected Nazi war criminals who lied on obtaining citizenship or entering Canada. (Globe and Mail, June 7/85)

On June 12 the Globe and Mail reports that the Canadian Jewish Congress has handed over a list of 75 additional suspected war criminals believed to be living in Canada. Irwin Cotler (not yet the Liberal government's Minister of Justice), representing the CJC, said "the names may duplicate the 660 names that the commission already has. I don't know, we're not allowed to see the list either" (ha, ha). Deschenes had previously ruled that the names mentioned at the commission hearings could, allegedly, not be made public.

These 75 additional names come from the American government i.e., Neal Sher's Special Investigation Unit, the Israeli government, the Jewish Documentation Centre of Simon Wiesenthal in Vienna, the Soviet Union and a number of other foreign governments. They are all from world war 2. "Mr. Cotler said that it is up to the inquiry to investigate the names on the latest list. Each name had a file; in some cases there is a lot of supporting evidence. In other cases there is not. The CJC is not an investigative body.[?] We have neither the mandate nor the resources to conduct investigations into individual cases. It is the commission that has the legal mandate to do that, and the resources to pursue investigations" under Canadian law (Globe and Mail, June 12/85).

In short, the CJC and other Jewish organizations have turned the Deschenes commission into their court and have packed it with a bottomless list of people to investigate or to denaturalize and deport. The commission seems to have taken a break during the Summer of 1985. Of course, a single day that goes by without the accused being pursued is a moral lapse and an indelible stain on the Canadian system of justice.

On September 17/85 the Globe and Mail reports that the Deschenes Commission may go abroad to take testimony on Nazi war criminals (though no others of course). "The groups that enjoy so-called standing before the committee include the League for Human Rights of B'nai Brith, the Canadian Jewish Congress and the Ukrainian Canadian Committee. They have the power to cross-examine witnesses subpoenaed by the commission counsel at public hearings" [emphasis mine].
Jewish organizations claim that the files of East European countries are bulging with files dealing with war criminals which should be investigated. Ukrainian, Latvian and Lithuanian spokespersons however reject any files found in Communist-run countries, saying that these have been tailored to charge emigre opponents. The commission intends to hear submissions from the United Kingdom about its past decisions about those suspected of war crimes.

It strikes me that if the alleged 'war criminals', forty years after the events, have died off, it should still be possible to charge their children or grandchildren. Those who were not conscientious enough in tracking down and punishing the bottomless list of war criminals which Jewish organizations have compiled are of course anti-Semitic. On October 10, the former Liberal general-solicitor Robert Kaplan informs the Deschenes commission that the RCMP had destroyed many of its former files on suspected Nazi war criminals. He is in a rage. "It is an unbelievable turn of events" Mr. Kaplan told reporters. He said that he had pushed for the pursuit of suspected Nazi war criminals in Canada since he was elected in 1980." The current Tory solicitor-general said that the destruction of hundreds of thousands of files made it difficult to sustain a pursuit of those involved. Well, well, 'hundreds of thousands' of potential suspects to investigate.

"Mr. Kaplan would not say whether he thought the file destruction was part of a conspiracy to protect war criminals in Canada or simply an attempt to make room in Government offices, but urged the commission to investigate" (Globe and Mail, October 10/85). As an American senator once put it, "A Conspiracy so vast that it boggles the mind". Two weeks later Kaplan held that the destruction of these precious files had been a routine operation to clear records of past government investigations. (Globe and Mail, October 25/85)

The Globe and Mail Letters-to-the-editor for October 26/85 are filled with impassioned demands that Soviet files on war criminals be utilized or not utilized. The usual line-up is evident.

On November 6/85 the Vancouver Sun repeats that the Toronto Star has reported the former Tory Prime Minister John Diefenbaker's cabinet was advised in the early 1960s "...not to prosecute Nazi war criminals hiding in Canada because doing so would appear to be pandering to Jewish groups intent on revenge." In a document opened under the recent Access to Information Act one Federal bureaucrat, "John Donald of external affairs' European division, said in a confidential memo dated May 25, 1962 'Both cases [of alleged Nazi criminals in Canada] have been brought to light in what looks like a spirit of revenge instigated by Jews. And in my view, anti-Jew baiting by the Jews is just as reprehensible as Jew-baiting by the Nazis."

On November 12/85, the Globe and Mail notes that Judge Deschenes had previously written a book critical of the Nuremberg trial. His The Sword and the Scales, while it commended the Nuremberg trials, said that they were tilted far in the direction of the US judges who presided. He also noted that the court which sentenced Marshal Phillipe Petain to death in France was dominated by Resistance veterans and 'entirely political'.

"Mr. Littman, a spokesman of the Canadian branch of the 'Nazi-hunting' Simon Wiesenthal Institute of Vienna [actually of a similarly named organization based in Los Angeles], said he disagrees totally with the idea that Nuremberg dispensed the tainted kind of justice described by Judge Deschenes... "it was a necessary, fair and salutary trial." The Jewish-American chief justice of that court was exceptional too.
While noting that Judge Deschenes had been moderately fair to date, "How fully does the writer really understand what went on in Europe - the real nature of the Holocaust", Mr. Littman asked" (Globe and Mail, November 12/85), Possibly he is ready to compel the judge to take a course in Holocaust Studies given by people like himself.

On November 18/85 the Globe and Mail reports on the infighting going on behind the scenes as to whether the Deschenes Commission should go to the Soviet Union or not to gather information on Nazi war criminals in Canada. Strong pressure had been building on the Canadian government to disallow such a trip. On the Jewish side the initial 650 names charged as Nazi war criminals had blossomed into over a thousand in Sol Littman's hands while the Soviet Union claims there are upward of 10,000 war criminals in Canada. Many of them anti-Soviet Ukrainians.

To make a very long story short, the Deschenes Commission ultimately does not go to the Soviet Union to gather information about alleged war criminals living in Canada.

Another Jewish "civil rights" lawyer, Edward Greenspan, says that Canadian citizens should demonstrate in front of the homes and businesses of those they suspect to be or have heard are former Nazis, or their sympathizers. "...Canadian Jews owe it to their relatives killed by Nazis to identify war criminals and make their lives miserable, he said" to a gathering at Beth Sholom synagogue, Toronto. "Mr. Greenspan said he rejects Solicitor-General Robert Kaplan's view that people who take such actions 'are acting as vigilantes'. He also said that Canadian law does not seem to allow for the persecution of war criminals, of whom there are an estimated 2,000 in Canada today. (Globe and Mail, November 22, 1985) Right.

Deschenes asks for an additional year to pursue his commission's work. It is granted. An NDP member of the House, one Ernie Epp, says that he and an informal group of members calling itself the 'Canadian Nazi War Criminal Inquiry', have been discussing the 'fallout' of events. They are fully behind the angels. David Matas, the lawyer for B'nai B'rith, says he is pleased the commission has been doing such good work. (Globe and Mail, December 4/85) Any time David Matas and his lot are in support of anything it is time to worry.

The following day (December 5/86) a letter to the editor appears in the Globe and Mail from one Robert Keyserlingk. He notes the extraordinary complexity of Nazi and SS sources in the mountains of sources left to us. "The Americans learned some time ago that academic specialists must be attached to keep historical innocence - no matter how good their intelligence and legal qualifications - from disaster. Mr. Justice Jules Deschenes should do likewise." It sounds that Mr. Keyserlingk is making a plug for his own kind of historical specialists. (Globe and Mail, December 5/85)

The year ends with a letter to the editor by one Larry Shapiro, of Calgary. He believes that Sol Littman, incorrectly denoted as being a member of the Deschenes commission, has been attacked as 'a vigilante' by a lawyer of the Justice Department. Shapiro goes on to attack the governments of both MacKenzie King and John Diefenbaker as demonstrating anti-Semitic attitudes over the previous sixty years. He ends with an indignant complaint about those currently challenging the efforts of the Jewish witch hunters and their allies. "Pressure brought by Eastern European emigre groups, politicians and civil servants to block the natural course of justice once again reveal Canada's historical hypocrisy in the matter" (Globe and Mail, December 21/85). Sure.
The year 1987 opens with the Deschenes Commission continuing its collection of lists of alleged war criminals in Canada from interested parties, its questioning of real and spurious witnesses, and the attendant persecutorial organizations taking careful note of all names mentioned for future use.

On January 11/87, Simon Wiesenthal charges Canada for not acting quickly enough to punish the now 200 individuals he considers to be war criminals. Sol Littman, a spokesman of the ultra right Simon Wiesenthal Centre of Hollywood, says that he has received a list of some 218 names of suspects from the true source - Wiesenthal himself. Littman says that in America the US Office of Special Investigations of its Justice Department (currently being run by witch finder Neal Sher) has the power to strip people of their citizenship and deport them. He demands that Canada also establish such fast acting 'justice'.

Littman also claimed that 28 names of alleged war criminals which the Canadian Department of Immigration said it could not locate were listed in the Toronto telephone book, of which he claimed 14 names were 'validated', meaning that he found such or similar names in the Toronto telephone directory. Mr. Littman said that these 28 names came from American military sources, and all belonged to Ukrainian members of an SS unit.

Reb Marvin Hier, the founder and head of Littman's parent organization, the Simon Wiesenthal Centre of Hollywood, said the recently declassified information from US occupation forces in Austria suggested that they had captured concentration camp doctor Joseph Mengele at the end of that war, but allowed him to escape. (Globe and Mail, January 11/86) Maybe that will be the topic of some future investigations.

On January 30/87 the Globe and Mail reports that David Matas has demanded that the Deschenes commission make all its files public so that concerned Canadians can make their own determinations about who has been charged for what past crimes. "It is time to take the initiative out of the hands of a Royal Commission." That demand was foreseeable from the very inception of the commission and it is probable that Jewish organizations already have a list of every one named or allegedly implicated with Nazi anti-semitism.

In late March of 1987 the Globe and Mail carries a long letter to the editor by one Dave McIntosh entitled 'War probe sources deplored'. In part it reads as follows:

"A shocking aspect of the report of the Commission of Inquiry on War Criminals is the commission's admitted use of scores of anonymous letters and telephone calls, 'unspecified sources', 'documents or lists of unknown origin', and even a lost file to launch investigations into private citizens." "By my count, the commission has listed 44 cases in which anonymous letters, notes, telephone calls and 'materials' formed the basis for investigation. Eleven cases resulted from 'unspecified sources', seven from documents or lists of 'unknown origin', one from a source 'not clear' in the file and one lost file."

"In every case where the commission found no evidence of war criminality it recommended only that the file be 'closed', not destroyed. Moreover, hundreds of names were submitted by the commission to the departments of immigration, secretary of state (citizenship) and external affairs for checking and are no doubt in their files, if they weren't before."

"Seventy-one names put before the commission came from no more than newspaper reports, 'certain publications' and radio broadcasts. Forty-three of these names were submitted by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police which obviously runs an active clipping service."
"The commission itself acknowledged that many denunciations of individuals as war criminals stemmed from 'neighborly animosity', racial prejudice, mistaken belief and similar motivations. One denouncer named a storekeeper and his wife because they wouldn't divulge the source of the goods in their shop. One person denounced as a war criminal had died in Europe in 1938 before the Second World War started. Others had never left Canada in their lives, another was a year old in 1940. In one instance, a Canadian citizen's place of business had been vandalized [and defaced] with Nazi symbols and the commission ruled that this 'suspect' (its word) 'should be summoned by the appropriate authorities for interrogation on his wartime activities.' ...Is this the kind of commission we want to protect our individual rights and freedoms" (Globe and Mail, March, 1987).

No one replies to this letter.

There is a gap in my record of the Deschenes commission here but it goes on investigating alleged war criminals in Canada. It asks for an extension of another year to carry on its show but the Tory government will only approve a three month extension. This will take the investigations into its third year of operation. (Globe and Mail, May 24/86)

"Meanwhile, Nazi-hunter Sol Littman said Wednesday in Winnipeg the commission may turn out to be a political sham that Canadians are powerless to contest. 'The government apparently intends to wrap the commission in cement and bury it'. Littman, the Canadian representative for the Simon Wiesenthal Centre, [of Hollywood] told the University of Manitoba's Learned Societies conference, referring to a statement by federal archivist Bob Hayward that the commission's finding would not be made public." (Vancouver Sun, June 5/86) But Littman has his own 1,000 name list of authentic Canadian war criminal suspects to bandy about.

By January 7, 1987, the Mulroney Tory government, working with an overwhelming majority in parliament, indicates that it is ready to act on judge Deschenes recommendations. (Five years later it would be reduced from over 150 seats to a mere 2.) It hints that it will issue guidelines on what it intends to do with the 3,000, 300 or 30 Nazi war criminals said to be sheltering in Canada. Jewish organizations hold that a single former Nazi in Canada is one too many and that all efforts needed to root them out must be pursued regardless of the costs or consequences.

The Vancouver Sun of January 26/87 reports that lawyer John Sopinka believes that the Deschenes Commission, whose report is now in the hands of the government, documents that it has uncovered only 15 alleged Nazi war criminals. It has issued notices to these individuals of government intent to prosecute.

The Vancouver Sun of March 12/87 notes that the Deschenes commission entails some legal recommendations as well as cites some 20 persons in Canada who are suspected of being guilty of war crimes. War crimes committed by any non-Nazi forces were not investigated. Also not investigated were war crimes committed in the previous 40+ years. "In his 837 page report, Deschenes rejects estimates that war criminals in Canada may number in the tens of thousands, and especially rejects claims that Ukrainians who served in the 14th Waffen SS division should be considered suspects simply by virtue of having served" (Vancouver Sun, March 12/87).

However, the report suggests that a file on 218 other cases should be left open for further investigation. It holds that the prosecution of 20 alleged war criminals take place in Canada, if possible, and that "...Canadian law be amended to make involvement in war crimes grounds for denying citizenship and revoking it if it
has already been acquired. *No Canadian analogue of the American Office of Special Investigations should be contemplated.*

This report was later used to justify the pursuit of alleged war criminals, not through the courts but through Immigration Department hearings and deportations.

On March 15/87 David Matas pens an angry letter to the editor which is printed in the *Globe and Mail*. In brief it is an attack on an earlier letter by one T. Zakydalsky, who, he claims, has made an unwarranted attack on the US Office of Special Investigation and its procedures for prosecuting alleged Nazi war criminals.

Matas denounces Zakydalsky for suggesting that the information gathered by the Deschenes commission be kept secret rather than flaunted about as is done in the OSI/US cases. Matas says "...the letter repeats the canard that the United States strips suspects of citizenship on the minor charge of lying on their entry visas and then ships them outside for trial on war crimes. The letter ignores the fact that the United States, unlike Canada, can denaturalize and deport for participation in Nazi persecution. Every OSI case is launched on the basis of participation in Nazi persecution." At least as deemed by its head persecutor.

Matas specifically mentions the case of John Demjanuk, who was denaturalized and shipped to Israel for trial relating to his alleged role in concentration camps. This is a case which would later blow up in the hands of the Israelis, who had already sentenced Demjanuk to death when real American courts (and not any 'Special Investigation Office') intervened and threatened legal action against Israel unless Demjanuk was freed.

Matas ends his letter with "Canada should have its own OSI." (*Globe and Mail*, March 15/87) Then he or others like him could run it. The witch hunt now begins to pursue investigation of how those 20 (or 200 or 2,000) alleged war criminals got into Canada in the first place. This should provide fodder for a fresh batch of outraged researches.

On June 20/87 the *Globe and Mail* reports that Tory Minister of Justice Hnatyshyn is preparing changes in Canadian legislation to permit Nazi war criminals (but no others) to be tried in Canada. A second bill, not yet firmly spelled out, would make it easier to denaturalize and deport those suspected of having been involved in Nazi persecution in any way. This would allow the Department of Immigration and not the courts to play their role in keeping Canada morally clean. The Government will call its new law 'retrospective legislation' not 'retroactive legislation'.

Somewhat surprisingly, on July 1/87 Justice Minister Hnatyshyn, withdrew his proposed new legislation regarding alleged war criminals in Canada. Time ran out on the Parliamentary session and at least two Western Conservative MPs indicated that they would not provide the unanimous support needed to pass the bill post haste. Mr. Hnatyshyn blamed the Liberals for not helping to speed the bill through the House. He claims he will be back with the same bill the following session. (*Globe and Mail*, July 1/87)

In a classic example of paranoia and finding Nazi sympathizers and collaborators under every bed, Bert Raphael, a high panjandrum in the Canadian Jewish Congress writes the following letter to the *Globe and Mail* editor. After impugning the record of the Liberal St. Laurent government of the later 1940s and 1950s, he says he finds it incomprehensible that ministers of the Mulroney government could not bring two of their members into line to push through the new War Crimes bill. "To compound this affront, we now have the
acknowledgement that as recently as 1982, Nazi sympathizers within the RCMP allowed war criminals to immigrate to Canada. The Government of Canada refuses to identify those Mounties."

"As one who has had some involvement in the pursuit of Nazi war criminals in Canada and who mildly applauded the restrained and reserved recommendations of the Deschenes commission, I am appalled and disgusted by the inaction and stonewalling by our federal Government. ...Surely the least that the government could do is to quickly enact the enabling legislation so that at least one Nazi among us is brought to trial while he or she is still alive" (Globe and Mail, August 19/87). Right.

On October 8/87, the Globe and Mail reports on David Matas' recent book, Justice Delayed. Nazi War Criminals in Canada holds that "Witnesses are dying. The accused are dying. Memories are fading, and of course the accused may flee now that the legislation [the federal Government's law dealing with war crimes] is in place."

"Mr. Matas' book says that four decades of apathy, bureaucratic incompetence, political expediency and lingering anti-Semitism combined to allow Nazi mass murderers and their henchmen to find a haven in Canada free from prosecution."

Justice Delayed (1987) was written by two lawyers, David Matas and Susan Charendoff, who acted for B'nai B'rith at the Deschenes Commission. As one might expect, it finds 'Nazi war criminals' everywhere in Canada, hundreds if not thousands - their alleged sympathizers often running the show. Most of those hundreds of thousands who emigrated from Germany or Eastern Europe are all more or less suspect. "The book pulls no punches. And no one gets nailed as hard as Martin Low, the senior Ottawa bureaucrat who chaired an interdepartmental committee on war criminals in 1981. Low's legal opinions are described as 'far-fetched, flimsy and fantastical'. Matas describes Low's report as 'a lopsided analysis' that provided the federal Cabinet 'with every excuse to do anything about war criminals'."

Pierre Trudeau also gets bashed while "Justice department lawyer Ivan Whitehall, the man who went after Nazi-hunter Sol Littman publicly at the Deschenes Commission is described as caught up in 'misguided logic' and as being 'aggressive and abusive'," However, Brian Mulroney gets top marks for launching the Deschenes Commission. (Globe and Mail, October 31/67)

Justice Deschenes has urgently reminded the Canadian government that his commission identifies 20 persons who should be tried on war crimes charges and another 20 who should be further investigated. Meanwhile, "Ms. Holtzman [a member of the US House of Representatives] disagreed with the [Canadian] federal Government's decision not to set up an office of Special Prosecutions to specialize in these cases. She also expressed concern about the Government's decision to prosecute war criminals in Canada, rather than permitting deportations. Holocaust victims in European countries have a right to conduct these trials, she said."

"Moreover, by precluding the possibility of deportation, a suspect for whom there is insufficient evidence for a criminal conviction could remain in Canada, 'making a mockery of your efforts' ... 'In a way, the cards may be stacked for acquittal' Ms. Holtzman said.' Juries after all can acquit even when there is full evidence of guilt. Acquittals of alleged Nazi war criminals in Canada, based not on facts but on the jury's nullifying powers, would pervert history" (Globe and Mail November 5/87).
In other words, if the Office of Special Investigations lawyers accuse anyone, that person is guilty and no jury must be allowed to find otherwise! What an utterly reactionary bunch this lot is!

Another article in the *Globe and Mail* of November 5/87 deals with Allan Ryan, former head of the US Office of Special Investigations, and his charges to Canadians. At a Nuremberg memorial conference he holds that "The secret agenda of comparable [ethnic] groups in the United States was to try to abolish the Office of Special Investigations", said Allan Ryan, former director of the OSI. In Canada they have a chance to strangle the baby in the crib, he said. Whether they will succeed or not is still an open question."

"Mr. Ryan endorsed Canada's decision to prosecute war criminals at home. Many other countries cannot be depended on to prosecute after a deportation, he said, citing a US resident who was deported to Portugal where he will apparently live out his days 'lying on the beach'. Likewise, Mr. Ryan said, West Germany is unreliable and a senior official there once told him that 'West Germany is not interested in receiving war criminals from other countries'" (*Globe and Mail*, November 5/87).

Sabrina Citron is a Polish Jew who claims to have survived four years imprisonment as a 'slave laborer and as an internee in a number of concentration camps,' beginning at age thirteen. She came to Canada after that war and in the late 1970s began a career as a 'Nazi hunter'. She is the co-founder of the Canadian Holocaust Remembrance Association.

"She described some of her frustrations this week at a libel trial she initiated against Imre Finta, a 76 year-old retired Toronto restaurateur. She had accused him of having been a Hungarian police captain who had ordered the deportation of thousands of Jews to Nazi death camps."

Mrs. Citron said that after obtaining documents of the Simon Wiesenthal Centre organization [based in Hollywood], she released Mr. Finta's name. It was Mr. Finta's response in a *Toronto Sun* article that led to the libel award." In other words, she called him a mass murder, he said she was a liar, and he was fined $30,000 for doing so. She also launched a private legal suit against Ernest Zundel for claiming that the Holocaust is much exaggerated. (*Globe and Mail*, November 7/87)

"Frank Dimant, executive Vice president of B'nai B'rith Canada called the Finta case 'an unparalleled opportunity to teach Canadian society about the horrors of the Nazi holocaust" (*Globe and Mail*, December 11/87). There's no business like Shoah business.

And to end this brief overview of the Deschenes commission and the continuing hunt for Nazi war criminals in North America, an article by Allan Ryan, the former director of the US Office of Special Investigations. This was an agency which, quite outside the American courts, convicted and denaturalized scores of those accused of Nazi war crimes. Ryan is the author of *Quiet Neighbors. Prosecuting Nazi War Criminals in America*.

Against one of the central findings of the Deschenes Commission, Ryan raised the number of alleged war criminals in Canada to 'several thousand'. Canada's immigration policy "and its laxity in allowing almost anyone into the country during the post world war 2 period" also comes in for a blast. He writes that there is a great deal to do now that Canada has faced "the moral and political legacy of its postwar actions." He suggests that this country establish a special investigation agency like his own, to coordinate the hunt for world war 2 criminals. (*Globe and Mail*, January 12/88)
It demonstrates once again that propagandists can make anything out of very little and cover up current crimes by focusing on what happened elsewhere a half century previously. Many of those engaged in this witch hunt are the most fantasy-prone ethnic chauvinists imaginable. They have filled the courts and the newspapers with charges of war criminals under the bed in Canada for over thirty years when in fact their numbers were negligible. They have used their political influence to change the nation's laws to facilitate their ability to try whomever their target is.

Further hunts for war criminals in Canada

The *Vancouver Sun* of December 28, 1992, in an article entitled 'Nazi hunters target 20 in Canada' notes that the Canadian government intends to strip them of their Canadian citizenship. The 20 were chosen from a list of over a hundred others, said Peter Kremer, head of the Canadian Justice department's War Crimes investigation unit.

"Since the Criminal Code was amended in July 1987 to allow for the prosecution of alleged war criminals (of the proper sort) in Canada, the unit has only recommended four criminal prosecutions and they have yet to win one" (*Vancouver Sun*, December 28/92).

A year later the *Vancouver Sun* (July 23/93) runs an article it calls "Truth squad' to fight denial of Holocaust'." It notes that a group of Canadian academics and lawyers have banded together to fight 'holocaust denial', which has become the anti-semitism of the age. It calls for an organization to deal with anti-semitic propagandists to be established to hunt them down.

Such an organization actually is established and called the 'Canadian Task Force on Revisionism' and was launched with a $100,000 grant from the Federal government. A number of psychiatrists suggest a psychiatric 'thought modification' process to deal with all but the hard core false thought thinkers (*Vancouver Sun*, January 23/93). Is there no end to the degeneracy of this lot?

On January 26, 1996, the *Vancouver Sun* reports another alleged war criminal living in Hope, BC, the 90 year old Antanas Kenstavicius, who has lived in that village since 1953. One Efrawn Zueoff, self-described in his own book entitled *Occupation: Nazi Hunter*, discovered the old Lithuanian there in the early 1980s but had failed to get government support in bringing him to justice. "In 1982, Sol Littman did a study estimating there were about 3,000 Nazi war criminals living in Canada. He estimates about half of those are dead today (*Vancouver Sun*, January 26/96). These figures refer only to anti-Semitic war criminals from the second world war and do not include American, Jewish, Latin American and other war criminals in the fifty years since the end of that war.

A little over a month later the same newspaper provides an update of the Kenstavicius case. Sol Littman, a director of the Simon Wiesenthal Center (Toronto) "...said a member of the Jewish [Israeli] police force tracked Kenstavicius to Canada in May 1949... The presence of Kenstavicius has been known since 1949, but it's only in 1996 that he is finally being prosecuted" (*Vancouver Sun*, March 4/96). He was charged with being the commander of a Lithuanian unit which murdered 8,000 Jews during the 2nd world war.

In September of 1996 three elderly men, Erich Toblass, Helmut Oberlander, and Johann Dueck, ranging in age from 71 to 84, had their arraignment for war crimes dismissed by a senior judge because of the inordinate time the investigations were taking. Earlier that year a Federal report on the Canadian
judicial system held that the courts must speed up the trials and handling of judicial decisions.

"...Sol Littman of Toronto’s Simon Wiesenthal Center said 'it makes a mockery of justice in continuing the delays. We're fighting a biological clock' (Vancouver Sun, September 6/96). What he would like to see is a process where Jewish charges would be quickly followed by judicial punishment, without all the painful and time consuming bother of a trial.

"The situation prompted Ted Thompson, a senior Justice Department lawyer, to meet with Federal Court Chief Justice Julius Isaac in hopes of getting things moving. Bernie Farber, an official with the [Canadian] Jewish Congress, said the dismissal of the cases was an 'incredible over-reaction'...the whole fiasco caused even further delays in the cases ..." (Vancouver Sun, September 6/96).

Neal Sher is a Jewish-American witch hunter (born in the mid 1940s) who from 1979 until the early 1990s was the chief prosecutor for the US Department of Justice’s Office of Special investigations War Crimes unit. In that role he led the conviction and deportation of some 30 long time American immigrants, sometimes to countries where they would be imprisoned, at he very least. In one prominent case the suspect was sentenced by Israel to be executed. These deportations were often on the most spurious of 'evidence'. When Sher finally overreached himself on the Demjanuk case, he was judicially reversed by US courts. He left the Office of Special Investigations and soon landed a job advising witch hunters in Canada. Some years before his departure from the US Office of Special Investigations the Globe and Mail did a long article on him in August 17, 1989. It said:

The Office of Special Investigations was established by Congress in 1979 because of assorted pressures to go after alleged world war 2 criminals more thoroughly than had been the case in the preceding thirty years. The Office has a staff of about 40 people, including prosecutors, and after ten years of operation, at the cost of tens of millions of dollars, it has managed to strip about only 30 people of their US citizenship and deport them to foreign countries. About 600 more cases are under investigation.

This Office does not pursue any war crimes perpetrated by American or American controlled forces during the last fifty years.

"Most OSI cases involve Eastern European collaborators with the Nazis rather than former German citizens. This is largely because German records were generally available to immigration officials in the late 1940s, while lists of those who worked with the Germans in occupied countries such as Yugoslavia, Ukraine and the Baltic republics were destroyed or unavailable" (Globe and Mail, August 17/89).

East European groups in the US say that Sher is engaged in smearing entire communities in his pursuit of actual and alleged war criminals. 'He strenuously rejects all such arguments and doesn't even listen to them anymore. He does not publicly speculate on whether these complaints flow from a deep-seated anti-semitism.'

"Sher holds that many war criminals have escaped prosecution by dying before they could be brought to justice. But he is palpably impatient with Canada's slow progress in ferreting out those who committed war crimes against Jews. He "adds that Canada and other countries should not be deterred just because the 'small fry' are the only ones left" (Globe and Mail, August 17/89). He finally decided to leave his post in the Office of Special Investigations after his pursuit and deportation of John Demjanuk, who was sentenced to death in Israel,
was overturned by a ruling of a US appeals court which demanded that Demjanuk be returned to the US.

An article in the *Vancouver Sun* for August 20, 1997 entitled 'Canada Looks for help from US Nazi-hunter', notes that Canadian officials had approached Neal Sher, who headed the US Justice department's Office of Special Investigations (OSI) for 12 years until 1994. "He has been an outspoken critic of Canada's record on dealing with war criminals." After successfully deporting some 30 Americans charged with committing world war 2 crimes, Sher resigned from his top post following the fiasco of the Demjanuk case. Sher was also a leader in the political effort to have Kurt Waldheim barred from entering the US.

He apparently hadn't lost his star status in Canada. "Jack Silverstone of the Canadian Jewish Congress said his organization has been asking the government for years to bring in outside counsel to the war crimes unit and applauded the choice of Sher. 'Neal Sher is extremely knowledgeable on the matter and has demonstrated a lot of energy in bringing Nazi war criminals to justice', said Silverstone (*Vancouver Sun*, August 20/95).

So, Canada acquires a professional American witch hunter who left American prosecutions because of mounting evidence of his misconduct in those matters. But if he has the support of the Canadian Jewish Congress who would dare object.

Four months later Sher was appointed as a special consultant to the Canadian Department of Justice. The then Canadian minister of Justice, Anne McLellan, announced his appointment in a Toronto park which houses a Holocaust monument. "Neither Sher nor McLellan explained the exact nature of his role or how much time he will spend in Canada... Jewish groups applauded the appointment of Sher but said he shouldn't be seen as a 'panacea' for the problems plaguing the Canadian war crimes efforts" (*Vancouver Sun*, December 13/97).

Not surprisingly, Canadian Ukrainian groups strongly objected to Sher's appointment. 'Several Ukrainian groups say Ottawa shouldn't have gone anywhere near Sher because the OSI's 'unscrupulous' tactics in pursuit of suspected Nazi war criminals in the US have been 'discredited'. 'With the arrival of Neal Sher, well, Senator Joe McCarthy move over', says Eugene Harasymiw, president of the Alberta Self Reliance League, a lay organization of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church" (*Vancouver Sun*, January 26/97).

The Department of Immigration and Naturalization as well as the Department of Justice issued a report card on their efforts to track down and expel world war 2 war criminals in Canada. It said that it had investigated some 1,571 cases since 1987, including all the 883 cases mentioned in the Deschenes commission. Of these 880 cases have been closed, including the 363 suspects who died, and another 176 who have been classified inactive because no evidence could be found of their alleged guilt. Further investigation found that suspects in another 280 cases could not be tried because of lack of any evidence. Another 54 individuals were not in Canada and another 20 apparently never had been. In another 177 cases there was proof that the suspect had been a member of the Nazi party but there was no evidence that they had committed any war crime. Some 89 cases are considered to be active of which some 10 are now before the courts. Some 80 suspects have also been forced to flee Canada.

"Irwin Abella, chairman of the national Jewish organization's [Canadian Jewish Congress] war crimes committee said he was surprised so many cases have already been investigated' (*Vancouver Sun*, July 15/98).

In early June of 2005 (*Vancouver Sun*, June 7-11/05) the Canadian Department of Immigration revealed that it had 'prosecuted' (without trial) five
additional Canadian citizens for participation in 'war crimes' during World War 2. They were to be denaturalized and deported. One had been in Canada for fifty years. The Canadian government now goes the route of Immigration Department tribunals because in the past it has generally been stymied in proving its cases in the courts of law.

The five to be deported are all East European 'collaborators', which is now apparently another war crime. They include a 77 year old Polish man who in 1944 was briefly a 17 year old interpreter for German forces operating in his country. All this is presented on national television.

PART SIX
Chapter 12. Israeli Arms and Sales

Vanunu and Israeli Nuclear Weapons

Israel had been in the process of building nuclear weapons since the early 1960s, secretly throughout much of its history. They had acquired a small research reactor from France in the late 1950s and somewhat later smuggled some 200-300 tons of nuclear fuel (uranium) out of France. This involved some creative manipulation of export licences and a quick transfer of the material from a complicit French-flag carrier to Israel-owned ships at sea. This raised quite a ruckus in the French parliament, as did the Israeli theft of aircraft designs for the new French Mirage fighter plane. There was a marked cooling in relations between these two powers thereafter.

Later, Israel would acquire its nuclear materials from both the processing of low grade deposits on its own soil and from scattered sources abroad. Its 'research reactor' would be upgraded into a facility for creating the materials for nuclear weapons manufacture.

It is not at all certain when Israel began the production of nuclear weapons but sometime in the mid to later 1960s seems a likely date. By 1967 it probably already had them. By 1973, during the Egypt-Israel war, Israel had a stock of nuclear weapons. Then prime minister Golda Meir ordered some of them to be loaded aboard Israeli military aircraft on October 9/73, during the initial phases of the Egypt-Israel conflict.

Israel still refused to admit that it had nuclear weapons. They called those who said that Israel had such weapons were engaged in anti-Semitic slander. It is probable that Egypt's later recognition of Israel was at least partly based on her possession of nuclear weapons, against which Egypt was powerless. Israel may also have been involved in the research program which later gave white-rulled South Africa her own nuclear weapons. She had joined the exclusive club of the then half dozen nuclear powers in the world.

Although Israel's possession of nuclear weapons was known to the major secret services of the world, it was still a secret to the general public everywhere. By the mid 1980s Israel may have possessed some 200 'atomic bombs', although this figure is based on guess work. Given the extraordinary fanaticism of those in and close to power in Israel, it is a question under which conditions she would actually employ such arms.
In the early fall of 1986 a 31 year old Mordecai Vanunu, a middle echelon technician at the secret production facility of Machon 2 for ten years, photographed these atomic facilities and reported Israel's nuclear weapons program to various newspapers in Great Britain. The actual weapons were built at another facility at Dimona. Deep under the Negev desert Israel had been building atomic weapons for about 20 years by then. Israeli officials were shocked at what they considered his incomprehensible 'treachery'. By this time Vanunu had departed and was lodged in Great Britain.

His revelation also shocked some nuclear inspection experts in the UK because it not only documented that Israel had nuclear weapons but had had them for almost 20 years - it had become a major nuclear power. The plant at which Vanunu worked was equipped with French plutonium extraction equipment with the capacity of providing weapons material for some 10-20 nuclear devices a year. Vanunu's account was vetted by a number of nuclear physicists, some of whom had been involved in America's weapons production. They suggested that Israel's current weapons were likely to be smaller but also of greater power than the original atomic weapons used against Japan in 1945. They had interviewed Vanunu and had considered the 60 photographs he had taken and the notes he had assembled. Said one Frank Barnaby, a nuclear scientist who worked at the British nuclear installation at Aldermaston, "As a nuclear physicist it was clear to me that the details he gave me were scientifically accurate and clearly showed that he had not only worked on these processes but knows the details of the techniques. Also the flow rates through the plant, which he quotes exactly, confirm the quantities of plutonium that were being made" (London Sunday Times, October 5/86).

The Sunday Times noted that Israel wanted a weapon of last resort should her conventional forces ever be overwhelmed. She had the capacity to deliver such weapons wherever she wished in the Middle East.

It was revealed that Vanunu was a Moroccan-born Jew who worked in the Machon 2 production facility which, along with a number of others such facilities, is located on the Beersheba-Sodom road in the desert of southern Israel. He had been born in Marrakesh, the son of a small shop owner, but had emigrated to Israel with his family in 1963. Since then he had served three years in the Israeli army and had become a technician at the Dimona facilities since 1976.

"Dimona was secretly built by France between 1957 and 1964. It was originally claimed to be a textiles plant by Israel. When, in 1960, an American U2 spy plane photographed it for the first time, the incoming president, John Kennedy, forced the then Israeli prime minister, David Ben Gurion, to submit to regular inspectors to ensure that Dimona's purpose remained peaceful nuclear research. Those visits gave Kennedy's successor, Lyndon Johnson, sufficient assurance to publicly declare that Dimona really was a civilian reactor" (London Sunday Times, October 5/86). President DeGaulle added his reassurances that the technology delivered to Israel could not be used to upgrade the plant to a nuclear production facility.

The key upgrade needed to make weapons grade material was the installation of a Plutonium separation plant. Somehow Israel managed to build or acquire such separation facilities, along with new techniques requiring smaller amounts of plutonium for bomb making. This gave it the capacity to build a substantial number of nuclear weapons.

Vanunu's account documented Israel's capacity beyond any doubt. The London Sunday Times (October 5/86) story is packed with the specifics of the nuclear manufacturing process and details of the plants around Dimona. These
were vetted by British nuclear scientists. I won't go into them here except to note that the plutonium recovery rate was some 40 kilograms per year, enough for some twenty nuclear weapons. The plant also produces tritium (H3), which gives it the potential for producing weapons far more powerful than the original atomic bomb.

If the estimates given are even approximately correct this would suggest an Israeli nuclear arsenal of some 200 weapons in 1986. This would put it behind the 300 to 700 weapons estimates for China, France and Great Britain, and far less than the circa 35,000 weapons possessed by the Soviet Union and the United States of America.

Shimon Peres, the leading 'dove' and then outgoing Prime Minister of Israel, had ten days previously held a conference with the leading Israeli newspapers, notifying them of a probable leak about Israel's nuclear program and also warning them that the Official Secrets Act still applied on any publication about such facts.

Vanunu, tracked by the Israeli secret service, had originally fled to Australia but had moved to London when his claims were being investigated by British newspapers. He wanted to sell his scoop but the British newspapers were initially doubtful until expert testimony convinced them that they were dealing with the real stuff. "His testimony is totally convincing," said Barnaby.

Israeli Prime Minister Shimon Perez said that "..today a newspaper report alleging that Israel has been stockpiling atomic weapons is 'sensationalistic' and he said Israel will not introduce such weapons to the Middle East" (Vancouver Sun, mid October/86). No one noted that his nose had grown noticeably longer. Israel had consistently held that its two nuclear reactors were not used to produce nuclear weapons. The Israeli embassy in London said "They [the reports of nuclear weapons manufacture in Israel] have no basis in fact and therefore there is no need for further evidence."

By this time Israel had managed to kidnap Vanunu from Great Britain, allegedly through the services of one of their agents who sexually enticed Vanunu and had facilitated his kidnapping. Mr. Vanunu was reported as last seen leaving the Mountbatten hotel in central London, where he was being put up by the Sunday Times, on September 30/86. The Vancouver Sun reported that "As Israeli sources tell it, when Mossad got wind of Vanunu's whereabouts they arranged for a woman friend to lure him on a trip through Europe. On the Mediterranean, he was persuaded to board a yacht and once in international waters was arrested by the crew of Mossad agents and then returned to Israel" (Vancouver Sun, October 18/86). This sounds like an Israeli-Hollywood script.

It was later revealed that Margaret Thatcher herself had been informed of these steps and had given them her tacit support. Vanunu had made a serious error by going to Britain if he expected to be protected by the law.

Senior Israeli officials said that "Mr Vanunu was abducted on British soil and that Foreign Minister Shimon Perez had discussed the abduction with Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher of Britain. This left Israeli leaders feeling that if they did not issue a formal denial and clarification of Mr. Vanunu's status they would embarrass Mrs. Thatcher." They held that even in a secret trial Mr. Vanunu's presence in Israel would become widely known. (New York Times, November 1/86)

Vanunu was held incognito in a secret Israeli jail waiting for his secret 'trial'. At this point it was revealed that he was a member of the Israeli Communist party and had been active in pro-Palestinian demonstrations in the past. On November 5/86 Yitzak Shamir, the former Stern gang terrorist and now Israel's new right-
wing prime minister, defended the policy of blanking out all reports of and information about Mr. Vanunu. "It has its reasons. The Israeli government will say what she thinks is correct and will fulfill all obligations toward its citizen' he said."

From other Israeli quarters one heard that "Mordecai Vanunu is a traitor', a left-wing Member of Parliament, Yossi Sarid, said. 'As a traitor he must be brought to trial. I am not concerned how he is brought. The trial must be held behind closed doors. But one thing must not happen; a man cannot just disappear. Apparently there was a serious failure here. A failure that can't be dealt with by silence or covering up'." (New York Times, November 5/86) Mordecai Kremnitzer, a law professor at Hebrew university, noted that Mr. Vanunu could be tried and sentenced in secret and without the public's knowledge under Israeli law. "It can be done legally and in secret. There are precedents, not many, but there are precedents', he said."

On November 10/86, Israel finally admitted they were holding Vanunu. A clamp down of all reports relating to Mr. Vanunu was in effect in Israel where "[Military] censors are empowered to suppress stories that they believe damage Israeli security." (Globe and Mail, November 10/86) The London newspaper, the Observer, reported that Shimon Perez had phoned Margaret Thatcher on September 23 of that year to inform her of the plan to abduct Vanunu and asked that British intelligence service agents not interfere. They didn't. (Vancouver Sun, November 10/86)

On December 1/86, a small notice in the New York Times notes that Vanunu had been arraigned and charged before a Jerusalem district court on one count of treason and two counts of espionage. All that because he made Israel's nuclear program public. If convicted of any of these charges he could face either the death penalty or life in prison. No one questions that Vanunu's revelations are true or that Israel had been vehemently lying about its nuclear program for the previous twenty years.

On December 22 Vanunu manages to communicate with the outside world for the first time by writing a brief message on the palm of his hand and showing it to reporters while being brought to the courtroom. The message conveys that he was abducted in Rome. Following this he is screened by a sheet while being moved from prison to courthouse. He is being kept in solitary confinement before he goes to trial in an Israeli district court under one Judge Zvi Cohen. (New York Times, December 23/86)

Coincidentally, an Israeli Justice ministry inquiry has absolved Yitzak Shamir of ordering the murder of two Arab bus highjackers in 1984 when he was the head of state. He had been charged by the former head of Shin Bet (the Israeli internal secret service), one Avraham Shalom, of being implicated in the killings and the following cover-up. The two bus highjackers, 17 and 18 years of age, had not killed anyone but were captured and beaten to death by Shin Bet agents. The five agents involved had already been cleared of any crime. (New York Times, December 28/86) These findings came down on the same day Mr. Vanunu pled not guilty to the charges of treason and espionage laid against him.

On February 17/87 Norway asked Israel to allow Norwegian inspectors to verify that the 20 tons of 'heavy water' it had shipped to Israel under a 1959 agreement banning its use in weapons production had been adhered to. "Heavy water, or deuterium oxide, is used to allow nuclear reactors to run on natural uranium, which is widely available, rather than on enriched uranium, which is scarce and tightly controlled. A by-product of nuclear reactions is plutonium,
which can be used to make bombs ...Some American researchers believe that the Norwegian heavy water has been used by Israel to make bombs at the Dimona installation." (New York Times, February 17/87) This request was never granted.

Mordecai Vanunu's brother, Meir Vanunu, has gone to Great Britain to quiz British newspapers about his brother's abduction by Israel. Israeli army radio reported that a warrant for his arrest has been issued in Israel, although he does not expect to return there, holding that he is now a political refugee. (Globe and Mail, August 25/97)

On September 1/87 John Gellner, a 'defence analyst' writing in the Canadian Defence Quarterly, tries to put the best spin possible on the Vanunu case, claiming that his revelations had actually increased Israel's nuclear status in the region. It made it clear to Israel's neighbors that it possesses an ultimate 'deterrent to aggression'. This balance will only prevail as long as Israel is the sole nuclear power in the region, which accounts for its 'preventative' bombing of Iraq's Osirak nuclear facility in 1981. (Globe and Mail September 1/87)

On September 1/87, Vanunu's actual trial starts. The evidence and arguments made there will be kept strictly secret, no hint of how the case is proceeding will be leaked to the world press. His lawyer, Avigdor Feldman, holds that he cannot discuss any of the evidence or arguments raised. (Globe and Mail, September 17/87)

On September 8/87, the New York Times publishes a foreign affairs commentary by Flora Lewis, who notes that Vanunu did not commit treason or espionage by any reasonable definition but simply acted as his conscience directed in making public what had long been suspected. Comparing Vanunu to a Soviet proponent of non proliferation Lewis says "By wit and personal risk, not by violence or deception, both men tried to send messages to the world against war and the hatreds that others work so hard to inflame. The law is stern and they are obligated to submit, but they were not dishonorable."

Lewis compares their acts with the systematic lying and self-righteousness which launched America into wars in the recent past. She ends by saying "It is bad to break laws. It is worse to be without a conscience, for a person or a nation."

The Globe and Mail reports that 'Vanunu wins Alternative Nobel'. The awards were established in 1980 by a Swedish-German philanthropist to recognize those whom the official Nobel prize invariably overlooked. Along with other recipients of the award, "The jury honored Vanunu 'for his courage and self-sacrifice in putting his loyalty to humanity first' said a statement issued by the Bradford research office. Vanunu, 32, faces a possible death sentence for telling a British newspaper about a top-secret nuclear installation in southern Israel." (Globe and Mail, October 10/87)

Meir Vanunu, the defendant's younger brother and a lawyer, was touring western nations trying to drum up support for his brother. While in Toronto he described the stringent conditions under which Mordecai Vanunu was being held and filled in some of the specifics about his kidnapping. Apparently Mordecai was injected with an anesthetic drug by two Israeli agents when he reached Rome, smuggled aboard an Israeli motor vessel and delivered to Israel in chains. In this way any possible extradition hearings in Britain or Italy were avoided. He said that he and his family had been warned by the Israeli police "...not to discuss details of the case with anyone lest they face prosecution and a possible sentence of 18 years in prison."

"He [Meir Vanunu] appeared uncomfortable when asked about the reaction of Jewish communities outside Israel to his campaign. 'Generally' he said, 'the North
American Jewish community is conservative in aspects of defence and security. They usually take a stand on supporting Israel on these issues (Globe and Mail, November 18/87). Meaning that they support Israel 200% in whatever it does.

On December 5/87, the Vancouver Sun presents a wide ranging account entitled 'Inquiries spur fears Israeli system biased'. It noted 1) that the alleged concentration camp guard, John Demjanuk, was being tried in a court which operated like a Roman circus. This continued even after evidence that they had the wrong man surfaced. 2) That Mordecai Vanunu was being tried totally in secret, in which neither the evidence nor the arguments made were permitted to be known to the public. That the real charge against him was that he was telling the truth. 3) An inquiry found that in the past 16 years, Shin Bet, the internal secret security force, has tortured Palestinian prisoners until they confessed to assorted crimes. "Shin Bet operatives regularly torture prisoners and then perjure themselves when confessions are challenged." One Israeli law professor noted that the police agents are above the law. He said "Until now they have denied that torture takes place. Now they are saying it does but it is OK."

"In a judgement last spring that led to the Landau inquiry, the Supreme Court overturned the espionage and treason conviction of Lieut. Izat Nafsu, a member of the the border police. It found that Nafsu, who had already served seven of an 18 year sentence, had been tortured by Shin Bet officers who then lied to both civilian and military courts." This affair followed an investigation into the deaths of two Palestinian captives who were beaten to death by Shin Bet officers. "Instead of facing charges, 11 Shin Bet men, including chief Avraham Shalom who ordered the Palestinians clubbed to death, were granted presidential pardons."

"...it is estimated that Shin Bet 'confessions', written in Hebrew, led to the conviction of 90 percent of the 4,000 Arabic-speaking Palestinians now in Israeli prisons. Few appeals are expected in the wake of the Landau inquiry. According to Kuttab [a member of the 'Law in the Service of Man' organization] the high failure rate and longer sentences convinced Palestinian lawyers years ago only to challenge confession in extreme cases" (Vancouver Sun, December 5/87). It would be difficult to construct a more damning testimony against a nation's police service than this.

The Globe and Mail reports that Shimon Peres provided a one hour testimony at the end of Vanunu's trial. Avigdor Feldman, Mr. Vanunu's lawyer, afterwards said that "...the testimony was curtailed by a gag order issued by Prime Minister Yitzak Shamir, that prevented Mr. Peres from answering questions in five areas. Mr. Feldman said that he could not disclose what the subjects were, but he described them as central to the case."

Mr. Peres was the last witness for the prosecution in this caricature of a trial by a kangaroo court. There is a period of a little more than a month while the august three member court panel reflects on the secret testimony, evidence and arguments presented. (Globe and Mail, January 7/88)

On March 24/88 the panel which is to decide on the evidence presented in the seven month secret trial comes to a decision. Of the 60 page verdict only one sentence is permitted to be published. They find Vanunu guilty on both charges of espionage and treason. He is sentenced to 18 years of imprisonment but not to death.

Mordecai Briemberg, the former chairman of the P.S.A. department at Simon Fraser University, writes a long article in the Globe and Mail of September 30/88. In it he summarizes the appalling conditions under which Mordecai Vanunu is being held, and the complete secrecy in which his trial had been held. Vanunu's
younger brother is on the run in Europe because he publicized the workings of the 'court' and the charges against his brother - another serious crime in Israel.

Briemberg raises the question of the post war Nuremberg tribunal, which held that a citizen had the duty to oppose a state's actions if that state goes beyond certain limits. He holds that clandestinely producing nuclear weapons, which is what Israel had done for 25 years, is beyond that limit and that Vanunu had a right to bring that matter into the open. However, "The Israeli government, by illegal and heavy-handed efforts, is trying to transform what is now confirmed back into mere rumor."

A number of prominent individuals world wide have come to Vanunu's defence, although this apparently does not phase the Israeli government. Briemberg notes that while America and the Soviet Union are trying to arrange for a gradual nuclear disarmament Israel continues to test its nuclear weapons and its bomb carrying missiles. He suggests that Israel also has a contingency plan for a nuclear attack on the Soviet Union, to say nothing of its military plans directed against its middle-eastern neighbors.

"On whose decision does the use of nuclear weapons fall? That question was asked by an Israeli legislator some years previously, but as yet has not been answered. Mordecai Vanunu tried, in his own way, to raise the question of Israeli nuclear weapons and the control over them. It is for that that he was sentenced to prison for 18 years." (Globe and Mail, September 30/88)

As yet there is no indication o who the master minds were who created the Israeli atomic bomb and its infrastructure. Or if, by the mid 1960s, any 'master minds' were needed to construct such weapons.

Mr. Vanunu serves his entire 18 year sentence without any remissions. Somewhat surprisingly, he actually leaves his Israeli prison alive and seemingly in some sort of stable mental health despite the long periods of solitary confinement and the psychological pressures he has undergone. While he is freed from prison he is not truly free since he is encumbered by a host of restrictions about who he may associate with, where he may go, and what activities he may engage in.

All this happened almost 20 years ago and Israel today must have the equivalent of some 400 nuclear weapons, assuming that her nuclear program has not expanded in the intervening years. She also has the capacity to deliver them almost wherever she likes, certainly throughout Europe and the Middle East. All that Israel lacks now are intercontinental ballistic missiles with a world-wide reach. These cannot be too far off. Who is to say what some Jewish fanatic, should one come to power, might do with such weapons. It is like having an aggressive Ayahtollah Komeni with a large stock of nuclear weapons. No country is safe with such a force in the world.

**Merchants of Death. Israeli Military Sales and Training to Third World Dictators**

By the late 1970s Israel had emerged as one of the major arms merchants in the world. It supplied a wide range of weapons, from small arms, to artillery and military aircraft, including bombs, and spare/repar parts in all variety. Arms manufacture and sales became a major industry in Israel, outranked only by tourism and foreign aid transfer payments. Her customers included many of the right-wing tyrants in the western world. In addition to the arms provided were service contracts for training armed forces and private militias in such countries, both in the use of Israeli weapons but also in their suppression of their own restive populations.
A partial listing of her clients included death-squad Guatemala and El Salvador, Somoza’s Nicaragua, Panama, Colombia, and General Pinochet’s Chile. They included white-ruled South Africa, the Shah of Iran (on a sub rosa basis), and the government forces in Ceylon. She also had had contracts to provide military training for a number of countries in Africa, including Uganda, where she once had instructed the murderous dictator Idi Amin. Ethiopia under Emperor Haille Selassie also received Israeli military support.

Israel’s major client in Africa, however, was Apartheid South Africa, with whom she cooperated to build modern jet fighters, mobile heavy artillery and even aided in creating Africa’s first atomic weapon. All of these nations used their arms primarily to suppress their own people. Israel’s sales were based on the principle of ‘cash on the barrel head.’ Israel and Jewish organizations abroad would later pursue suppliers of materials to Nazi Germany during world war 2. Any suggestion that Israel was doing the same thing on a world scale would be totally unacceptable.

Since the late 1960s and the 1970s Israel had been the recipient of massive American military aid, or at least aid funds which went into purchasing American arms. Israel’s forces were initially equipped with American infantry weapons; she also acquired the Middle East’s largest tank force. Her military aircraft were predominantly American. Her own production of military air craft relied on a modified version of the French Mirage fighter, whose production plans she had stolen from a Swiss supplier in the mid 1960s. By the end of the 1970s Israel was offering these and her own new weapons for sale to purchasers around the world. She was also working on a new ‘cruise missile’, a jet powered, long range missile which followed the earth’s contours at very low altitudes and thereby avoided enemy tracking systems. It was Israel’s vaunted contribution to ‘defense of the free world’.

On October 12/82, the Globe and Mail reported on a number of new kinds of weaponry developed by the United States, including a kind of cluster bomb which disperses to knock out tanks. These have been transferred to Israel. "They apparently were issued to Israel for defence of Israeli territory but not for aggressive missions. Instead, it seems, they have been used against Syrian, Lebanese and Palestine Liberation Organization troops, both as an anti-armor weapon and for antipersonnel purposes. There were complaints from Middle East countries against their use early in the [Lebanese] campaign when civilians were killed..." (Globe and Mail, October 12/82).

Such cluster bombs are delivered by Israeli heavy artillery and rockets, by manned aircraft and by guided drones. They also spread small land mines over target areas. For instance, a shell designed for a 155 mm shell contains anywhere from 36 to 88 mines which scatter on detonation. Each of these mines disperses a net of fine wires around wherever they land. Someone activates the mine by stepping on a wire and the mine fires a powerful grenade into the air which then explodes and releases hundreds of lethal splinters. The victim may not even know he or she has been hit, until they collapse due to loss of blood caused by external or internal injuries. Israel showered Beirut with thousands of such bombs during its shelling of the city in the summer of 1982. The report details a number of such technological marvels recently acquired by the Israeli 'Defence' forces. (Globe and Mail, October 12/82)

On April 5/84, the Globe and Mail runs an article entitled 'Arms exports crucial to Israel'. It notes that Israeli arms exports are now earning more that $1 billion a year and have become a crucial factor in Israel’s economy - according to
reports from the Jaffee Centre for Strategic Studies in Tel Aviv. A professor Aharon Klieman, attached to that centre, notes that "...there is a need for preserving diplomatic and political interests which shouldn't be shunted aside by economic concerns." What he means by this apparently is that Israel should not necessarily support brutal tyrants abroad even if it is selling them military supplies.

"The arms industry in Israel grew from about $50 million in 1975 to about $1 billion in 1982-83, the study says. Israel now ranks twelfth among the world's military suppliers, in recent years selling to more than 20 countries, primarily in Latin America and Africa..." It may be 12th in the world but its per capita contributions to the small Israeli economy is crucially important.

The report says that the arms industry in Israel involves more than 150 companies and employs more than 60,000 workers, some 18 percent of Israel's industrial labor force. *(Globe and Mail*, April 9/84)

A full page article by Patrick Martin in the *Globe and Mail*, March 30/85, asks is 'Israel's war machine out of control?' Beginning with Israel's allegedly heroic role in fending off its "150 million Arab neighbors" during the late 1940s he notes that its primary source of weapons until 1967 was France, which thereafter banned weapons exports to Israel. Since then, in addition to the acquisition of masses of American military equipment, Israel has expanded its arms and military aircraft production. They produced the Gabriel and Jericho missiles, the Kfir fighter, the Uzi and Galil military rifles, plus a host of technical equipment ranging from long-range night vision sensors to improved tanks and artillery. "All together, the arms makers employ one out of every four Israeli industrial workers and spend 30 percent of the country's gross national product - between 5 and 10 times the percentage expenditure of any western industrialized nation."

Some charge that those directing such companies have, to a large extent, taken over political decision making in Israel. A number of influential people in Israel now "...argue that 'The 'People of the Book', as the Jewish people describe themselves, have become 'The People of the Sword'" ..."The emergence of this military-industrial complex has far-reaching implications not only for the Israeli economy but also for the country's foreign relations and for its internal system of social and ethical values."

Some seven to eight years previously the Israel Aircraft Industries, the largest of the arms manufacturers, had convinced Menachem Begin to order a new twin engine fighter-bomber. No public discussion was involved. This turned into the Lavi project which ten years after its inception would wind up being scrapped because America would no longer pay the cost for producing it.

"The military has another idea however. By increasing the volume of arms exports it believes Israel can pay for the expensive weapons production at home. As Ahron Klieman documented last year in a report to the influential Jaffee Centre for Strategic Studies, arms exports have increased dramatically from $50 million US worth in 1972 to more than $800 million in 1982. Israel is now the world's seventh largest arms supplier." The increasing economic imperative or these sales has meant that "the trade in arms has taken on a life of its own." *(Globe and Mail*, March 30/85)

One Mr. Neubach, another Israeli specialist in Strategic Affairs, held that "The sphere of arms exports is hidden from the public view and usually from that of the Knesset as well. Sometimes the cabinet itself may be unaware of developments."
The international debts created by Israel's arms build up have resulted in its attempts to sell its arms wherever it can. "Excessive export policies generate international resentment of Israel, and the people here, believing that everyone hates them, demand more weapons to ensure their security."

That would be a liberal gloss on Israel's murderous policies at home and abroad and the blind support they receive from overseas Jews.

On June 18/86 the New York Times reported that the US was having some second thoughts about Israel's development of its new fighter aircraft. The report states that Israel has been by far the leading recipient of US military assistance and since October 1984 these loans have been granted with the understanding that they never had to be repaid. However, recently Israel's new Lavi fighter plane had become a point of contention between the Pentagon and Israel's Defence Ministry. The US had already invested $1.7 to $2 billion in its development. The cost overruns in Israel had been astronomic and the US financial analysts were investigating the figures involved.

Caspar Weinberger, the US Defence Secretary, noted that the cost over-runs in the Lavi project appear to come to over 7 million per plane for a total cost of 22 million per unit. He held that other alternatives needed to be investigated. This presumably meant that US military aircraft producers were pressing the Defence Department about funding their competitors. Officials said Israel could keep its research on the Lavi going under established aid funds but that its production, expected later in the year, would run into severe funding problems - competing as it does with other funds for Israeli military assistance. Israel had planned to build about 300 Lavi fighters between 1987 and the end of the century. Its builder, Israel Aircraft, is Israel's largest industrial concern. One source estimated that some 70% of Israel's defence budget was devoted to military aircraft.

On July 5 and July 9/86 the New York Times reports that Israeli authorities have resisted subpoenas issued by Federal grand juries in Iowa and Pennsylvania requiring Israelis to testify in cases involving the illegal transfer of US military cluster bomb technology. "The Israelis offered 'vigorous' protests to Mr. Trott [a U.S. Justice Department official] and asserted that at least some of the subpoenaed Israelis were protected by diplomatic immunity. Those in charge of the Iowa and Pennsylvania investigations said it was unsure if the subpoenaed Israelis would appear in court. (New York Times, July 5/86)

On July 9/86 the New York Times reported that the US Customs Service had executed search warrants on three US firms held to have produced and illegally shipped cluster bombs to Israel. Eight Israelis who worked in that country's military procurement in New York were also subpoenaed. The firms searched were the Vector Corporation, Bexco International of Iowa, and Assembly Machines Inc. of Pennsylvania. The records of 12 other firms were also subpoenaed. "The case is the latest in a series of incidents in which Israelis have been implicated in the theft of American technology or intelligence information. Last month a former Navy analyst, Jonathan Jay Pollard, pleaded guilty to spying for Israel. In May 1985 a Federal grand jury indicted a California business executive on charges of illegally exporting to Israel 800 devices that can be used as triggers in nuclear bombs. And last December, Customs officials raided three companies in search of evidence that a technology for making tank cannon barrels had been illegally exported." (New York Times, July 9/86)

The case of Jonathan Pollard was as follows. Raised as a more or less secular Jew in the US, he had come to develop a great attachment to the State of Israel as a teenager during the late 1960s. After proceeding through college and landing a
job with Naval intelligence he had been engaged in high level spying for Israel, that is, delivering American military procedures to that state. He was discovered, investigated and charged in 1984 for divulging highly sensitive information to a foreign power and in June of 1986, after a long trial, he was sentenced to some thirty years of imprisonment. His Israeli minders did not go to bat for him and rapidly removed themselves from the reach of American investigations.

Outraged indignation surfaced in Israel's parliament and a grass roots campaign briefly surged through that nation charging America with anti-Semitism. However influential right-wing American Jewish commentators, such as the New York Times' William Safire, turned their fury on Israel and asked what they thought they were doing spying on Israel's closest ally? Israeli public opinion quickly simmered down when they realized that for once they didn't have the automatic support of America's Jewish lobby. Pollard was still in prison during the Bush No. 2 administration, although efforts were being made to grant him clemency. Now, to return to the case of American military technology in Israeli hands.

"The [Israeli] Ministry of Defence, headed by Yitzhak Rabin, said in an official statement this morning that it had carried out an internal check after there were reports by American news organizations that the United States Justice Department was investigating charges that Israel had bought American technology and smuggled it into that country. "The results of the check", the military statement said, "have made it clear that those claims published by US media were unfounded. The Ministry of Defense also resolutely determined that there was no case here of unlawful technological export." After Israeli's denial only an anti-Semite could pursue that charge.

"A senior Israeli official said that Israel was becoming convinced that someone in the Justice Department was 'out to get Israel'" (New York Times, July 10/86). However, Israeli use of American cluster bombs in the invasion of Lebanon is rather difficult to account for.

On July 17 President Botha of South Africa unveiled his nation's newest military aircraft, the Cheetah, which was based on designs for France's Mirage 3, provided by Israeli designers and engineers. It was compared by some observers to Israel's Kfir fighter, also based on the Mirage. Mr. Botha boasted that it demonstrated South Africa's ability to produce its own arms if needed. "Israel and South Africa are said to have close military and intelligence ties, but details are not made public" (New York Times, July 17/86).

On March 28/87, in a tiny blurb, the Globe and Mail reported that Israeli arms sale to South Africa alone totalled between $600 and $800 million in the previous year (Globe and Mail, March 26/87).

In a report entitled 'Jet fighter not essential to Israel, general says', the Globe and Mail notes that a General Levy was addressing the Israeli foreign affairs and defence committee. This followed discussions about US funding with US deputy Undersecretary of Defence Dov Zakheim. "Mr. Zakheim is trying to persuade Israel to switch to a less expensive, US manufactured, warplane and has presented Foreign Affairs Minister Shimon Peres with a report that suggests five alternative aircraft... an Israeli official said Mr. Zakheim rebutted arguments that cancelling the Lavi would throw many skilled Israelis out of work. He said their jobs would be secured if the US F-16 were manufactured in Israel" (Globe and Mail, January 7/87). Wonderful.

In a piece entitled 'Israelis are in demand as the best security guards' the Globe and Mail notes the explosion of private police services offered by Israelis
overseas. It portrays one Beni Tal, a 28 year old who had been dismissed from the Shin Bet, along with eleven others, some years earlier merely because they had beaten to death two Palestinian youths who had surrendered after a bus jacking. Mr. Tal now runs one of Israel's senior private security agencies. "Private agencies [abroad] now have some of Israel's leading security people on their payrolls. The New York Daily News reported that a $75,000 contract to review security procedures in Newark, Kennedy and La Guardia airports was signed under an assumed name by Avraham Shalom, a former chief of Shin Bet now working for a private Israeli security agency. Mr. Shalom turned to the private sector after losing his job for perjuring himself during an investigation into the murder of two suspected terrorists during interrogation."

A Mr. Tal, who operates another of Israel's overseas' security agencies says the following: "We are always asked to adopt fake identification so that the client can avoid the political embarrassment of maybe having to explain why he uses foreign and especially Israeli security men." "We charge $10,000 to draw up a program for the client and then charge $2,000 a day"...The applicant must be cleared with SIBAT, the Israeli defence ministry's security aid and advice bureau. SIBAT controls the sale abroad of arms and classified security material - anything from bugging devices to special techniques for armed combat. At any one time Mr. Tal has 11 of his 16 man security teams working abroad. A half dozen other agencies have between 20 to 100 agents overseas. Because of the expense, they all train local guards to take over their function after a contracted period." In short, they train private thugs to act for private firms.

"Another Tel Aviv agency, called Blue and White, advertises its wares on a billboard outside its office buried in a shabby apartment block off Dizengoff Street. The proprietor is one Eli Ratz, a former police detective and paratroop sergeant, who says 80 percent of his men abroad work with Jewish communities afraid of Palestinian terrorists. His customers include politicians in Third World countries but he would not identify them. 'We defend the bodies of heads of state, not their governments.'" (Globe and Mail, June 4/87)

On July 22, Israel reported testing a new, longer-range missile which could reach most Arab capitals in the region. The range of the Jericho 2 missile is about 900 miles, more than double that of its predecessor, of which at least a hundred are deployed on the Syrian border. (New York Times, July 22/87)

In an August 17/87 report the New York Times notes that the Israeli cabinet of combined Herut and Labour ministers have decided to put off a decision on what to do with its Lavi fighter-bomber project. Apparently the Israeli army, the air force and the finance department had come out against its development and in favour of acquiring the most up-to-date American aircraft. It appears that the $1.5-$1.8 billion which had already been sunk into the Lavi project had all come from American aid funds. "At a time when the Zionist revolution [...] seems to be drifting a bit at middle age the Lavi has come to symbolize, for many Israelis, the old audacious spirit of striving and achieving far beyond their means - something that seemed to be a hallmark of Israel in its youth." So multi-million dollar fighter planes were a hallmark of Zionism's youth?

On September 2/87 the New York Times notes that 'Israel Faces Reality' in its decision to close down development and production of its Lavi aircraft. Despondency is widespread and displaced aircraft workers storm government buildings and block roads throughout the country. "The principle that 'If you will it, it is no dream' is cheap for politicians and costly for the public', said Yaron Ezrahi, a university political theorist." The positions of the Likud and the Labour
party are indistinguishable on the Lavi matter, as in most other polices. However, Ariel Sharon has begun campaigning on the theme that the Labour party was hopelessly weak on the defence of Israel. (New York Times, September 2/87) On the following day Moshe Arens, an aeronautical engineer, cabinet minister, and Likud member resigned from the government. Hundreds of workers from the Israel Aircraft company gathered at Jerusalem's wailing wall carrying mock coffins of Yitzhak Peres and Yitzhak Shamir. (New York Times, September 3/87)

In 1987 some 13,000 more Jews emigrated from Israel, (presumably the majority to the US) than immigrated to it. This was soon to be reversed by the massive emigration of Russian Jews to Israel after the self-imposed destruction of the Soviet Union by its leaders. It is to be noted that the $800 million annual arms sales by Israel should be placed against the $600 billion dollar annual military budget racked up by the US.

"...Israel is insisting that Washington keep its promise to maintain the level of military aid for the next two years, Defense minister Yitzhak Rabin said today. 'We believe that the [US] Administration is committed to us as a result of the decision on the part of the Government of Israel to end the Lavi project, to maintain the present level of military assistance to Israel for the coming two years...". (New York Times, October 29/87) There is something remarkably strange about such demands.

Not quite a year later Israel launches its own space program putting its own satellite into orbit and making it independent of American satellite information. The initial probe was geared to collecting scientific data of various sorts but the program is believed to have been developed to provide Israel with its own spy satellites. The Israeli press is full of reports suggesting that. "'Who said anything about spying?', Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir said rather boastfully after a cabinet meeting."(New York Times, September 30/88)

Near the end of its reign the Reagan administration announced that it had extended diplomatic immunity to 45 representatives of the Israeli military purchasing office in New York. Now they can't be questioned, their offices searched, or tried for inducing US arms companies to manufacture and export military hardware to Israel illegally. It means that they are effectively beyond the reach of American law. No one seems to object. "In a statement criticizing the move the American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee called the decision 'an outrage'." (New York Times, October 7/88)

On November 15/89 the Globe and Mail reports that a US research group made public a US government document that says that Israel possesses nuclear and chemical warheads for its Jericho missiles.

"The National Resources Defence Council said it obtained the document from the Defence intelligence Agency under the Freedom of Information Act. 'This is the first time that the US government had acknowledged that an Israeli missile is armed with nuclear and chemical warheads', said Thomas Cochrane, senior staff scientist with the NRDC... A spokesman for the Israeli Embassy in Washington could not be reached immediately for comment'.

This reminds me of an old Tom Leher ditty: "Once the rockets are up who cares where they come down. That's not my department, says Werner Von Braun."

Israeli Arms Sales and Military Training Abroad

Israeli arms deals and military training to Third World countries began in a small way in the early 1970s. It emerged as a major supplier to Latin American dictatorships, South Africa and yet other countries throughout that decade and
became a full-blown arms merchant during the 1980s. From sales of about $50 million or so at the beginning of the 1970s it blossomed into a trade of $800 million or more by the early 1980s. It only began to contract somewhat with the replacement of the Apartheid government in South Africa and the saturation of the arms market in Latin America during the 1990s.

**South Africa**

Israel was involved in military cooperation with the South African Apartheid government for many years under Israel's so-called Labour government of the early 1970s. By this time the policy differences between the Likud and Labour governments were almost indistinguishable.

Israeli government authorities had apparently come to see South Africa as a brother settler state, a minority Boer government ruling over a large and restive native population. A pariah nation beset by an uncomprehending and hostile world, a fellow warrior state. There was a substantial Jewish presence in South Africa comprising about 5% of that nation's white population. This Jewish population had initially been comparatively left-wing and had originally opposed Apartheid and the state which maintained it. This, however, had gradually given way to a growing Jewish national chauvinism which actively supported Israel. They launched public campaigns to support the developing ties between South Africa and Israel.

South Africa's advanced piece of mobile artillery, the G-6 Rhino, was prominently utilized by South Africa in its invasion of Angola during the later 1970s. This was halted only with the entry of Cuban military forces which ultimately drove South Africa out. By this time South Africa had few friends in the world, outside of Israel and the American and British right. It had begun to manufacture its own arms on a large scale.

Israeli military and arms production specialists were quite active in South Africa throughout the 1980s, although it was a topic banned from public discussion in Israel itself. It played a major role in helping South Africa develop its new Cheetah fighter-bomber, based on upgraded designs of France's Mirage 3, which was the basis of Israeli military aircraft production up to that point. This war plane was first unveiled in South Africa in July of 1987. This was near the highpoint of Israeli-South African cooperation.

Early during that decade South Africa completed its project of building nuclear weapons, the first of which was secretly tested over a southern Atlantic island. South Africa had had its nuclear program for well over a decade, gradually building up a stockpile of a few weapons. These were ultimately dismantled before South Africa finally turned to majority rule in the 1990s.

Israeli arms sales and technical aid in weapons production in South Africa lasted for almost two decades, during which time Zionist officials somewhat implausibly tried to rescue South Africa's good name before a doubting world. Even among America's Jews it was a tough sell. As Pretoria's military and political rule began to crumble Israel backtracked and pulled out its military specialists. Its long role in helping to support the Apartheid regime was not forgotten by Nelson Mandela, Desmond Tutu and other leaders of the black liberation movement. They excoriated Israel and lent their moral support to the Palestinian people living under occupation. This, surprisingly, did not not lead to an outburst in condemnation among American Jews, except of course among those who condemn everybody and everything which is not 150% behind Israel.

The *Globe and Mail* business section of August 14/86 offers an article entitled 'Land of apartheid spawns mixed arms sector'. It details the range of arms then
being produced by South Africa and suggests that some of them probably sprang from cooperation with Israeli arms manufacturers. The list includes the production of Israeli automatic rifles, short range guided missiles, military helicopters and a new fighter aircraft built on a French-Israeli pattern. Commenting on the provenance of some of this, the Globe and Mail reporter says that "Israel, for example, worked openly with South Africa before the UN [arms] embargo. Since 1977 some South African-produced equipment has continued to bear a resemblance to Israeli hardware."

"The basic weapon of the South African infantry is the R4 5.6 millimeter rifle... The weapon is a copy of the Israeli Galil, itself a variation of the Soviet AK 47... The display unit of a computerized firing control system designed to manage four simultaneous engagements by up to eight artillery pieces, looks suspiciously like the Israeli David system." And so on down the line (Globe and Mail, August 2/86)

The article was not intended to be a criticism of anyone but was rather a notice to Canadian businessmen of the opportunities to be found in the South African arms industry.

By March of 1987 American and other pressures from major states have forced Israel to back off on its previous policy of involvement in South African arms delivery and production. On March 18 the Israeli cabinet decided not to sell any more arms to South Africa. However, since all military contracts between Israel and South Africa were secret, it will be near impossible to monitor whether there were any changes in such sales or not.

America has brought pressure to bear on Israel and it is forced to cease its open collaboration with South African arms manufacturers. In an acrimonious debate in the Israeli cabinet about Israel's position in the South African arms embargo, one minister suggests that pressures on South Africa will also hurt Israel's arms industry. However the decision is taken to cease open collaboration with South Africa. This raises the issue of the danger such a decision might pose to South Africa's 110,000 member Jewish community. (Globe and Mail, September 17/87)

In February 1989 the Globe and Mail notes that South Africa is stockpiling arms and is preparing for a continuing war with its neighbors. The report holds that its arms industry is running full bore. To militarily reequip itself has required the aid of foreign technicians and specialists. "[One] Mr. Minty said [at the Commonwealth ministers conference] South Africa is increasingly hiring foreign experts, especially Israelis but also nationals of other countries." (Globe and Mail, February 5/89)

Despite its nominal embargo of aid to South Africa, Israel secretly continued to foster that country's arms developments till the end of the 1980s at least. The American television network NBC reported a series of intelligence documents which "...said Jerusalem has been engaged in a partnership with Pretoria to develop a nuclear missile capability for South Africa. NBC said Israel provided missile technology in return for a continuous supply of enriched uranium for its own nuclear warheads. and the use of a long-range test range...the document identified the South African state arms maker Arms Cor as the builder of the missile, and said Israeli technology was provided through Urdan Industries Ltd., based outside Tel Aviv." (Globe and Mail, October 26/89)

Mozambique

In Mozambique during the 1980s, Remano, a murderous body of right-wing terrorists backed by South Africa, was devastating that country through raids, mass kidnapping and large scale killings. Remano's funding was never fully revealed but it supposedly included backing by certain wealthy ultra-conservative
Americans. The FRELIMO (Front for the Liberation of Mozambique) forces, which had ousted the former Portuguese colonial regime, were attempting to reply to these raids, but with little success. At this critical time Rabbi Marvin Hier, of the Los Angeles Simon Wiesenthal Documentation Center, 'discovered' that a FRELIMO mural contained an enemy soldier with a six-pointed Star of David on his collar tabs. This, he claimed, was "acquiescing in anti-Semitic symbolism ...it serves as an outrageous anti-Semitic statement which reminds one of the banners and portraits that once were displayed in the cities of Adolf Hitler's Nazi Germany." (Ah, the Nazis reappearing in Mozambique.) Hier had been informed of the mural by one Grover Norquist, a Republican who had recently visited Mozambique. Knowing Rabbi Hier's past fairy tales one should doubt anything he had to say about anything.

Hier started a letter writing campaign and his organization published their charges in the national press, later steaming off to Senate hearings, aiming to deny the miniscule US funds for that desperate country. Jesse Helms, the octogenarian Ku Klux Klan senator from South Carolina held that the US government should be supporting the right-wing terrorists, Remano, operating in that country. Other Jewish organizations added their dutiful chorus about recrudescent anti-Semitism in Africa.

At first the Mozambican Embassy in Washington was taken aback by this affair. However, as it turned out, those involved had not really investigated what these murals stood for and what they represented, something which any Mozambican could have told them. It seems that the Portuguese colonial police which had operated in that country had worn shoulder tabs with the six-pointed star prominently displayed. Both the Mozambican and the Portuguese authorities confirmed this, providing the official regulations prescribing this star. That is what the murals and posters depicted, a threatened return of colonial rule through a set of comprador African supporters. (New York Times, November 30/87)

When this fact was made known the Jewish crusaders simply refused to accept the 'explanation' and Hier grumped about it simply being a cover for a subliminal Mozambican anti-Semitism. He said he found the charge plausible 'because Mozambique has frequently criticized Israel.'

This indicates the bottomless depths of venom into which a considerable body of American Jews and their spokespersons have fallen. If the Israelis had helped fund forces like Remano, who ultimately killed possibly 100,000 Mozambicans, wouldn't a certain anti-Semitism be justified?

Elsewhere in Africa
Ethiopia

Ethiopia, following the overthrow of Haille Selassie's senescent rule in the mid 1970s, a regime with which Israel had developed a 'special relationship', Israel was somewhat at a loss of how to deal with the left wing military government which took power there. That regime attempted to transform Ethiopia while engaged in an escalating war with Eritrea and Somalia. During the late 1970s and 1980s Ethiopia received military and development aid from the Soviet Union and Cuba. While it handily defeated Somalia, its struggle with Eritrea and with internal guerilla movements resulted in constant retreats. Shortly before the collapse of the Ethiopian military regime in the late 1980s it somewhat surprisingly signed a diplomatic agreement with Israel, which even more surprisingly then backed this
sinking ship. Possibly Israel saw Ethiopia as an old Christian state surrounded by a sea of hostile Moslems - and pursued a myth they may have wound up believing.

Cuba and the Soviet Union had by then left Ethiopia. From the early 1980s 'Falasha' Jews from Ethiopia began a surreptitious emigration to Israel, which became a flood with the approaching collapse of the Ethiopian regime. Israel moved to 'repatriate' the 30,000 black Falasha Jews still living there. Despite opposition and dire warnings from within Israel itself, the emigre Falasha came to join the Israeli police and military forces. They could later be prominently seen in the suppression of the Palestinian population.

**West Africa**

In West Africa, Israel and the Cameroons restored diplomatic links in August of 1986, broken some 13 years previously. This was announced during a visit by the then prime minister of Israel, Shimon Perez. "Answering questions on Israel's position on South Africa, with which it had close ties, Mr. Perez said that no true Jew could favor Pretoria's system of apartheid since the basis of Judaism is anti-racist." The system of apartheid applying to Palestinians living in the occupied territories did not apparently count as racism.

By 1987 Israel had reopened diplomatic relationships with 5 of the 29 nations which had broken ties with it in 1973. In Lome, capital of the Togo republic, African dancers dutifully chanted 'Shalom Shamir' as another Israeli prime minister, Yitzhak Shamir, arrived to visit Israel's most recent partner. Israel's close ties with South Africa are said to be the prime reason why other African states are withholding diplomatic relations.

A columnist in Lagos' daily, the National Concord, wrote "The Arabs are basically to blame for Israel's increasing influence in Africa. Many African states reportedly complained about the inadequacy of Arab aid to them." However, Ghana radio "...charged that neighboring Togo had become 'the latest member of the Zionist zone of influence'." The commentator urged the Organization of African Unity to "...deal with the reactionary and recalcitrant leaders who have ganged up with Israel and South Africa to destroy the continent." There was not much need for that since African leaders were destroying their nations quite satisfactorily on their own.

Said the New York Times, "It is often Israeli military expertise that opens the door to normal relations with black African nations. The presidents of Zaire, Liberia and Cameroon are protected by elite armed units trained by Israeli military instructors."

"In Liberia, it is popularly believed that quick intervention of Israeli security instructors allowed President Samuel Doe to survive a coup attempt in November 1985. Israel's Ambassador to Liberia is a former Inspector general of police." Also, "In Togo last September the Government of President Gnassingbe Eyadema was shaken by a coup attempt mounted from Ghana...The following month Bernard Avital, director of the Africa division of the Israeli Ministry of Foreign Affairs paid a discreet visit here." (New York Times, July 27/87)

Other candidates for resuming full ties with Israel were the Central African Republic, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon and Sierra Leone - among the most impoverished, backward and dictatorial states in Africa. Moreover, both Ghana and Kenya had allegedly returned to a "virtually normal trade...facilitated through Israeli diplomats who work from the Israeli interest sections established in Western embassies." (New York Times, July 27/87)
In Latin America

Central America

Panama's General Manuel Noriega came to power following an 'unexplained' assassination in 1981 of Panama's previous ruler, a General Omar Torrijos, who had allegedly been 'unAmerican'. Noriega was an archetypically corrupt ruler who had American backing throughout his career, which was undistinguished to say the least. Then, in the late 1980s, for reasons which are still unclear, he was 'discovered' to have been protecting large scale drug lords who were using Panama as a transshipment point for drugs headed to the US. This has never been sufficient cause for the US to overthrow any foreign government but in this case it was the reason America gave for its invasion of Panama in December of 1989.

On December 29/89 the New York Times contained an article titled 'GI's in Panama Capture Israeli Regarded as Top Noriega Advisor'. It reported that one Mike Harari, a sixty-two year old Israeli, who had retired as Israel's head of intelligence services in Central America in 1979, had become Noriega's commercial attaché in Israel. At the same time another Israeli, Eliezer Ben Gaitan, who had been head of Noriega's special security force, was arrested. "The sensitivity of the matter was heightened by the fact that Mr. Harari has been linked to reported shipments of arms to the United States-backed Nicaraguan rebels [i.e. Somoza contras] that were financed by drug proceeds."

It was reported that Mr. Harari had been an Israeli commando with the Palmach forces since the late 1940s and had become a specialist in 'anti-terrorist' actions. One of the actions he undertook outside of Israel resulted in the murder of a totally innocent Moroccan waiter in Norway, whom he mistakenly thought was a leader of the Black September movement. Harari had served as the security director for Israel's Foreign ministry until his transfer to Central America, where he headed Mossad activities. On his move to Panama he had been made a lieutenant-colonel in that country's armed services, with the requisite pay.

In Israel a top government official denied any connection with Mr. Harari's role in Panama. "He's definitely a private citizen", said the unnamed government official. (New York Times, December 29/89) However, the Israeli press reported that Mr. Harari had funnelled some of Noriega's drug profits into Israeli banks.

On January 3/90 the New York Times retracted its previous story on Mr. Harari, saying that he was not yet in American custody. It said that he had disappeared some hours before the American attack with two of his fellow Israeli assistants. Another Israeli was the head of a para-military organization called 'Dignity Battalions, which had mobilized about 4,000 poor Panamanians into a defence force. Effectively untrained as they were, they put up about the only resistance offered to the American invaders. Their Israeli commander, however, fled when the first American bombs fell. He was captured by the Americans and soon released to return to Israel.

The cynicism of Noriega's Israeli advisors and organizers was clearly transparent. Also transparent was that they, formerly senior police and intelligence officials in Israel, were acting in conjunction with Israeli interests.

Most of Central America had been ruled throughout the 20th century by brutal and utterly corrupt military regimes which when they were faced with popular revolts shifted to mass murder. In Guatemala, after a brief period in the late 1940s and early 1950s a popular government attempted to distribute land to the poor from large holdings. It was overthrown by an American organized and funded invasion which threw the country back 50 years. With a slowly emerging
guerilla challenge to them, the Guatemala rulers proceeded down a road of ever increasing mass murder and bestiality. The low point of this trajectory may have been reached during the 1980s and earlier 1990s when systematic torture, mass killings of peasants and Indians and the unchecked activities of death squads linked to the governing regime created a situation which was debatably more bloodthirsty than the Nazis ever were. When the US, during a brief period of morality, declined to furnish the Guatemala junta any more arms during the mid 1980s, Israel stepped in with the sales of its own weapons and its own military and 'security' presence. Something over 200,000 Guatemalans were murdered in a 40 year period.

El Salvador was another military dictatorship which had continued since the Matanza of 1932-33 (a large scale massacre in which some 30-50,000 people were killed because they had the audacity to elect a communist regime). The country had stumbled along for decades under the leadership of mindless military rulers. For a very brief period in the mid 1970s a military-civilian government ruled El Salvador with the promise that the anachronistic and repressive regime would gradually be liquidated. However, after less than two years those leaders would be removed or shifted to join the established right-wing forces. At this point a variety of guerilla forces began to emerge and a few years after the triumph of the Sandinista forces in Nicaragua a full scale guerilla war emerged in El Salvador. By the early to mid 1980s El Salvador became a state known internationally for its wide spread, indiscriminate torture and endless assassinations carried out by death squads linked the Salvadorian army. Ultimately, they murdered some 100,000 Salvadorians. That tiny country was flooded with American arms, military experts and training. This did not leave much opportunity for Israel to sell its arms there. However Israeli secret police specialists and a limited number of arms were delivered to El Salvador.

To go back a bit, consider the Globe and Mail report of June 1983 titled 'Israel widens part in Latin arms sales'. It notes the recent seizure of 12,000 Israeli military rifles in Florida bound for the death squad regime of Guatemala. This highlighted "Israel's growing role in Central America as an arms supplier to right-wing regimes." Israel had also recently signed major contracts to supply weapons to El Salvador "...where the right-wing death squads have met with international condemnation." It notes that US restraint in supplying arms to countries with 'poor human rights records' "...has expanded a market the Israeli [arms] industry needs to export in order to survive." Abba Eban, foreign affairs spokesman for the Israeli Labour party says "...he thinks US officials are pleased to see governments such as El Salvador receiving Israeli arms. Israeli experts on arms sales say that 'The Israelis are good surrogates because they don't have a human rights problem.'" Meaning that they don't give a damn about human rights anywhere.

One Nathaniel Lorch, a former US. ambassador to various Latin American countries said. "As long as the Soviet Union is our most outspoken enemy, we've found ourselves in alliances with right-wing dictatorships. But our most intimate relations are with other democracies." (Globe and Mail, June, 1983) Where might those be?

An editorial in the Globe and Mail for July 28/83 entitled "What are friends for?" notes that after the US cut off arms sales to Guatemala and Somoza, the Israelis stepped right in to supply them with new arms. "It is difficult to say which of these two democracies does greater violence to its ideals by this shabby exercise in 'strategic cooperation'." On September 1/83, one Yakov M. Rabkin writes a lengthy article in the Globe an Mail glorifying Israel's military aid to a
plucky little Costa Rica allegedly beset by threats from the Nicaraguan Sandinista menace.

On April 24/84 the *Globe and Mail* provides an overview of Israel's recent role in Central America. "Over the past decade Israel has delivered weapons, military expertise and high technology [for 'security' matters] to El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras and Nicaragua when it was ruled by right-wing dictator Anastasio Somoza. Costa Rica, one of the world's few countries without an army, has a standing Israeli offer to assist in building its security forces. Government officials in San Jose say." Outside Central America, Israel has supplied weapons to at least 11 Latin American countries, according to western statistics.

In Nicaragua, Sandinista government officials say that Israel shipped ammunition and assault rifles to the Somoza dictatorship after such deliveries were banned by the US and thereby helped increase the causalities of the civil war in which Nicaragua was engaged during the mid 1970s. In Guatemala, in addition to supplying more than 15,000 Israeli Galil assault rifles to equip the Guatemalan army, it has provided short range take-off aircraft and armored cars produced by Israel. (*Globe and Mail*, April 24/84)

The *Globe and Mail* also reported that the Honduran army is looking to Israel to supply arms and equipment to the Nicaraguan contras if the US withdraws its support. It recommended that Israel and a number of other Latin American arms suppliers could provide the weapons for the 10,000 man 'contra' force should the US back out of supplying them. "Israel, with its advanced military equipment and technical expertise, is a major arms supplier in Guatemala. El Salvador and Honduras have also dealt with the Israelis'." (*Globe and Mail*, June 30/84)

At the time, America was on a crusade to overthrow the Sandinista government of Nicaragua and pulling out all the stops. The three Central American regimes being supplied by Israel were notorious places of mass political murder and state terrorism carried out by exceptionally bestial regimes. These are the forces which Israel has chosen to arm and support overseas. Let no one cry anti-semitism if the victims prove hostile toward Israel.

On January 19/87 the *Globe and Mail* reported that "Former Israeli military officers living in Tegucigalpa [Honduras] helped arrange secret Israeli arms ship-ments to US-backed Nicaraguan rebels [ie. contras] by channelling it through Honduras, Honduran military sources say."

An Israeli agent was allegedly working with an agricultural firm in the Honduran capital which had been involved in arms shipments since 1984. "...an Israeli firm operating in Honduras, International Security and Defence Systems, was linked to the arms shipments." Also involved were Emil Saada and Yehuda Leitner, two aides also engaged in arms transfers. The *Globe and Mail* noted that "One of the largest arms shipments to Honduras arranged by Israeli dealers arrived at Puerto Cortes in May 1985 and contained assault rifles, anti-aircraft rockets, ammunition and mortars, a rebel source and Honduran military officer said... In a related development, Israeli radio said yesterday that Israel has warned its officials and arms dealers involved in the shipment of US arms to Iran not to go to the United States so that they will not be summoned to testify before Congress". (*Globe and Mail*, January 19/87) Honduras was then one of the most impoverished nations in Latin America.

In the same issue of the *Globe and Mail* their correspondent in Guatemala reports that despite the alleged return to civilian rule and the alleged end to the campaign of assassinations, mass murders and 'disappearances' of Guatemalans
by the military and its death squads have not fundamentally changed. (Globe
and Mail, January 19/87)

On December 6/88 a New York Times report is entitled 'Nir's Fatal Visit to
Mexico Called a Business Trip to Buy Avocados'. Amiran Nir was a senior Israeli
anti-terrorism advisor who had acted as go-between for the Reagan inner circle
and the Iranian government in swapping US arms for hostages in 1985-86. He
allegedly was in Mexico arranging for the purchase of avocados when his small
plane crashed, killing all its occupants.

"An Israeli Embassy spokesman here today denied published reports that Mr.
Nir was in Mexico to supervise a shipment of arms sold to the Mexican
government by Israel. Some of these reports said the weapons were destined for
the Mexican armed forces and police to use in official efforts to combat drug
trafficking." Jewish sources who had retrieved Mr. Nir's body noted that Mexico
and Israel had official channels to make deals and transfer arms. (New York
Times, December 6/88)

Nicaragua

Nicaragua had been a brutal dictatorship for almost 40 years when serious
guerrilla resistance broke out in the early 1970s. The country had been invaded a
number of times by the US during the late 19th and early 20th centuries, which
during the late 1920s triggered a determined revolt led by one Augusto Sandino
against American occupation. Although not involving large numbers of fighters on
either side it resulted in the withdrawal of American troops and the creation of a
Nicaraguan National Guard to help run the country. Sandino was soon
assassinated and his forces scattered or killed. The new ruler who came to power
was the uncle of the later dictator, Anastasio Somoza. Over the course of 40 years
the Somoza family became the virtual owners of almost every major enterprise in
that nation, or at least a stockholder in them. Only General Trujillo of the
Dominican Republic, who also came to power through American support, was as
great a kleptomaniac as the Somozas. Nicaragua was unique in the concentration
of its wealth. Any popular opposition to this state of affairs was dealt with by
systematic assassinations and disappearances. This continued into the early
1970s when the first sporadic network of armed opposition appeared.

This opposition grew amazingly rapidly and called itself the Sandinista
Liberation Front, in honor of the nation's earlier liberal guerrilla leader. By 1975-
76 there were pitched battles between guerilla forces and the National Guard and
by 1977 the Guard was being driven back almost everywhere. This all happened
so quickly that the then current despot, Anastasio Somoza, could not believe the
developing events. Finally, less than a year before his overthrow, the US
government under Jimmy Carter reviewed Somozas long, bloody record and
withdrew its military aid and financial support - to vehement denunciations by
varied right-wing forces in America. It was during this last year that Israeli arms
came pouring into Nicaragua; cash on the barrel head. In 1979, after a series of
successful engagements with the National Guard, the Sandinistas won and Somoza
fled with whatever loot he could gather together. Congratulations poured in from
many of the world's governments. However, Nicaragua had only a basically
civilian, very poorly armed, military force.

The National Guard was rounded up and, with the exception of a handful of
particularly brutal murderers, allowed to go free - many headed across the
borders and soon regrouped as a military force in Honduras. Many of the upper
class cronies of Somoza also departed to the US, where they soon made vocal
demands for a US invasion of Nicaragua. Somoza went to live in Paraguay, where he was fittingly assassinated not long afterward.

By 1981, under the Ronald Reagan administration, an armed campaign against the Sandinistas began to unfold. Former members of the National Guard had transferred to Honduras and were now supplied with arms, intelligence, and American military direction. These 'contras' (i.e. counter-revolutionaries) as they came to be known, carried out a campaign of sustained guerrillas attacks, murder and kidnapping in Nicaragua. They effectively became a US mercenary force fighting against their former homeland. The cost to the Sandinistas was very heavy for a nation of its size. If something like 25,000 had died in the struggle to oust Somoza, the death toll attributed to the war with the contras ultimately reached 50,000 Nicaraguan dead. It was one of the most blatant examples of American imperialism which that era offered.

Americans didn't have long to wait for a flood of official fantasies to appear. There was a phase where President Reagan warned against Nicaraguan forces being a mere three days drive from the American border, and might be expected to come rolling over it if they weren't stopped in Nicaragua. Media commentators actually had the gall to elaborate on that scenario. There was a Hollywood thriller made called Red Dawn, which played on a theme of America 'giving in to United Nation's demands', disarming, and finding itself invaded by a host of propaganda characters comprised of Red Nicaraguans, Cubans, and others backed by the Soviet Union.

Added to all this were the charges of assorted American Jews who "discovered" that Nicaragua's new government was anti-Semitic. Jewish professors 'revealed' this new insight in a series of totally fabulous accounts. A handful of wealthy Jews from Nicaragua who had been cronies of Somoza and had fled to the US filled newspapers with accounts of the wave of anti-Semitism which was being fostered in that country. The Jewish Defence League turned out wherever they could to support the contras and to belabor the Sandinista regime. At one point they traipsed around after the Sandinista representative to the United Nations. One Nora Astorga, a young woman and the Nicaraguan representative at the UN, tried to call forth some international support against the US assaults on her country although she was dying of cancer. According to the JDL she was a chief 'apologist' for Sandinista 'anti-Semitism' and therefore deserved to be harassed and threatened to the full extent of their abilities. This was their response to a small nation struggling against coordinated American and American-supported terrorist attacks. That was the depths to which right-wing American Jewry had fallen.

The Vancouver Sun of May 25/83 reported that Nicaragua's Sandinista government had forced the country's Jews into exile after taking power. "They had confiscated their property and turned their synagogue into a children's social club, the (Anti)Defamation League of B'nai Brith says." Rabbi Morton Rosenthal, the league's Latin American Affairs director, makes the allegation in an article to be published next month in the league's national newsletter, the ADL Bulletin. "The 'forced exile' of Nicaragua's 50 or so Jews occurred in 1979, when the Sandinistas came to power after overthrowing the US-backed Somoza dictatorship, Rosenthal said Tuesday." Good, the fewer Somoza's cronies in the country the better.

A similar commentator was Werner Cohen, a reactionary professor at the University of British Columbia, who recounted how the Sandinistas were anti-Semites as well as being unAmerican. This despite the fact that a number of
Sandinista leaders were Jewish. Cohen had never been in Nicaragua and seemingly knew nothing about it.

By September of that year Ronald Reagan was parroting the ADL claims about Sandinista anti-Semitism. On July 29, 1983 he held a meeting with Jewish leaders in the US and asked for their support in his backing of the contras in America's fight with the Sandinistas. "The results of this self-proclaimed unity between the Sandinistas and terrorists in the PLO are evident for all the world to see and an evil echo of history," said Mr. Reagan. Virtually the entire Jewish community in Nicaragua had been frightened into exile...

A Rosenthal article in the New York Times holds that "...some Jewish businessmen were labelled 'enemies of the revolution' for allegedly helping long-time dictator Anastasio Somoza obtain weapons from Israel." However, in a recent report, US Ambassador to Nicaragua Anthony Quainton, held that there was no anti-Semitism to be detected in that country." (Globe and Mail, September 22/83)

The Jewish Defence League put that aside its attacks on other Americans and concentrated their fury on the Sandinistas. The JDL of Canada also got into the act. In early June/83 they mounted a 60 member demonstration against the home of the Nicaraguan consul to Canada, repeating the charges contained in Rosenthal's ADL Bulletin release. Rosenthal had prominently noted the case of one Isaac Stavinsky who allegedly had been expelled from Nicaragua. However, the Nicaraguan consul said "I know him, I went to school with him... He owned a textile shop. He did not return to Nicaragua following the downfall of Somoza because he had worked with Somoza engaged in arms sales in a war which cost Nicaragua 50,000 lives. We want him back to face trial. We didn't expel him." The JDL besieged the consul's home, kicked at his door, ransacked his car and generally terrorized his young family for two hours before the police arrived. There were no arrests. (Pacific Tribune, June 12/83)

Some three years later the (anti)Defamation League of the B'nai Brith repeated the charge it made some years earlier, apparently not having found anything else to expatriate about. However, "Rabbi Balfour Brickner of the Stephen Wise Free Synagogue in New York, who investigated charges of anti-Semitism by the Sandinista government during his visit in July 1984 said 'I'm not impressed by any white-paper by the Anti Defamation League which presumes to set the record straight. All it actually does is to confirm their own previously held position, which happens to be in line with the [U.S.] President'." (New York Times, March 26/86) Apparently there are still some voices of decency within the Jewish community.

By early 1985 the Nicaraguan government had been charged with supporting leftist rebels in El Salvador and Guatemala, accepting aid from the Soviet Union and other unAmerican sources, not extending the privileges formerly held by the Roman Catholic church, being anti-Semitic and crypto-Communists, nationalizing the land and properties of Somoza and his cronies. It was also guilty of defending itself against the contra army equipped and directed by the US. And finally, for American liberals, Nicaragua was charged with a campaign against the Miskuito Indians merely because they were carrying out guerilla operations against the Sandinistas. Let's see, was that all? Oh yes, Mr. Reagan claimed that the Sandinistas were international drug pedlars.

A New York Times account entitled 'Nicaragua's Jews: Wide Disagreement on Status' reports that while most of the Nicaraguan Jewish emigres in America bewail the anti-Semitic sentiments of the Sandinistas, those who remained in Nicaragua find no trace of such sentiments. "'I have never felt persecuted', said
Rolando Najlis, a retired merchant in his early 70s who described himself as Jewish by ethnic identification but an atheist by belief. 'If there was the smallest manifestation of this sort against Jews I can assure you I wouldn't stay in Nicaragua.'

"Perhaps", he said, 'Jews left after the Sandinista victory because they thought the behavior of Israel in its links with Somoza could bring reprisals against them. Jaime Levy, 72, once an active member of the Managua synagogue, said the Sandinistas had never bothered him and suggested that those who fled had been 'very good friends of the former regime'."

It also turned out that a former synagogue, which the Sandinistas had been loudly reviled for turning into a children's center, had in fact been partly destroyed and looted by members of the National Guard during the final days of the insurrection in 1979. (New York Times, April 20/86)

On December 12/86 the New York Times reported that Israel is eager to reestablish diplomatic relations with Nicaragua, broken in 1982. Israel has formally denied providing military aid to the contras but Benjamin Netanyahu, then the Israeli Ambassador to the United Nations, had until very recently lobbied for Israel to help train and arm the contras.

Israel continued in its efforts to sell arms and military equipment throughout Latin America. One Professor Edy Kaufman, a member of the Peace Institute at Hebrew University, said "He deplored Israeli sales of arms during internal peace time to governments that consistently violate human rights. 'In Chile I saw people carrying Uzis everywhere, from the airport to the poor neighbourhoods,' he said." Well, why not? After all, Israel had been one of the first nations to recognize the coup government of General Pinochet.

Colombia

Colombia has a long history of revolutions through the 19th and early 20th centuries, many of them quite bloody and none of them like the comic opera coups portrayed by Hollywood. In 1948, after a long period of increasingly dictatorial Conservative party rule, the Liberal party was assured to win national election under one Jorge Elicier Gaitan, when he was assassinated. That brought forth a spontaneous rising in Bogota, 'el Bogatazo', which seized the city and was crushed only with considerable difficulty. This opened a period called 'La Violencia', an undeclared national civil war between the Conservative and Liberal parties and their supporters. It was an increasingly bitter and bloody civil war which touched most Colombians and witnessed the deaths of 300,000+ persons out of a population of less than 18 million.

Some degree of national consensus was established when the two main parties merged as a National Front government in 1957. This brought the large scale battles to a halt but even in 1965 there were still many former gunmen littering the countryside. A nucleus of an armed Communist guerilla force, the Fuerzas Armadas Revolucionaria Colombianos (FARC) remained in contention. Despite all expectations, this force continued to grow and establish itself. By the early 1980s popular sentiment throughout the country was that the government must come to terms with the guerilla movement and offer it some participation in the political processes of that country.

By the later 1980s the FARC forces were given zones in which they operated as local government; they then came out into the open to organize and run a movement called the Patriotic Union. It won about 20% of the votes in national elections and in 1986 seated some fourteen senators in the national Congress.
The Colombian right was enraged and, with the probable support of many in the military and police forces, began a campaign of systematic assassinations of everyone identifiable on the left. *Amnesty International* tabulated some 350 assassinations of left-wing political figures, union leaders, reporters, civil servants and intellectuals *in the vicinity of the city of Cali alone*. The leader of the Patriotic Union and three of its Federal senators were also assassinated during this time. The left, after considerable internal debate, withdrew into the underground struggle again - where it continues today after more than 50 years of fighting.

It was into this milieu that Israeli military trainers came to instruct the Columbian military and right-wing death squads. There can not be the slightest doubt that they fully knew that they were supporting sadistic killers and torturers. Israeli presence in Colombia was not particularly extensive but it is instructive.

A report in the *Globe and Mail* of August 25, 1989 noted that "In recent years the [drug] traffickers have trained paramilitary squads that Colombian officials say are responsible for a wave of killings of leftist and peasant leaders. According to the NBC television network, Israeli and South African mercenaries have been hired by the traffickers to train the squads and motorcycle-riding assassins known as sicarios. Israel said yesterday that the private security company involved in the training, Hod Hahanit, does not have a licence to operate in Colombia." But it went on doing so anyway.

On the same day the *New York Times* (August 25/89) ran an article that the Colombian government itself, as well as the left, was under attack by the drug traffickers' death squads. Both members of the Liberal and the Conservative party had been assassinated or come under attack by them. "As the violence flared, Foreign Minister Julio Londono Parades said that he was unable to confirm reports from Israel that retired Israeli military officers this year trained paramilitary groups maintained by drug traffickers. NBC News reported this week that Israeli mercenaries had trained assassination teams for Colombian drug rings." (*New York Times* August 25/89) As it turned out, three deserters from one of the death squads reported the presence of Israelis during their training.

One can be certain that if Israeli officers were engaged in such training then Israeli authorities would know about it down to the finest detail. Unless they had arranged not to be informed about such ventures by their ex-military men.

The *Globe and Mail* reported on August 29/89 that 'Shamir skeptical of reports on Israeli role in Colombia'. The Israeli Prime Minister, Yitzak Shamir said that he could not believe the allegations that Israeli officers were training Colombian drug lords armies. "There are allegations. We must investigate them.. But I don't understand why this onslaught, this quickness to blame before we know the truth', he said." Could it be a reemergence of a new anti-Semitism?

The Israeli police had begun to question one Lt. Col Yair Klein, the president of the firm Hod Hahanit (Spearhead) who "... says he trained cattle guards and knew nothing about drug-gang links." "Ron Ben-Yishai, military commentator for the *Yediot Ahronot* newspaper, told Israeli radio [that] two Israelis were arrested in June by agents of the US Drug Enforcement Agency. He did not say where the two were arrested but said that as a result weapons, explosives and two pilotless aircraft were uncovered. Mr. Ben-Yishai said the two Israelis reported they had a partner who was a senior officer in the Israeli reserves and that the aircraft were intended for an attack on the reputed head of the Medellin drug cartel, Pablo Escobar," (*Globe and Mail*, August 29/89) They were presumed to be working for a rival drug lord. Both were 'former' Israeli military men.
On August 30/89 the New York Times carried an account of a video tape which Colonel Yair Klein had made showing him training Colombian death squads and which he was showing around as a kind of advertisement to others who might be interested in the services of his company. "A retired Israeli army officer, Lieut. Col. Yair Klein, who has acknowledged training the Colombians and making the tape, said in a radio interview broadcast in Bogota today that he was training them to fight communist guerrillas. But the Colombian police, in interviews and in a report made available today, said that about a half dozen Israelis and at least 11 British mercenaries were training paramilitary forces and assassins for the Medellin and Cali drug cartels." General Miguel Maza said that "...one of the Israeli students, Alfredo de Jesus Baquero, was arrested 10 days ago on charges of gunning down a group of four judges and nine judicial workers on a country road earlier this year. The police said they believed that hundreds of other killings had been carried out in the last year by gunmen trained by Israeli and British mercenaries." (New York Times, August 30/89)

Continuing this story the New York Times of August 31/89 reported that, "Violence in Colombia took a new and shocking turn last year. Scores of peasants and judicial officials were massacred and leftist political leaders were singled out for killing."

"Government investigators discovered clear links between the Medellin syndicate and so-called 'self-defence' groups operating in the Central Magdalena region west of Bogota and Uraba province in the northwest. They also reported that top syndicate leader Jose Gonzalo Rodriguez Gacha had hired British and Israeli mercenaries to train members of the paramilitary groups."

"Under director Miguel Maza Marquez, a police general and sociologist, the DAS [Colombian secret police] began investigating links between traffickers, right-wing land owners and the self-defense groups. More that 130 such groups have been identified with names such as 'Black Hand', 'Love for the Homeland' and 'Death to Revolutionaries' in Northeast Antioquia."

"The self defence groups were officially sanctioned under a 1985 law aimed at fighting left-wing guerrillas. But the groups were implicated in the massacre of 43 people in the town of Segovia in November 1988 and another 20 on a banana farm in Uraba."

During the previous March deserters from some of these groups indicated that they had been trained in explosives and other skills by British and Israeli mercenaries. "Several sources said that General Maza persuaded Mr. Barco [the sitting Colombian President] earlier this year that an alliance between traffickers, far-right ideologues and paramilitary groups, with sympathizers in the armed forces, threatened his government's security." (New York Times, August 31/89)

The same day the Globe and Mail reported that a weapons shipment to drug lord forces was intercepted in Medellin. "In Israel, meanwhile, Defence Minister Yitzak Rabin said reports on ties between Israelis and Colombian drug lords are overblown, and only one or two companies may have violated the law. He added that there are few if any Israeli mercenaries." He may be right there - they may be direct agents of the Israeli government. "Mr. Rabin and other Israeli officers sought yesterday to stem the scandal about allegations that 'former' army officers gave paramilitary training to assassination squads for the Medellin drug cartel... Police questioned two more employees of Hod Hahanit, or Spearhead, a security and arms trading company, said to have provided training for the cartel. Yair Klein, a reserve lieutenant colonel who heads the company, confirmed that an Israeli official had told him to leave Colombia because he might be arrested - raising the
possibility the [Israeli] government knew more of his dealings than it has acknowledged."

"The Israeli parliament's law committee rejected a proposal that laws controlling the export of arms and military expertise be strengthened to allow prosecution of Israelis for offences committed abroad."

By that time Yair Klein had escaped from Colombia and was back in Israel. They refused to extradite him to Columbia for trial because they held that the charges against him were not covered by extradition treaties. It is a case of Meyer Lansky's Murder Incorporated writ large.

In an Op Ed piece in the New York Times of August 31/89, Juan Mendez, executive director of the human rights organization Americas Watch, noted the 'Colombian Military is Part of the Problem.' He begins by noting that the death squads of the drug cartels could not impose their reign of terror without the direct cooperation with the Colombian military and police. He goes on to say that these death squads are at war with Colombian civil society as a whole. "The cartels do not kill only for business purposes, nor do their goons only attack the judges and prosecutors who try to enforce the law against them."

Their violence had recently escalated into gunning down a leading Presidential candidate, Luis Carlos Galan, and the execution of many left wing leaders - over a thousand leaders of the Union Patriotica in 1985 alone. "The drug dealers have apparently determined to wipe out the left to insure perpetuation of the regressive social order that they want. They hope to replace or join the oligarchy that has ruled Colombia since its independence from Spain. They forge alliances with the police and the armed forces and, inevitably, their targets have come to include those in the traditional parties, the courts and the press - anyone intent on making Colombia a functioning democracy."

"The Medellin cartel recruits, trains and finances paramilitary groups in many areas...whose members call themselves 'peasant self-defence organizations', are responsible for the great majority of Colombia's killings of trade union and peasant leaders, social activists and left-wing political figures."

In the massacre at Segovia the death squads were not restrained by police and seemed even to have had the cooperation of local military officials, who blocked and otherwise interfered with later investigation of the events. The judge who signed indictments against the police and military authorities suspected of involvement of another massacre at Uraba, was later murdered in Medellin. In other cases, military officials have arrested and detained judges investigating such killings and shipped them back to Bogota after their illegal arrest. (New York Times, August 31/89)

The New York Times of September 1/89 carries another story about Yair Klein, with an accompanying photograph. Strangely enough he actually does look like an image one may have of a thuggish killer. "In an investigation by both Colombian and Israeli officials Mr. Klein said that he believed those he trained were cattle guards, but there was the possibility that one of them was the person who had recently assassinated Luis Carlos Galan, the leading candidate for the Colombian presidency. He said, 'But I say again, we worked with farmers. If after we left one of them worked with drug dealers, we wouldn't know.' And the Israelis call other people 'terrorists'?"

"Mr. Klein acknowledged that a promotional tape his company made in Colombia, showing his students armed with automatic rifles, storming a building also shows people whom the Colombian officials have identified as important
members of the Medellin drug cartel. These people were 'visitors from outside I didn't know, Mr. Klein said."

"The tape was shown on American television and Mr. Klein's recorded voice on it, speaking in Hebrew, set off the investigation and a public furor that has not abated...[Klein said], 'If drug dealers got into the group, then God only knows. Everybody's talking, everybody knows. But I have receipts from the Colombian security services to validate what I'm saying.' Asked to produce the receipts he said he left them in Colombia." (New York Times, September 1/85)

Mr. Klein says that his first military contracts were for supplying equipment to the Christian Phalangist [i.e Lebanese fascist] militia in Beirut in 1983. He then proceeded to give a dramatic account of his life in the Colombian jungles training right-wing death squads in their fight against 'Communist guerrillas'. He noted that Colombian government officials had complained to the Israeli government about his role in training those who had killed Colombian union leaders.

"Ariel Sharon, who suggests military solutions to many of Israel's problems, said today that Mr. Klein and others 'have already been judged' adding 'It's simply unbelievable. With our own hands we are making Israel responsible for the subject of drugs in Colombia." (New York Times, September 1/89) Sharon would later be Prime Minister of Israel.

In a report entitled 'Israeli Hired Guns a Public Secret' (New York Times, September 7/89) Andrew Cockburn, the co-producer of 'Israel, The Covert Connection', a documentary which aired on the PBS program 'Frontline', recounted the following: While Cockburn's team was in Israel they were given a demonstration of Klein's 'Spearhead' skills. In a Jerusalem quarry, a number of instructor-officers climbed into a sedan and raced at a dummy of a passer-by at top speed. The sedan slammed on its brakes and the officers leaped out spraying the dummy with bullets from their automatic weapons, and then, very quickly, leaped back in again and sped away. Cockburn quips, 'As an example of how to blow away a passerby from a moving car this was most impressive, but its efficacy in defending against terrorism appeared open to question.'"

One of Mr. Klein's top associates was a Lieutenant Col. Amatazi Shuali, formerly of the Shin Bet, who had returned from working with the American-funded 'contras' in Honduras. "Our political views are very much parallel with American political views, fighting terrorism", one of their associates said. Such work is in the grand tradition of the covert side of the US-Israeli relationship. Time and again, when domestic political circumstances inhibit US assistance to particular regimes, Israel has stepped into the breach. As Spearhead's marketing director explained to us, 'The Americans have the problem of public opinion, international image. We don't have this problem'."

At the time of the interviews Klein was refurbishing a cafe he opened on the banks of the Jordan River. He intends to cater to the needs of Christian fundamentalist visitors to the Holy Land. (New York Times, September 7/89)

In an article entitled 'Columbia Policemen and Soldiers Reportedly Tipping Off Drug Figures' the New York Times reports exactly that, pointing to the penurious pay of Colombian policemen and soldiers.

"Not only are many police believed to be on the traffickers payrolls, but some members of the security forces, especially soldiers, have forged alliances with groups of drug traffickers' gunmen to fight leftist guerrillas. These relationships, Colombian officials and academics say, have led to leniency on drug violations... 'The drug traffickers have an anti-Communist ideology', said a professor, who asked that he not be identified because of concern for his safety. 'The interests of
the security forces and the mafia correspond on this and in addition, the mafia pays a lot of money to the security forces." (New York Times, September 14/89)

Also, in the September 14/89 edition of the Globe and Mail one Bernard Pinsky writes a letter-to-the-editor in which he accuses the Globe and Mail "and your media colleagues, the press in general, of creating 'a new Evil Empire', the state of Israel." He especially denounces the Globe and Mail's reporting of Israel's response to the Yair Klein-Colombian drug lords connection. He notes that the US, Britain and France are also involved, "But that wouldn't be national news. Only Israel's involvement is. The media are creating such a negative image of Israel that when Israel is severely threatened, or when Israelis are in danger, the world will not react, feeling that Israel will get the punishment it deserves. It was in the midst of this type of campaign of vilification that the Nuremberg Laws were passed in the 1930s."

So, apparently it is anti-Semitic to uncover some of the truth about Israel's doings around the world and doubly anti-Semitic to hold that nation to standards applied to other nations.

On September 20/89, a Colombian judge issued formal arrest warrants for Yair Klein and one of his close associates, Arik Acek. The Israeli government refuses to act on these warrants because it says it does not have an extradition treaty with Colombia. So Israel will stand behind its Lt. Colonel who made a living training death squad killers.

The London Observer of October 1/89 reports that it has documents which show that Israeli Defence Minister Yitzak Rabin had given Yair Klein's apparatus permission to operate in Colombia, training drug lord killer gangs - something Rabin had previously denied. That newspaper had discovered a signed letter from Rabin giving Hod Hahanit (Spearhead) permission to operate in Colombia. "The news comes as concern mounts about signs of dubious undercover Israeli military activity, not only in Colombia but also in Peru and Panama."

It turns out that Klein's operation "...is run by a number of officers who hold important posts in the Israeli military reserve. Its director-general is listed as Brigadier General Moshe Spector, its chief instructor is Lt. Col. A. Sadaka, and its special operations expert is Lt. Col. S. Amatzia."

"Another Israeli security company, International Security and Defence Systems, has published documents in Spanish, promoting its expertise in interrogation techniques and in the planning and supervision of prisons in Latin America."

"In Peru, two members of a committee of the Peruvian Congress reported last month that documents, tapes and official reports which pointed to Israeli involvement in the arming of a shadowy right-wing terror squad had disappeared from the committee's files. The deputies, Gustavo Espinoza and Manuel Piqueras, had claimed earlier that more than 650,000 pounds sterling of Israeli security equipment, including laser sensors, had been sold to the death squad by companies in Belgium and the US... The Peruvian authorities have rejected the allegations." (London Observer, October 1/89)

On January 29/90, the body of Arik Afek is discovered in the trunk of a car in the Miami international airport. He was an Israeli business man who reportedly served as a link between the Medellin drug cartel and the Israeli mercenaries operating in Colombia. (Globe and Mail, January 29/90)

No Israeli was ever tried for facilitating the bestial savagery carried out by the death squads they trained. Indeed, the main culprits, the senior Israeli military officers, were protected by the Israeli state.
PART SEVEN
Chapter 13. The Invasion of Lebanon and the Beirut Massacres, 1982

Background

Israel's military apparatus was first established during the 1930s as underground sections of the Labour (the Haganah) and the General Zionists (the Irgun). They backed the suppression of the Arab Revolt of 1936-1939 by British regular forces, which decimated Arab resistance to the later Zionist takeover of Palestinian land. During the 2nd world war Jewish forces in Palestine mobilized to support the British, except for the Stern Gang under Yitzak Shamir, whose supporters carried out assassinations of Palestinians and the British High Commissioner alike. They were efficiently suppressed; some were hung by the British. Following the end of world war 2 the Zionist forces launched a fuller terrorist campaign against the British, now with the full support of the American Jewish community who filled the press with stories of British anti-semitism and similar crimes. By 1947 the British had had enough and turned the decision of Israeli independence over to the United Nations, then mainly a creature of the United States. It recognized the right of Israel to independence.

In the two-phased Arab-Israeli war of 1947-48 the alleged 27 million population of the Arab countries facing Israel were extremely fractured and militarily weak. Lebanon was under the control of a Christian minority, had just been granted independence and did not want any hostilities with Israel. Syria, also recently granted independence from France, was far too weak to offer much meaningful military aid to the Palestinians. Jordan did have a 20,000 member Arab Legion but it was under the control of one Pasha Glub, a British army general who stringently disallowed any real military action against Israeli forces. Moreover, King Abdullah of Jordan had signed a secret agreement with Israel not to engage Israeli forces if they stayed out of what has become known as the 'West Bank' region. This agreement was strained in the Israel advance on Jerusalem but basically held firm. Egypt did have an army independent of British control, which it used to preserve Egypt's land east of Suez. But it proved ineffective elsewhere. The Palestinians themselves were both disorganized and very poorly armed and could offer no effective resistance to Israeli expansion. All in all, it would seem that the forces in contention were about equal, but with the Israelis profiting from substantial arms transfers and volunteers from their American supporters.

Israeli expansion finally covered about twice the amount of land allotted to it by the UN negotiated settlement in 1947. Some 400-500,000 Palestinians were driven from their ancestral lands by threats, terror and a few bloodthirsty massacres - in which the Irgun and also the Israeli defence forces took leading roles. Some 150,000 Palestinians managed to hang on in parts of Israel and now comprise about a tenth of the Israeli population. Charges that most Palestinians left because of orders delivered over the radio by surrounding Arab governments have now been totally discredited. This was the foundation for the Palestinian diaspora in Lebanon, Jordan, Syria and elsewhere through the Middle East.

The early 1950s were a time when the Palestinians were either struggling to reestablish themselves in the surrounding countries or were barely subsisting in the miserable shanty towns or refugee camps established in the West Bank and in neighboring countries.

The Anglo-French attack on Egypt in 1956 witnessed the active participation by Israel, driving to the Suez canal without much effort. After American
intervention under President Eisenhower the Israelis complained bitterly about having to give up their military gains but Israel was not yet a favored client of the US. It was then seen as just another, rather troublesome, Middle-Eastern state.

The later 1950s and the early 1960s witnessed a growing number of raids into Israel by Palestinians groups and massive Israeli military retaliation against the originating states. It was early during this period that Ariel Sharon earned his reputation as a mass murderer of Palestinians and POWs. On the Palestinian side, Yasser Arafat emerged as the leading figure of the resistance.

The 1967 Six Day War was initiated by Israel and defeated the armies of all of its bordering powers. This military triumph mobilized the entire American Jewish community to the side of Israel, with much praying, pontification and celebration. It instituted the phenomenal increase in Jewish chauvinism in the US. The US government, becoming bogged down in Viet Nam, rushed to support Israel - which had not previously been its primary client in the Middle East. This applied despite Israel’s air and sea attack on an American spy ship in the region with the attendant loss of 34 US lives. American subsidies to Israel rapidly increased after this point.

By 1973 Israel was armed to the teeth with American military aircraft and weapons. Its own arms industry was also progressing, so that within a decade its peddlars could travel the world selling their own manufactured assault rifles, artillery, and aircraft.

In 1973 the initial Egyptian attack across the Suez canal was successful and Israel had to mobilize its entire army to drive them back. Ultimately they were unsuccessful and all of the lands east of the Suez were reincorporated under Israeli occupation. All cities on the Egyptian border were utterly devastated. General Ariel Sharon once again carried out his predilections for murdering Arab POWs in his captivity. While relatively small, Israeli military losses in that war had been significant and the Labour government of Golda Meir was held to blame. Some four years later an ultra-right Herut [Freedom] government under Menachem Begin came to power in Israel.

In the intervening years a Palestine Liberation Organization had been put together by Yasser Arafat, a displaced Palestinian living in Egypt. It had rapidly grown to importance. The sufferings and oppression of the Palestinian people were also beginning to be taken cognizance of by people and governments outside the American ambit. After bitter conflicts with Jordan the PLO shifted its base of operations to the Palestinian refugees living in Lebanon. By the middle of the 1970s it was beginning to win acceptance among many nations of the world. This was totally unacceptable to Israel, especially to the Menachem Begin government, which based itself upon the principle of the indissoluble Jewish nature of and right to 'Judea and Samaria' (i.e. the West Bank). It set out to uproot and destroy the Palestinian organization as it existed in Lebanon. In this, as in all things now, Israel had the support of the American Jewish community.

At about this time America under President Carter was striving to arrange a peace treaty between Egypt and Israel. Anwar Sadat of Egypt promptly announced that he was willing to go to Israel, sign a peace treaty and recognize that state without reservations. A combination of internal and external pressures finally swayed Prime Minister Begin into sourly accepting a permanent peace arrangement with Egypt and returning the Suez canal and the Negev desert to that state. He did so despite the dire warnings, breast beating, and charges of treason which arose from Israeli settlers in the West Bank. However, that move did
remove Egypt as a factor in future Israeli wars. This deal was concluded before the Israeli invasion of Lebanon. No one spoke of 'appeasing' Israeli aggressors.

Throughout the later 1970s the Herut government engaged in military raids, bombings and shelling of real and alleged Palestinian forces in southern Lebanon, with the Palestinians staging raids as best they could. This was paralleled by a Lebanese civil war between the Phalangist (Christian Fascist) government and its restive Muslim majority. A number of Phalangist massacres of Palestinians - the best known being of the embattled refugee camp of Tel Al Zaatar - mobilized the varied Muslim population so that by the end of the 1970s no central government or control over the country existed at all.

At this point, in 1978, Israel launched its initial military invasion of Lebanon, pushing north of Tyre to assault the Palestinian populations there, and then withdrawing. The Palestinian resistance continued however. Israel bombing raids took on a particularly murderous quality. A great many civilians were killed in the camps - men, women, children, old people.

Lebanon at the time must have seemed to Israel to be an ideal potential client state. A nation with an embattled Christian population (even if they were Christian Arabs), a highly fragmented Muslim opposition, and a refugee Palestinian population which was not integrated into Lebanese society. Lebanon was a nation with a significant number of successful entrepreneurs but with a large impoverished sub class. If the Palestinians and the other Muslim forces could be effectively suppressed then Lebanon offered the opportunity of creating an allied Christian state on Israel's northern border which, with sufficient Israeli military support, could provide a counterweight to Syria. In early 1982 the Menachem Begin government decided to intervene and establish this kind of state in Lebanon. This was supported by endless accounts of PLO attacks on northern Israel, although none had occurred during the previous year.

With Ronnie Reagan in power in America and the Jewish lobby riding high, with the American news media seemingly having washed their hands of conflicts in Lebanon, it seemed like a sure bet. By then the American fundamentalists were in support of Israel no matter what it did or who it did it to. In Britain Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher cheered on the Zionists.

The Israeli invasion of Lebanon began on June 4, 1982 with massive air strikes against Muslim targets, especially throughout the south of the country. Armored forces followed during the succeeding days. Israel threw something like 45,000 troops into the invasion - a very considerable force considering the numbers and the armament of those who opposed them. Israel's armed forces were supplied with all of the most advanced weapons, armour, artillery, airpower, which the American arsenal could provide. They could and did surround towns and cities and pound them into submission with artillery fire and bombing. It must have seemed like it would be a walk over. The Israelis called the operation 'Peace in Lebanon'.

The Invasion of Lebanon: the Initial Stages

The Israelis advanced rapidly through the south of Lebanon, bombing and mopping up any resistance as they went. Both Lebanese and Palestinian dead begin to pile up. Beaufort's castle, a massive medieval structure with 6 foot thick walls near the Syrian border, and a base for some Palestinian forces, was taken after a few days of bombing and shelling. Tyre was surrounded and pounded with bombs and shells, killing many civilians but not fully ending Palestinian resistance. At this point it was mainly the Palestinians with some Lebanese allies
who are resisting; a resistance which would gradually grow to incorporate most of the Muslim population of Lebanon.

On June 14/82 the Globe and Mail reports a march of some 600 Palestinian, Lebanese and Canadian protestors to the US Consulate in Toronto, who they say (correctly) has armed and supported Israel in all its military aggressions.

The same issue of the Globe and Mail reports that the much revered newspaper rabbi, author and moralizing philosopher, Rabbi Gunter Plaut, called on Canada to 'spearhead a diplomatic offensive against international terrorism'. Anyone opposing Israel was a terrorist supporter. He noted that these demands were presented to the Federal government on the previous weekend by the Canada-Israel Committee. Rabbi Plaut spoke to a rally of 5,000 organized by an outfit called the North American Jewish Students Network. They supported the Israeli 'anti-terrorist' invasion' of Lebanon to the full. Plaut steadfastly supported the Israeli invasion and called it "an act of desperation by a people with an utter distaste for war". Also heard were leaders from the Canadian Jewish Congress and Ontario's Attorney-General, Roy McMurtry, who called himself a 'Christian Zionist'.

The Globe and Mail of June 17/82 carries a letter to the editor from one A. Newman who says that he formerly was an admirer of Israel. However, "The latest actions by the Israeli leaders should perhaps surprise no one. Aren't there rumors of Israeli assassination squads murdering people throughout the Middle East? Wasn't Israeli Prime Minister Menachem Begin himself a terrorist in the old Palestine, whose specialty was blowing up hotels filled with British soldiers and civilians? Didn't Mr. Begin and others around him commit the same crimes for which he now condemns the PLO?"

A week later Israeli troops have reached the city of Sidon, which they lay waste with artillery shells and bombs. Block after block has been turned to rubble, especially the Palestinian refugee camps where some 20,000 people formerly lived. A Lebanese vendor who has ventured out on the street tells a reporter that some 2-4,000 Palestinians and Lebanese have been rounded up by the Israelis, who apparently had a list of those they wanted, and taken to a disused factory on the edge of town. He also says that there must be many victims still entombed under the rubble of the buildings. The destruction of Sidon seems to be a warning to Palestinian and other forces in Beirut who might attempt to resist the Israelis. (Globe and Mail, June 24/82)

The same issue of the Globe and Mail reports that two Norwegians allegedly associated with the PLO or with some international aid organization said that they saw Israeli troops beat a number of prisoners to death in Sidon ten days earlier. They are a Dr. Steinar Berge, a medical doctor, and Oivind Moeller, a child welfare worker. They made their charges after being released by the Israelis and returning safely to Norway. An Israeli foreign ministry spokesman in Jerusalem said that "the two Norwegians were not credible sources and their allegation should not be believed." An Israeli member of the Knesset visiting Norway "denied that Israeli forces had been guilty of maltreatment or torture." The two Norwegians had reported only what they had seen with their own eyes. Possibly they were Norwegian anti-Semites - why else would they go to help Palestinian refugees?

As an aside, 'Semitic' refers to speakers of a family of languages, of which Hebrew is one and Arabic is a close cognate. Palestinians and other Arabs are just as Semitic as Jews, possibly more so since they haven't had to relearn their language in the last fifty years and put aside Yiddish, a basically Germanic language.
In a letter to the editor in the *Globe and Mail* of June 26/82 R.T. Naylor writes the following. "Since 1954 Israel has planned to seize control of southern Lebanon and install a puppet regime in order to draw off the waters of the Litani River to irrigate the Galilee settlements. Since the mid sixties, Israel has struck time after time at the towns of southern Lebanon to empty them of population. Even before the latest incursion, Israeli attacks had driven more than 500,000 people out of the area, and into the refugee camps further north, into already crowded suburbs of Beirut or out of the country altogether... But what of the 'terrorist activities'? One can only be amazed at the gall of apologists for a government headed by the only formerly active terrorist to be freely elected head of state, to denounce other people's alleged 'terrorist' propensities. In terms of sheer numbers, in terms of deaths and destruction and violation of human rights, the Zionist state apparatus has inflicted incomparably more on the Palestinians than they, in retaliation, have inflicted on it." (*Globe and Mail*, June 26/82)

It has by now become clear that the invasion of Lebanon had been planned for years in advance. The Shin Bet, the Israeli Gestapo, had compiled the names of tens of thousands of Palestinians and their Lebanese allies who were supporters of the PLO and was using such lists to round up and imprison suspects by the thousands. These lists had presumably been compiled over the years by Israeli agents living in Lebanon. Those who resisted arrest were severely beaten or killed.

By late June Israeli forces had reached and were digging in on the outskirts of Beirut, which they did not intend to enter and were already subjecting to severe bombardment. Surprisingly, there was relatively little detailed coverage of frontline actions from Lebanon reported in Canadian newspapers. This may have been related to the fact that the Israelis were not permitting any untrustworthy foreign reporters to observe their deeds.

However, one C. Ben Cohen, living in Hebron, Israel, writes a letter to the *Globe and Mail* on June 30/82 saying that he was in the Canadian Army in North Africa during world war 2 and never saw a tenth of the arms which the Palestinians had stored in Lebanon. A story about massive 'red' arms stores in Lebanon had been issued by Israel, which its supporters around the world were quick to take up. The Palestinians didn't have any armour, artillery, airforce or navy - but they did have a lot of deadly rocks.

Mr. Ben Cohen also holds that Jerusalem has always had a Jewish majority and that Palestinians are not even historically mentioned as inhabiting it until that history was made up by the PLO some years earlier. "We wanted peace in 1947, but the Arabs wanted all our land. Since then they've tried to take it from us. We lost it 1,912 years ago, but now we are here for good. Jordan is 77% of our land, okay. The rest we want to keep and we want to be left in peace." That peace is apparently the peace of the masses over a caste of slaves, who are illegitimately inhabiting Judea and Samaria, incorrectly known as the Palestinian West Bank.

Irving Layton, the self-proclaimed greatest poet in Canada, writes in to castigate all those who think they can live in peace with terrorists and those who blow up synagogues and little Jewish kiddies. He also notes that Israel is America's greatest ally in the world and that the Communist Soviets are trying to destroy it through the PLO. He tells us that Yasser Arafat is not interested in reaching a political solution with Israel but instead wants to destroy it. (*Globe and Mail*, early July/82)

In Vancouver, one Bernice Gerard, a raucous fundamentalist preacher at the People's Temple Fellowship, has just returned from an Israeli government-paid
tour of the 'Lebanese front'. Various other representatives of the 'Christian media' had also been invited on the tour by the 'International Christian Embassy in Jerusalem'. "Gerard said that she supported the Israeli invasion fully while tears welled up in her eyes for the 'the innocent victims of the invasion, the Lebanese people caught between the Israeli army and the PLO'." By Lebanese people' she presumably means the Christian Phalangists. "Gerard referred to Israeli allegations that the PLO had amassed enough weapons to equip an army of one million guerrillas." One million, well well, imagine that. Gerard had been discovering international red plots and anti-Semitic terrorism for the last twenty-five years. (Globe and Mail, July 5/82)

The Guardian Weekly of July 7/82 carries a front page headline reading 'Lebanon: The untold tragedy'. It notes that even vaguely comprehensive figures for Palestinian and Lebanese deaths due to the Israeli invasion cannot yet be tabulated but that in Sidon alone the International Red Cross on June 17th reported some 1,500 deaths, 3,000 wounded, and some 200,000 made homeless. These figures, it said, do not include those for the 60,000 people living in the former Palestinian refugee camps on the outskirts of the city which had been totally destroyed by Israeli bombing and shelling.

It notes a New York Times report from Beirut which says that a Lebanese doctor with two Norwegian doctors have been trying to help those struck by Israeli cluster bombs and napalm. One says "It's hideous. We're getting pieces of people. We've never had that before."

Israeli occupation forces are systematically denying the entry of any and all volunteer doctors from Europe to help the survivors. Many Palestinian and some European doctors in the occupied regions have been arrested by the Israelis. Aid shipments of food from UNRWA and other international agencies have also been denied entry. Israel has refused the Red Cross permission to see prisoners taken by their army and refuses to give prisoner-of-war status to Palestinian prisoners. The Washington Post of June 21/82 reported that 5-6,000 Palestinians had been taken prisoner in Sidon alone; they were stripped, blindfolded, tied with their arms behind their backs and taken to internment camps established by the Israelis.

By July 8 to July 12, the Israeli advance has reached most of south and central Lebanon and seemingly the only unfinished task for them was to take Beirut. Guerrilla resistance had not yet sprung up in their rear. Israeli agents, who apparently had been thickly scattered throughout Lebanon, were helping to arrest Palestinians and to direct artillery fire at points in Beirut. "I hear that our artillery were hitting the right things 80 percent of the time", a genial Israeli officer commented outside the newly occupied town of Bhamdoun. "But it depends what the 'right things' were supposed to be", notes a Globe and Mail reporter. The Israeli navy was also launching rocket and shell attacks indiscriminately on Muslim inhabited western districts of Beirut. (Globe and Mail, July 12/82) Israeli bombardments of Beirut the previous day were recorded as killing 52 people and wounding another 135. The Lebanese Premier Shafik Wazzan made an appeal to the US to 'Stop this mad bombardment.'

The Israelis would continue this bombardment into the end of August before the PLO capitulated, under US guarantees for the protection of Palestinians remaining in Lebanon. The Warsaw Ghetto rising had lasted for about two weeks; Beirut held out for ten weeks. The various Arab countries on the periphery made loud noises charging Israel with what it patently was doing, but none of them provided any aid to the Palestinian fighters.
On July 18/82 the *Globe and Mail* letters-to-the-editor are filled with vilification of the Palestinians and those who support them. One Barry Signer of Toronto notes the 'one million arms' said to be held by the PLO (for its 8-10,000 fighters) and wonders whether this might be a stock pile awaiting Soviet forces to be intruded into the area. A Peter Benson writes that "the trash [reports 'defaming 'Israel] is only an extreme instance of a certain kind of letter which has appeared almost daily in your paper since the crisis in Lebanon began." Steven Albin writes in to note that the Palestinians have been making trouble in and carrying out terrorist acts in Lebanon since their arrival in 1971, and have allegedly killed more Lebanese than has the current Israeli invasion. Now that they have been defeated it is time to get them out of Lebanon. These represent the views that many Jews apparently have.

On July 17/82 the *Vancouver Sun* reports that the Canadian embassy in Washington had protested an Israeli press spokesman who described a Canadian surgeon working in Lebanon as 'belonging to a European terrorist organization'. This presumably was a Dr. Christopher Giannou, who had testified at a US Congressional hearing that he had personally seen Israeli soldiers beat two prisoners to death at an Israeli prison camp in Sidon. He had been working with the Palestine Red Cross Society when taken prisoner by the Israelis, along with the other hospital staff. Between June 13-16 he had witnessed 'savage and indiscriminate beatings' of prisoners by about 40 Israelis. He was then transferred to another prison in Lebanon. Subsequently an Israeli press spokesman, one Nachman Shai, called Giannou a liar and said that he belonged to a terrorist organization. He noted that "It was only because of strong pressure from Canada that we released him."

Giannou had been born in Lebanon but was trained as a doctor in Canada. He had worked at Shatila refugee camp in Beirut since 1980. He will go on to write a book about his experiences there and go on a speaking tour of North America. We will return to him below.

The *Vancouver Sun* of June 19/82 reports that Menachem Begin's support has skyrocketed in Israel because of his invasion of Lebanon. At a Tel Aviv rally he held the previous Saturday more than 200,000 Israelis turned up in support. Throng's of women chanted "Begin, Begin, King of Israel". He said that he had promised to destroy the PLO and that this was what the Israeli forces were doing. He excoriated the Labour party for failing to stand behind 'the fighting Hebrew soldier'. They were thereby providing moral support for the enemy." The crowd lapped it up.

However Mapam, a left Labour party, had organized a 50-70,000 rally to oppose the war in the same locale a few days previously.

On the same day Israel unleashed particularly heavy shelling of Beirut after warning the PLO that it must withdraw entirely from Lebanon. The surrounding Arab countries, including Syria, rejected any suggestion that they accept Palestinians into their countries. The homeless refugees in Beirut continue to pile up.

On July 22/82 the *Globe and Mail* publishes a host of letters-to- the-editor which revile Israel and its supporters for their actions in Lebanon. Many of them may be reflected by one David McKay. "Where are all the compassionate Jews with a conscience? All I see from the Jewish community are newspaper advertisements, rallies in town squares and meetings in synagogues for the purpose of supporting Israel in the present Mideast crisis and defending the militaristic policies of Menachem Begin." He goes on to say that the "...master plan of political Zionism
publicly and explicitly put the frontier of Israel at the Litani River. David Ben Gurion in 1948 declared that the battle for Galilee was not yet over, for Israel had not yet seized upper Galilee (South Lebanon)... In the wake of the June 1967 war, Moshe Dayan was quoted widely in the press as having declared "Israel now had natural borders with all of its neighbors except Lebanon."

At present Israeli 'archaeologists' are already digging through the rubble of Tyre and Sidon for Jewish artifacts which are to be displayed on Israeli television which demonstrate that southern Lebanon is part of the Biblical land of Israel. Discussion of the prospect of Jewish colonies is now quite open in Israel. While Beirut is dying of thirst under the Israeli siege, Israeli pumps are busy draining the Litani waters off to irrigate the lower Galilee settlements. So well known are Israeli plans and intentions that they even drew a passing reference in a recent Globe editorial." (Globe and Mail, July 22/82)

Rabbi Abraham Foxman of the B'nai B'rit begins gathering material for his current version of a book which is provisionally entitled 'The Newest anti-Semitism'. It will reveal an upsurge in anti-Semitism among those who do not accept American world domination and who quibble about Israeli domination of the middle east and similar crimes against humanity. It is predicted that it will be seriously reviewed when it hits the streets and will sell widely.

The same issue of the Globe and Mail carries a front page photo of Israeli soldiers armed with machine rifles kicking and dispersing a dangerous crowd of Palestinian women and children come to demonstrate outside Israeli government offices in Sidon for the release of their husbands and fathers seized during the war so far.

Three days later (July 25/82) the civilian centers in Beirut are struck by an especially intense bombardment which kills 84 people outright and wounds 142 others. A Red Cross ship, plainly marked with its insignia and delivering food to Beirut, is struck by Israeli coastal guns. Some of its crew are killed and the ship totally put out of service. Another example of Israel's 'clean hands' in military matters.

On July 28/82 the Globe and Mail reports that one Major Saad Haddad, a renegade Lebanese Christian army officer and Israeli collaborator, is building up his 5,000 man army in South Lebanon and controls about a third of that region. The Israelis had installed him as the commander in a narrow border region with Israel after their 1978 invasion of Lebanon. He is committed to the Israeli goal of driving the PLO out of Lebanon. The rival Maronite Christian militia (the Phalangists), are pushing south from Beirut to seize as much territory as they can before the arrival of Major Haddad and his forces. At one point later on I count some 10 or 11 separate Lebanese militia forces, fighting either in conjunction with or opposed to each other.

The following day, July 29/82, the Globe and Mail reports that the Canadian Ambassador to Lebanon, one Theodore Arcand, has described the death and devastation created by Israeli bombardment as 'unbelievable'. He notes the destruction of an eight storey apartment building by Israeli bombing in which 80 people were killed. "So much for pin-point bombing", he says.

On August 4/82 two letters to the Globe and Mail editor dispute Mr. Arcand's comments on the bombardment of Beirut. One Herman Landau holds that Israel has taken extraordinary precautions not to injure civilians in their bombardment while a Lothar Klein says that Mr. Arcand's comment 'betrays a glaring lack of impartiality and of political acumen.' Other letters castigate those Jews who have not rallied to Israel's defence during this current conflict.
B'nai B'rith and other Jewish organizations in Canada hold a press conference and reveal that the Canadian media have relied extensively on Arab and PLO news sources. Really? Frank Diamant, the head of B'nai B'rith Canada and other Jewish officials have gone to Lebanon to hear first hand accounts of the conflict. Naturally they meet no one from the Palestine Liberation Organization. "Nor do we intend to meet with them" said Diamant. Another member of this group, one David Levy, said, "The evidence is clear. They're assassins and dregs." (Globe and Mail, August 5/92) It should by now be clear to all who the real assassins and human dregs are in that conflict.

The following day the Vancouver Sun runs a long story called 'Toll soars as Israeli bombs hit Beirut'. It notes the wave of death and destruction the bombing and shelling have created in West Beirut. The Israeli government says that this bombardment will continue until it has valid evidence of Palestinian preparations to leave Lebanon en toto. It also rejects any plans to establish a UN observers' role to establish peace in Beirut. There are still almost 500,000 Palestinians in South Lebanon while an estimated 6,000 Palestinian fighters continue to resist the Israelis. The Israelis want to avoid entering the city where they would be engaged in street battles and potentially take heavy losses. (Globe and Mail, August 6/82)

The Globe and Mail on the following day (August 7/82) reports that the Rachidiye refugee camps on the Mediterranean coast has been flattened by bombing and its population sent fleeing. It also reports heavy fighting and resistance by members of the PLO to attempts by the Israelis to push forward into West Beirut.

'Begin's actions linked to obsession with Holocaust' reads the title of an article in the Globe and Mail of August 10/82. It begins with an extract from a letter written by Begin to President Reagan some time earlier. Begin writes, "My generation, dear Ron, swore on the altar of God that whoever proclaims his intent to destroy the Jewish state or the Jewish people or both, seals his fate, so that whatever happened from Berlin will never happen again."

Ze'ev Mankowitz, an Israeli teacher of Holocaust Studies, condemns the analogy between Beirut and Berlin as 'delusory and dangerous'. He said that Jews were the victims of hallucinations while the Palestinians were the physical victims of the Jews. Others have commented on Begin's guilt complex which flows from his leaving his parents and others to die in Poland while he escaped to Israel in 1939. "Guilt complex or not, Mr. Begin is preoccupied with the Holocaust. He refused to give interviews to German correspondents and he will not speak the German language. At the slightest provocation, he accuses German Chancellor Helmut Schmidt of war crimes (for which there is no foundation whatsoever) and enemies of the Jews are de facto Nazis." (Globe and Mail, August 10/82)

A report in the Globe and Mail of August 16/82 notes that civilians in West Beirut comprise the great bulk of the casualties in more than a month of intensive shelling and bombardment. "Many of those who survived the bombardment have had to undergo amputations because the phosphorous [in the Israeli bombs] continues to burn up to 24 hours, a process that can be stopped only by cutting away the surrounding tissue. Copper sulfate, which will stop the burning, was not available because of the siege of the city. As a result, there are hundreds of amputees, mainly young children and elderly civilians, in the hospitals and around the city." This is another example of the Israeli policy of 'purity of arms'?

More than 500,000 people are estimated to still be living in the Beirut enclave, including some 100,000 Palestinian refugees plus additional Palestinians who had settled there earlier. As people were driven into more restricted spaces their
density in buildings rises so that the casualties from direct hits by bombs increases geometrically. Recently, causalities of 300 dead and wounded from a single air strike have become more common. The Canadian ambassador to Lebanon, Theodore Arcand, has called the situation a "living hell" and "a scene from Dante’s Inferno”. Block after block of houses in some neighbourhoods have been flattened by the shelling and bombing. "The stench of rotting flesh permeates the still air but rescue workers were making no effort to retrieve the buried bodies. Instead, they searched for any remaining wounded, saying the exact number of those who had perished might never be known." (Globe and Mail, August 16/82)

The remaining hospitals which have not yet been shelled into rubble are packed and can provide only the most basic treatment, sometimes not even that.

The Vancouver Sun of the same day reports that "Israel says the refugee camps were targets of bombings because the guerillas had built their fortifications inside the camps. They [Israelis] do not want the Palestinian civilians resettling in the camps, fearing new guerilla movements might form. Instead, Israel has said the refugees should be assimilated into the Lebanese population.” Either that or dispersed elsewhere.

Throughout August of 1982 a series of meetings between Israel and the PLO have taken place under the auspices of a special representative from America. A tentative cease-fire between Israel and the Palestinian forces is arranged with the proviso that all PLO forces will immediately depart Lebanon for Tunisia. While these talks are going on Israel continues to pound Beirut from the air, land and sea. The Israeli army has pushed north of Beirut and deployed its forces there as well.

The final snags of the cease-fire are overcome and on August 22 and the following day an initial 1,000 PLO combatants board a Cypriot ship. The withdrawal of 8,000 PLO soldiers is expected to take about two weeks. A central provision of the withdrawal agreement was that foreign military forces were to be put in place to protect Palestinian civilians from reprisals from both the Israelis and the Lebanese Phalange forces. A few French troops have already landed there. The American are soon to come. The protection of the 600,000 Palestinians still remaining in Lebanon is very much in doubt. Both the military and the civilian organizations of the Palestine Liberation Organization are being withdrawn and that organization looks as if it may disintegrate into factions. (Globe and Mail, August 23/82)

In the same issue of the Globe and Mail an article reports that the upcoming Lebanese elections may lead to more fighting between the Maronite forces (Phalangists) and assorted factions of the Muslim majority in the country. The Lebanese army has long since disintegrated and the only organized armed forces in Lebanon are those of various party militias. Fighting between them has again broken out.

On August 26/82 the first contingents of American Marine forces are put ashore in Lebanon and gradually establish their camp within the heart of Beirut. However they do not venture outside of their base and are unable to protect anyone from anything. Ronald Reagan has called off the long distance shelling of Muslim villages in the interior of Lebanon from the guns of a world war 2 US battleship recommissioned from the mothball fleet.

The Vancouver Sun of August 26/82 carries a report that former Chancellor of Austria, Bruno Kreisky, delivered a stinging attack on the Israeli government. He wrote in the magazine Stern "Israel now stands morally destitute, its power
holders have shown their true face. The whole world is afraid of the madness of its leaders, who rely only on arms... Gigantic crimes have occurred and anybody who is silent is guilty too... I want nothing more to do with this Israel. Never again." Kreisky is an Austrian Jewish concentration camp survivor.

The same issue of the Vancouver Sun contains an article about an Israeli pilot who had been engaged in the bombing of Beirut and who is deeply angered by world criticism of the Israeli attacks. He and all his comrades aimed strictly at military targets, he says. (Especially when they were dropping bombs on residential areas.)

In a series of letters to the editor in the Globe and Mail of August 16/82, the tone of all of them is caught by one Nicholas Rice who says, "As Jews, we have nothing to be ashamed of. We need not apologize for Israel's actions. Nor should we make frightened distinctions between Judaism and Zionism. Israel freed Lebanon. This is an achievement of which we can all be proud." He goes on to say that all the rest, all the atrocity stories, are simply PLO propaganda. This is also the thrust of letters by Arnold Morus and Peter Davies.

On August 27/82 the Globe and Mail carries a report about peace having returned to Lebanon by the Jewish gas-bag reporter Abraham Rabinovich. He provides a cheery picture of Beirut and the former demarcation line between the East and West of that city now guarded by cheery Phalangist militia. A woman in a nearby apartment block stands on her balcony and tells him "This is the first time in seven years we've been out on the balcony." Now, with all the murderous Palestinians gone, the Lebanese middle class is able to live again.

On August 27/82 the Globe and Mail runs an article by George Ball, the former undersecretary of state in the Kennedy and Johnson administrations. He suggests a 'modest proposal' of deducting the cost of all aid the US gives to Lebanon to rebuild its shattered economy and society from funds which would otherwise have gone to Israel. He notes that US public funds now account for $2.75 billion per year to Israel, possibly a good deal more - a minimum of $760 for each person in Israel, kiddies included.

Ball continues with "Experience has shown the United States can expect little gratitude from the Government in Jerusalem. Israel will almost certainly press for a new supply of tanks and ammunition and cluster bombs to replace those it used to destroy Beirut and for an increased subsidy to help meet the estimated $2 billion or more that the war has already cost its own hard-pressed economy... Indeed, before Israeli troops are fully withdrawn there is evidence that they plan to keep control of southern Lebanon up to and including the Litani River - the last major water resource divertible into Israel."

Ball goes on to say that Israel's seeming victory in Lebanon has not made the Begin government any more flexible but has only hardened their resolve to seek military solutions to any problem which may arise, internally or externally. He also notes that the Camp David Accord, which was so recently signed by Begin, Sadat and Jimmy Carter, provided for a solution to the Palestinian condition, the establishment of a national homeland for them. This is also quite dead now.

On September 2/82 the Vancouver Sun runs an article written by Jimmy Cater, the recent President of the US. In it he holds that Israeli actions have totally ignored the 'Camp David Spirit. He also writes that "The massive settlement program in the occupied territories, launched by the Israelis contrary to repeated assurances by their leaders, has been an extremely unpleasant surprise to all of us who had such high hopes for a peaceful resolution of the major Middle East issue. This action plus the continued deprivation of citizenship rights of those living
under military occupation, the apparent unwillingness to grant any real autonomy to the Palestinians and the recent invasion of Lebanon have convinced most Arabs that Israel does not intend to carry out the commitments made by Prime Minister Begin at Camp David."

"There is plenty of blame for both sides and it must be shared by our own country, which has shown little interest in fulfilling the legitimate and necessary role of the United States as a full participant in the peace process."

The same issue of the *Vancouver Sun* runs a story which says that the Lebanese police have tabulated some 17,825 deaths in Lebanon to date due to Israeli bombing and shelling and that some 30,200 were wounded more or less seriously. The Israelis claim a 'few thousands' and say they cannot verify the Lebanese figures because they have never controlled all of Beirut. Right.

On August 24/82, the 34 year old Bashir Gemayel, the eldest son of the founder of the Lebanese Falange, wins 'election' as the upcoming president of Lebanon in a contest as free as those held in Guatemala. He is also the commander in chief of the Phalangist militia/army. Gemayel promises to get all foreign troops and citizens out Lebanon and that there will be no retribution against Moslems who have opposed the Falange in the past. He is the almost unchallenged head of the right-wing in Lebanon. His task will be to get the Israelis to withdraw from the southern half of the country, the Syrians from the eastern third, and to get the non-Palestinian Muslim militias to lay down their arms after eight years of civil war. (*Vancouver Sun*, August 24/82)

The *Globe and Mail* of September 13/82 reports on the split within the Phalangist forces between those backing the Gemayel family, and those supporting the former president, the aged Suleiman Franjeh - who has his own small militia force. Franjeh, who had previously been a deadly foe of all Muslim forces has since made trips to Damascus to gain Syrian backing for his enterprise of again ruling Lebanon. There already have been some mutual assassination attempts between his and the Gemayel forces. Israel backs Gemayel. His 'Lebanese Forces' militia have been permitted to occupy much of the territory which Israel had taken south of Beirut.

On September 14/82 Bashir Gemayel, Lebanon's president-elect and the leader of the Phalangist party, is assassinated in Beirut. No one apparently knows who the assassins are but suspicion falls on agents of the Syrian government. There is no evidence implicating anyone as yet.

Israel takes quick note of the killing and immediately sends its troops into Western Beirut, now largely undefended except for some scattered Lebanese Moslem and leftist combatants. These forces resist the Israeli advance but cannot stop it. Within two days Israel controls all of Beirut. (*Globe and Mail*, September 16/82) Only the north and the East of Lebanon remain free from Israeli conquerors.

By the second day after Gemayel's assassination the Phalangists had come to blame the Palestinians for this deed. This was about to erupt into massacres instituted against the Palestinian refugee camps of Sabra and Shatila.

**The Massacres of Palestinians at Sabra and Shatila Camps: An Overview**

The massacres at Shatila and Sabra refugee camps in West Beirut seem to have proceeded in the following manner. This account is pieced together from information and reports which appeared later and were not immediately available.
Following the assassination of Lebanon's president-elect, the leader of the Maronite Christian forces, Bashir Gemayel, on September 15/82, Israeli forces were immediately mobilized and began to push into West Beirut. With the departure of the PLO it was now defended only by scattered Lebanese Muslim militias. Either the Phalangist militia approached the Israelis or vice versa, but in any case Phalangist requests to enter two major Palestinian camps in West Beirut were passed up the Israeli chain of command. The request was permitted by the commanding Israeli general in Lebanon and the civilian authorities in Israel and then countersigned by the Israeli Minister of Defence, Ariel Sharon. The Israeli Prime Minister, Menachem Begin, was surely also contacted but allegedly 'could not be reached' for this life and death decision. However the Phalangist entry into the camps was phrased, all those Israelis who knew or had anything to do with the operation must have known that this could only be a pogrom in the making.

In the previous two days Israeli army units had taken over all of Western Beirut including the sites of Sabra and Shatila camps. They had established watchtowers and tanks around the periphery of those two camps and Israeli soldiers equipped with powerful binoculars could view almost every part of them. The watchtowers were manned by Israeli troops as the Phalangist entered the camps and continued to monitor the entire operation. It was perfectly impossible for the Israelis not to know what was occurring in Sabra and Shatila.

Phalangist military units entered the two camps in the early evening of September 16 and proceeded to haul out and shoot any Palestinians they encountered there. This fact was being reported by refugees fleeing out of the camps within an hour or two after the killing started. The hospitals where they came to have their wounds dressed and where they appealed for someone to stop the Phalangist massacre reported this immediately to Israeli commanders in the region. So did Israeli reporters who came on the scene. Such reports were stonewalled by the Israeli command, who ultimately made some pro forma phone calls to Defence Minister Sharon who advised them not to become involved in intra-Lebanese blood letting. It might be pointed out that Israel had a clear responsibility to preserve order and safety in territories which it had recently occupied and in which it was the occupying power. This was their duty under clearly understood international law. The camps had after all been sealed off by Israeli troops and any Palestinian who attempted to leave was forced back into them by military force.

The Phalangist killings proceeded throughout that first night - screams and gunfire were clearly heard and the Israeli watchtowers around the camps must have witnessed the killings taking place. No Israeli commander or soldier intervened. It might be reasonable to ask of the Israelis "What did you do while the massacres were going on?"

During the following day many of the Phalangist troops briefly left the two Palestinian refugee camps and were fed by the Israelis, who had made no move to halt the killers. In some cases they even resupplied them with ammunition. Then the Phalangists returned to the camps where they proceeded to go from house to hovel to continue their campaign of 'cleansing'. At this time lorries where driven into the camps and were loaded with surviving Palestinians, who were driven away and never heard from again. Both camps were just about emptied of living people. All this killing went on over 38 continuous hours. All this proceeded with Israeli knowledge, permission and support - regardless of what they later claimed. Presumably from the very highest level.
The following morning, after having completed their killings and having buried some of the dead in mass graves on the outskirts of the two camp but leaving other bodies lying scattered where they fell, the Phalangists withdrew. It was only then that western and other reporters were allowed to enter Sabra and Shatila camps and make their initial reports for their assorted newspapers.

The Israelis were suitably shocked and 'knew nothing of those events', of course. When they were apprised of the deed they simply put it down to 'Arab bloodlust', of which they were completely blameless. As noted above, no single Israeli soldier or officer acted to stop these killings while they were underway. The Israeli command expected to get away scot free from any charges.

The toll of Palestinian men, women and children who were murdered at Sabra and Shatila in mid September of 1982 will never be known exactly since prisoners were taken away to be killed elsewhere. However, the initial figure of 300 suggested by the New York Times soon climbed to 700 recovered bodies. However the total causalities suggested run from 800 to 1,200 dead. That is something like 20 times the number of Jewish dead at Kishinev, Russia, at the beginning of the century, which infuriated world opinion and has since become a part of Jewish martyrology.

Soon after the Phalangists withdrew Israeli officers of the Shin Bet (the Israeli Gestapo) descended on the scene and arrested any Palestinian male who had survived. They also hassled those few foreign news correspondents on the scene trying to get a picture of what had happened. An Israeli attempt to blackout any reports from the scene descended.

Throughout this overview it should not be forgotten that the massacres at these two refugee camps were only a small part of the killings carried out or facilitated by the Israelis in Lebanon, whose toll would ultimately total 17-20,000 or so dead and an even greater number of seriously wounded.

The New York Times, still under the editorship A.M. Rosenthal, was somewhat unsure as how to report the massacres. Its initial report (September 19/82) is entitled 'Mass Killings Reported in Palestinian Camps US Says'. This account shares the front page with a full spread story of Princess Grace Kelly's funeral in Monaco, with a photo of Prince Rainier weeping copiously.

The Lebanese Army, or what was left of it, had been excluded by the Israelis from extending its control over the camps. It has been suggested that the Phalangists instituted these massacres in order to strike fear into the hearts of the Palestinian survivors and get them to leave Lebanon. However, the US condemned the killings and asked Israel to pull out of Lebanon. The initial photos of the Palestinian dead, thick on the ground, began to appear. Regardless of how contemptuous of this Mr. Begin was, it did not go over well in America.

The Massacres at Sabra and Shatila Camps: The Unfolding Story

The day following the withdrawal of the Phalangist forces from the two camps the New York Times (of September 19/82) first reports on the massacres committed. It says "...Christian militiamen massacred scores of Palestinian men, women and children in a refugee camp." Reporters are said to have counted some 40 bodies lying in the camp on initial inspection - the actual toll would later turn out to be 25 fold greater. "Walking down the rubble-strewn streets of Shatila this morning reporters found two old men shot through the head, several piles of women and children, their bodies covered with flies, and at least one line of middle-aged men who had been lined up against a cinder-block wall and executed."
The previous day Israeli authorities in Jerusalem had denied any responsibility for the massacres and 'didn't know' how they had occurred. An unspecified Israeli official said they had no confirmed reports of women and children killed in the camps. "We would be very upset if these reports were true. I am sure that we would do whatever is possible to stop it, if that kind of thing is true." However, not only did the Israeli army not stop the killings they facilitated them and probably had planned on them happening. Israel naturally denies any responsibility whatsoever for the massacres.

".... with the withdrawal of the main force of the PLO now, the Phalangists faced less opposition. For weeks Palestinian civilians in the Beirut area and in the south have been expressing their fears that such attacks could take place in the absence of their PLO defenders."

"This is one reason that the PLO insisted on a multi-national force during its withdrawal. Mr. Sharon is reported to have opposed the multinational force, which has now withdrawn, because he was afraid it would stand in the way of 'mopping up' operations after the PLO departure. Such 'mopping up' is one of the stated goals of the Israeli army. The army chief of staff, Lieut. Gen. Rafael Eytan, said Friday [during the massacre] in an interview with the Hebrew language newspaper Yediot Ahronot, 'we will identify the terrorists and all their commanders. The area will be clean.' (New York Times September 19/82) He was alluding to a policy of making the region 'Palestinian rein'.

It might be noted that a multi-national 'peacekeeping' force of some 6,000 American, French and Italian troops had been sent into Lebanon in late August-early September exactly to prevent this kind of a massacre. However, once the PLO forces were withdrawn there was no one left to protect the circa 500,000 Palestinian refugees remaining in Lebanon. This multinational force did absolutely nothing to protect anyone.

President Ronald Reagan issued a statement condemning the massacres and extended his condolences to surviving members of families killed. He also noted that "Israel, by yesterday in military control of Beirut, claimed that its move would prevent the kind of tragedy which has now occurred." He also summoned the Israeli Ambassador and demanded that Israel immediately withdraw its forces from West Beirut and to begin serious negotiations for its withdrawal from the rest of Lebanon. (New York Times, September 19/82) Ariel Sharon, the Israeli Minister of Defence immediately dismissed these demands. For a nation depending upon American arms and public funds for its regional dominance it has become pretty arrogant.

"The United States' vote for Friday's Security Council resolution calling for a [Israeli] pullout, combined with American outrage at the Israelis for reportedly allowing the killings in the camps, was being denounced here [in Jerusalem] as 'hypocrisy'."

Israeli commandos and Shin Bet officers entered the camps at about 2 pm on Saturday September 18, about four hours after the Phalangists had withdrawn. They immediately began to round-up surviving Palestinians, having corralled about 500 men in a nearby stadium for interrogation. Their identity papers were checked against Israeli lists of suspected PLO members. The Israeli officer in charge of this operation, one Col. Naftali Bahiry, said that not many of his prisoners had proved to be members of the PLO. He also noted that Phalangist forces had been ordered out of the camps, but too late for the victims. (New York Times, September 19/82)
"'You must see it' said one member of the International Committee of the Red Cross. 'The world must know what has happened here'."

On September 20/82 the Globe and Mail reports that Israeli has agreed to allow UN observers into the remains of the two refugee camps and the Lebanese army, now composed mainly of non-Muslim officers and men, has taken over control of the area. They and the Lebanese police unearth some of the mass graves and bury the dead.

"In Jerusalem hundreds of demonstrators demanding the resignation of Mr. Begin were dispersed by police using tear gas yesterday morning as Mr. Begin, wrapped in a white prayer shawl, participated in Rosh Hashanah [New Tear's] services in the city's Great Synagogue a few hundred meters away."

Yasser Arafat requests the United States, France and Italy to bring back the military forces which they had already pulled out of Lebanon after previously guaranteeing to protect Palestinian civilians from attack.

Another article in the same issue of the Globe and Mail notes that "...Israeli army commanders were being blamed for failing to anticipate a bloodbath, given the Phalangists history of ruthlessness. Shimon Peres, leader of the opposition Labor Party, held Premier Menachem Begin and Defence Minister Ariel Sharon responsible and called for their resignation." [A few years afterward, Peres would share power with Begin's successor Yitzak Shamir and 23 years after that join with Ariel Sharon's newly founded party to govern Israel."

"A senior official in the Foreign Ministry said on Sunday that 'we permitted the Phalangists to go into the camps in order to search for terrorists' [i.e anyone who resists Israel] Mr. Peres said. 'Anyone who knows the Phalangists and their relations with the Palestinians should have know that it was indefensible to permit this."

"According to well-placed Israeli officials the military operation in the camps was planned by Phalangist president-elect Bashir Gemayel, before his assassination last Tuesday. He was determined to integrate his Phalangist forces into the regular Lebanese Army and to send them into the refugee camps for 'mopping up' campaigns against guerillas who stayed behind after the departure of the Palestine Liberation Organization. The plan fitted the objectives of Gen. Sharon, who was reported early in the war to have hoped that the Phalangists, known for their ruthlessness, would go into West Beirut against the PLO, thereby sparing the Israeli Army heavy casualties."

Mr. Sharon had previously told the US special ambassador to Lebanon, one Morris Draper, that "we believe this will bring the elimination of the remaining terrorists still operating in Beirut." (Globe and Mail, September 20/82)

Another report in the same issue of the Globe and Mail is entitled "Survivors' corpses tell story of slaughter". The reporter notes that the Phalangists immediately started going from house to house. "Some people were taken away, some were killed on the spot, some managed to flee and others to hide. Why some were killed and others were taken off was not clear. Many buildings that reporters saw standing on Friday at 5 p.m. had either been dynamited or bulldozed Saturday."

"The scene on the main street of the camp Saturday was horrific. Reporters and residents were gagging as they walked down the street from the stench of the bodies that were frozen in all manner of grotesque forms... Some were simply heaped in piles with garbage, others were trapped under rubble, while still more lay on the street where they were gunned down."
"It was impossible to determine just how much resistance had been put up by the camps' residents, many of whom had only recently returned after the pullout of the Palestinian Liberation Organization. Judging from the numbers of women and even babies whose bloated, decaying bodies where strewn about, and the number of people who appeared to have been shot at close range through the head - some of the men had been lined up and shot - their deaths were clearly not the outcome of a firefight but rather premeditated acts."

"Elsewhere one could find women with their heads blown apart and others rotting together with the garbage surrounded by flies. A Norwegian diplomat, Gunnar Falkstad, said he saw a pile of bodies taken off in a scoop bulldozer, apparently destined for burial. In the middle of the camp near some of the most grotesque bodies, was a freshly dug hole covered with red dirt and patted down by a bulldozer. The site is believed to be a mass grave." A young survivor told of how the Phalangists and their helpers had divided up their captives into Palestinians and Lebanese before they were taken away by trucks.

"The Christian militiamen also stormed the Palestinian Akka Hospital from which the International Committee of the Red Cross was trying to remove the wounded patients. Reliable Western medical sources who were at the hospital said a Palestinian nurse was repeatedly raped and shot dead by Christian militiamen and several doctors from the hospital were taken off." (Globe and Mail, September 20/82)

The New York Times of September 20/82 reports the unfolding account of the massacre. It notes that "....there is a wide patch of freshly turned red dirt inside the camp with arms and legs sticking out one end. It appears to be a mass grave containing an undetermined number of corpses. In addition no one has any idea how many bodies were taken off in the scoops of bulldozers, how many were driven away and killed outside the camp and how many are buried under buildings that were bulldozed to cover up bullet-ridden men, women and children." The Times reporter also notes that the Israelis had a clear view of the camp while the massacre was proceeding. "....there was no indication, witnesses said, that Israeli forces made any effort to interdict the operations of the Christian militiamen, who rested between forays into the refugee camps side-by-side with Israeli troops."

The Phalangists had been gathering south of the refugee camps since the previous Wednesday and reports to date, and later, suggest that there were some 1,200-1,500 of them involved in the attack. Not the ludicrous figure of around 100 Phalangists, as claimed by the later Kahan investigating commission. By September 20 /82 the Israelis are busy blaming the Phalangists for the atrocities and claim they had not had a hand in them nor knowledge of them at all. A claim which will prove to be equally ludicrous. General Rafael Eytan, the Israeli chief of staff, gave an interview in Beirut earlier that day in which he said "we did not give the Phalangists [an] order and we are not responsible for them. The Phalangists are Lebanese and Lebanon is theirs and they act as they see fit." This claim of the Israelis not giving the Phalangists orders will go by the boards within a few days.

At about 1 p.m. of Friday morning, about 6 hours after the assault had begun, a Danish reporter, Flint Pederson, "...stood at the southern gate of Shatila and watched as a cattle truck was loaded with women and children by Christian militiamen, two of whom were very agitated and firing into the ground...What happened to these woman and children is still not known." (New York Times, September 20/82)
An Israeli colonel was interviewed by a Reuters correspondent during the previous Friday night who said that "his men were working on two principles: that the Israeli army should not become involved but that the area should be 'purified'." The Reuters correspondent also noticed that the Israeli observation post had a clear view of virtually the entire camp and all that was going on in it. The Israelis also had tanks stationed around the two camps, both to keep the Palestinians in them and to provide support to the Phalangists should Palestinian resistance prove to be stronger than anticipated.

At 9 or 10 a.m. Saturday morning the remaining doctors and about 500 Palestinians who had been sheltering in and around the Gaza hospital were marched off under Phalangist militia guard, which carried out some killings along the way. The mainly foreign doctors and nurses were ultimately released to the Israelis after being interrogated but there is as yet no information on what happened to the 500 Palestinian prisoners.

"If the Israelis made any attempts to halt the actions of the Christian militiamen it is not at all apparent when this was done. The massacre clearly ended Saturday morning and reporters entered the camps long before any Israeli soldiers." Elements of the Lebanese army entered the camps at about midday on Saturday and were greeted by surviving Palestinians as potential protectors.

A number of remaining hospitals in West Beirut had been overwhelmed with Palestinian victims with gun and shrapnel wounds. A Christian Lebanese doctor working in a small hospital away from the camps said that even he was frightened of the Phalangist forces. (New York Times, September 20/82)

In the meantime, the Soviet Union had called for an emergency meeting of the Security Council of the United Nations to consider the expulsion of Israel from the UN, a step it had never previously taken. The Soviet’s Tass news agency compared the massacre at the two Palestinian refugee camps with the massacre of Jews near Kiev by the Nazis during world war 2.

In Israel, the protests were beginning with members of kibbutzim north of Tel Aviv blocking the road to Haifa with burning tires and shouting 'Out of Lebanon'. They were dragged away by Israeli police. Former (and later) Labor party leader Yitzak Rabin held that Israel at least bore indirect responsibility for the killings since it had assumed responsibility for public order and security of the population when it had seized West Beirut. Mr. Begin again repeated a variant of his "Goyim kill goyim and they come to hang the Jews."

A senior official of the Israeli Foreign Ministry said that "Anyone who knows the Phalangists and their relations with the Palestinians should have known that it was indefensible to permit this." While General Drori, the Israeli commander in West Beirut, said that he had pleaded with the Lebanese army, and not the Phalangists, to go into the camps but that his pleas were rejected. So, of necessity, he was thrown back on using the Phalangist killers. The story that the Israelis didn't know that the killings were taking place is already beginning to unravel. (New York Times, September 20/82)

The US, France, and Italy are discussing the possibility of reintroducing their forces into Beirut to protect the civilians there. Western newspapers have not yet mentioned that under the withdrawal agreement brokered by the US, the PLO had had a perfect right to maintain some thousands of their forces in Beirut to protect the Palestinians.

Anthony Lewis, one of the few surviving liberal commentators at the New York Times, says of Menachem Begin and Ariel Sharon and their entire government that, "In the name of peace, they have waged war. In the name of trust, they have
practiced deception on their friends. In the name of religion, they have undertaken territorial aggrandizement. They have done all this, they insist, for Israel’s security. But they have in fact put its security at risk by trying to extend Israeli control into troublesome areas nearby. And they have stripped Israel of what must underlie its military power, however great that is: a decent respect in the opinion of mankind. " (New York Times, September 20/82)

To the Paul Wolfowitzes and the Ariel Sharon’s this is so much empty liberal breast beating. Agreements are made to be broken, when it suits the purposes on the dominant power.

The New York Times of September 21/82 reports that the overwhelming evidence suggests that Israeli commanders and senior politicians were fully aware of the massacres as they were going on. They were no surprise to them. The same conclusion was reached by a broad spectrum of accounts in the Israeli press. The same issue of the New York Times however also carries testimonials by 23 Jewish ‘leaders’ in the US restating their fundamental support of Israel, its war against terrorism, the purity of its army, its complete innocence of any involvement in the massacres etc., etc. For instance, one Ivan Novik, the President of the Zionist Organization of America holds that "Israel would not knowingly be a participant in such carnage. If they misjudged conditions it was not malicious and it was not intentional. The entire thing is contrary to everything Jews hold sacred." Right! Jack Spitzer, the International President of B’nai B’rith, compared the Israeli presence in Lebanon to the New York police department. He notes that the New York police also kill malefactors when necessary. Right on, Jackie! Sidney Leiwant, the President of something called Organization for Rehabilitation Through Training, says "Any action to reduce support of Israel at this time would be fatal to the relationship between Israel and the United States. The Israelis, up to the point of this massacre, in my judgement were more than correct in carrying out [their humanitarian duties]." And so on and so forth. All 23 of them say that their support of Israel continues unchanged.

On the same page of the September 21/82 issue of the New York Times is another account by one Colin Campbell. It recounts in brief outline the experiences of Palestinians who witnessed and survived the massacres, often badly wounded.

The same issue of the Times also reports a fundamental rethink of US Middle East policy. American relations with Israel were being reconsidered by Mr. Reagan and members of his cabinet. Reagan warned Israel that if it did not withdraw from Beirut and make way for the three-nation peacekeeper forces being readied that it would have serious consequences in America. Israel was apparently having difficulty in mobilizing its Jewish lobby within that nation. However, after a few months everything was back on track again and Israel was being praised for establishing an investigating commission, even if its findings were a predictable whitewash. American funds would pour into Israel at an even increased rate.

The Vancouver Sun of September 21/82 reports that an additional 127 bodies of victims of the Sabra refugee camp were retrieved from mass graves by members of International Red Cross the previous day. "You can multiply that figure by five, maybe ten," said Col. Marcel Prince, a senior medical officer in the Lebanese army...Estimates of the number of dead range from 300 to 1,500, but no one knows for certain how many Palestinians were slaughtered in the Sabra and Chatilia refugee camps south of Beirut... Babies, children, the elderly and whole families were slaughtered by knife and bullet." The survivors blame both
the Phalangist militia and the Free Lebanon forces of Maj. Saad Haddad, a renegade Lebanese officer who has been protecting the northern boundaries of Israel from inside Lebanon.

"The Christian militia were said to have gathered at the Israeli positions at Beirut airport several kilometers to the south, entered the camp in small groups for forays lasting several hours at a time, while others rested and ate alongside Israeli positions encircling the camp."

Another article in the Vancouver Sun of the same day by Christopher Young holds that "The grotesque behavior of Israeli troops in West Beirut since the invasion last Tuesday night has horrified her friends and strengthened the hatred of her foes. ...The massacres in Sabra and Chatila camps is beyond excusing, whether the Israelis were active accomplices or impasive observers of crimes committed by allied forces. They alone had the power to start, stop or to allow violence on that scale."

Young also notes that the embassies and business offices of all countries which did not support Israel in its invasion have been shelled and largely destroyed by Israeli gunners, including the Canadian Embassy.

A Canadian Embassy official said "It may have been an accident. On the other hand, it may have been a message to say that the Israelis remember Ambassador Ted Arcand had some uncomplimentary things to say about the summer bombings." A similar treatment was delivered to the French and Italian Embassy buildings by Israeli tanks, which fired into them at close range. It was nothing compared to the events which occurred at Sabra and Chatila camps, "Yet it said something very disturbing about the psychology of the invading force."

This psychology presumably is the belief that everyone who in any way criticized Israel was their enemy and could be dealt with by force.

The New York Times of September 22/82 reports that Amin Gemayel, Bashir's younger brother, had been 'elected' as president of Lebanon with an overwhelming majority. [?] Israel is still baulking over its pullout from West Beirut and Begin is still resisting the establishment of any commission to investigate the massacres at Sabra and Shatila. The US congress claims to be shocked by such stonewalling.

The same issue of the New York Times carries another almost full page series of comments by a dozen prominent American Jews who continue to support Israel, although not necessarily its current leaders. To cite a few: Elie Wiesel writes "Since the end of world war II this has been the worst and darkest Rosh Hashana to me. It is not that I accuse or indict anyone, and surely not the people of Israel, but I felt sadness, incomprehensible sadness [as usual] ...I believe now that 'a gesture' is needed on our part. Perhaps we ought to proclaim a day of fasting, of taking stock." So speaks the moral conscience of the world. Robert Morgenthau, the Manhattan District Attorney, holds that "Every civilized person, Jew or Christian, is shocked at what happened in the camps. But for lynch mobs to get out and say it's Begin's responsibility is premature, to say the least. There is no evidence to say that the Israeli army was the cause of this. After all, the President-elect of Lebanon and 26 of his key people had been killed by other Lebanese a few days before." Presumably its all due to Arab bloodlust.

Lawrence Hoffman, a professor of Liturgy at Hebrew Union College, writes "I have too little information to make an informed judgement. The press and the media have been reporting different information, some of which I don't believe is true... It is like Vietnam when people tuned in to see the latest horror... I think it is dangerous for intellectuals sitting in armchairs to make real-life decisions in
regard to a war somewhere off in the distance." Presumably such decisions should all be made by military commanders in the field. Barbara Tuchman ends her long commentary with the following. "The policy of Begin and Sharon for the elimination of the PLO threat - a real one - had a justifiable aim. What concerns me is the survival and future of Jews in the Diaspora - myself among them. I do not think that the way the situation has developed is in the long-term interests of Israelis and ourselves." Elsewhere she tells us that her only measure of Israeli and others' actions 'Is it good for the Jews?' The same issue of the Times has a photo of a group of some 1,500 French Jews marching and calling for full support for Israel and its government.

Also on September 22/82 the New York Times and other major newspapers in the US run a paid full page statement issued by the Israeli Embassy in Washington. It reads as follows:

"Blood Libel"

"On the New Year (Rosh Hashana) a blood libel was leveled against the Jewish state, its government and the Israel Defense Forces.

In an area where there was no position of the Israeli army, a Lebanese unit entered a refugee camp in order to apprehend terrorists hiding there. This unit caused many casualties to innocent civilians. We state this fact with deep grief and regret.

"As soon as the IDF learned of the tragic events, Israeli soldiers put an end to the slaughter and forced the Lebanese unit to evacuate the camp.

"The civilian population of the camp gave clear expression of its gratitude for the act of salvation by the IDF.

"Any direct or implicit accusation that the IDF bears any blame whatsoever for this human tragedy is entirely baseless and without foundation. The Government of Israel rejects such accusation with the contempt they deserve.

"In fact, without the intervention of the IDF, there would have been much greater loss of life. It should be noted that, for two days and nights, the IDF carried out actions against terrorists in West Beirut and no complaint whatever was voiced concerning civilian causalities.

"It is now clear that the PLO cynically violated the evacuation agreement. They left behind 2,000 terrorists; they concealed heavy weapons - artillery, tanks and mortars and immense quantities of ammunition. They did this in order that West Beirut continue to be a center of PLO terror against Israel and other free nations.

"The people of Israel are proud of the IDF's ethic and respect for human life. These are the traditional Jewish values in which we have educated generations of Israeli fighters, and we will continue to do so.

"We call upon free men of good will to unite with Israel in its struggle for truth, in its fight against international terrorism spearheaded by the PLO, and its quest for security, peace and justice." (New York Times, September 22/82)

The lies and fantasies contained in this statement, its utter contempt for anyone who criticizes Israel, and its hoakum about its army's 'value for human life' should need no comment. The arrogance entailed is quite breathtaking.

On September 22/82 the Globe and Mail reports that Menachem Begin has rejected both Israeli and foreign calls for an investigation of the Beirut massacres and the role which the Israeli army did or may have played in them. He tells his listeners "Goyim kill goyim, and they immediately come to hang the Jews."

However, some ministers in his government are eager to jettison Ariel Sharon for his role in the massacres. The National Religious Party, represented by 6 Ashkenazi rabbis, say it will vote against Begin's government, throwing it out of
Palestinian strikes and protests are reported from all the towns throughout the West Bank and Gaza yesterday. They were met by reenforced army and police patrols. *(New York Times, September 23/82)*

The *Globe and Mail* of September 23/82 runs an editorial called 'Lebanon's hopes' which notes the forerunner of the massacres at Sabra and Shatila camps was previously carried out by Phalangist forces at Tel Al Zataar refugee camp during the the bloody civil war which raged throughout Lebanon throughout 1974 to 1976. It holds that if Lebanon is to survive as something more that a patchwork of feuding principalities it will require a leader who can weave together the competing groups and heal some of the wounds inflicted in the past. It wonders whether Amin Gemayel is the man to do this, with his close ties to the Phalangist militias. It notes that both Syria and Israel must somehow be gotten out of Lebanon. (Although neither the *Globe and Mail* nor anyone else imagines that the Israelis will be in that country for more than ten more years.) The article ends with this, "...Israeli Premier Menachem Begin is true to his own terrorist past in the Irgun Zvai Leumi. But this normally shrewd tactician has now made what may be a politically fatal blunder; selling short the conscience of his people."

The same issue of the *Globe and Mail* carries an account of a young Lebanese Moslem woman living in Toronto who had just heard that all 23 members of her immediate family had been killed in an Israeli attack on Beirut. Odette Manuel's family had all been living in an apartment block which was destroyed, along with 250 other inhabitants, by an experimental Israeli implosion bomb which flattened the building. She says, "They were not against the Israelis or the PLO. They were just civilians."

A large proportion of the front section of the *New York Times* of September 23/82 is devoted to developments in Israel and Lebanon. One article notes that a Danish film crew had filmed soldiers of Maj. Haddad's rightist allies of Israel rounding up Palestinian women and children and taking them to a refugee camp where hundreds of bodies were later discovered. The film, shot by a hidden camera, was taken by one Flindt Pederson and his recognition of Haddad's forces were later validated by Lebanese observers. Israel denied any involvement of their intimate ally in the massacres.

Israeli armed forces were also beginning their pullout from West Beirut. They are moved a few miles back. A three nation 'peace-keeping force' is to be redeployed around Beirut with soldiers from America, France and Italy. They will have almost as much impact as their previous deployment had - none.

In an article entitled "Reagan Said to See Israel as the Mideast 'Goliath, not David' the *New York Times* tells us that the President made this remark in a recent meeting of the National Security Council. "'The President was really aghast by the whole thing', a White House aide said, describing Mr. Reagan's reaction as Secretary of State George Schultz gave him the details. He was really shocked and emotionally moved by George's report on Saturday about women and children just massacred. It was hard to believe that it hadn't been done without at least the knowledge of the the Israelis." *(New York Times, September 23/82)* In fact, as additional information came in it is impossible to believe that the Israelis did not facilitate the massacre, from the highest political level and on down.

Egyptian president Hosni Mubarak told a mass meeting of his ruling National Democratic Party that "'We consider Israel fully responsible for this barbarism and this carnage because it took place while they were occupying Beirut. They
could see what was going on. Those who did this got the animus from them.' The assaults on the civilians, the Egyptian leader said 'showed that our warning about getting the Palestinian fighters out of Lebanon was not wrong'."

The same issue of the New York Times carried a lengthy extract of Ariel Sharon's report to the Knesset about the role of the Israeli army in West Beirut. It is shot through with his angry responses to those who taunted him. For instance an exchange with the leader of the Labor party, Shimon Perez, then still passing himself off as a 'leftist'. Said Sharon "'And I want to ask Parliament Member Peres, who stood here before me with disgusting self-righteousness attacking us for something we knew nothing about. I want to ask you, Shimon Peres, you in your time - and with aforeknowledge - there was another affair. And I would not bring it up except that you have sunk to the lowest rung of the ladder'."

"When you were Defense Minister there was an affair in Tel Zataar... I will not go into details here. How come your conscience does not bother you? Thousands of people were slaughtered [there]. And Parliament Member Peres, where were the officers of the IDF on that day, and that was an affair that occurred with foreknowledge."...

What Sharon was referring to was the long siege of the Palestine refugee camp of Tel al Zataar, at which Israeli army officers were present as advisors and in communication with Minister of Defence, Shimon Perez. The Phalangists had been armed and trained by Israelis and when the camp fell a great many of the 2,000 Palestinians there - including women and children - were murdered.

Sharon proceeds to tell a number of half truths and untruths about the involvement of the Israelis and the timing of the events at Sabra/Shatila. Over time it will become quite clear that the higher Israeli command, at the very least, knew exactly how the Phalangist would behave when permitted to enter undefended Palestinian camps. That the Israelis had running information on the progress of the massacres almost from when they started, both from external observers and from their own watchtowers. They did absolutely nothing about the killings for twenty-four hours and then gave the Phalangists another 12-15 hours to complete their tasks undisturbed. They had hemmed the Palestinians into the camps and kept them there while the killings proceeded. They did much to facilitate the Phalangist efforts, such as illuminating the camps with a rain of light flares and helping feed and resupply the Phalangist militiamen in the intervals between their killing.

All these things are half hinted at yet denied in Sharon's report to the Knesset. The alleged purpose of facilitating the entry of Phalangist troops into the undefended Palestinian camps was to root out Palestinian guerillas who were said to infest the camps. However these mythical guerillas didn't put up any resistance against the Phalangists. As is also turned out, the withdrawal agreement between the PLO and the Israelis had permitted the PLO to retain some armed forces within the camps to protect them, especially from the Phalangists. In a war any officer or soldier who murders enemy prisoners is guilty of a war crime and if his state is an adherent to the Geneva convention, he can be tried and punished for perpetrating such acts.

Sharon claims that he permitted the entry of Phalangist troops into the camps to save the lives of Israeli soldiers in the street battles he foresaw. However there weren't any. (New York Times, September 23/82)

What the real reason was for Israel to facilitate the massacres remains undiscussed, neither now nor during the following investigating commission. The only suggestion which makes some sense is that Israel and the Phalangists wanted
to create a massacre to terrorize the Palestinians into fleeing Lebanon. The Israelis had done this with the Palestinians at the end of the Israeli war of Independence in 1948, when it managed to drive hundreds of thousands of Palestinians out of their homeland. As for Sharon, he had a long history which extended from 1953 to 1967 of massacring civilians and murdering prisoners of war.

The New York Times of September 23/82 also carries a 'thought piece' by Irving Howe, an American social democrat/Zionist who had drifted progressively to the right. He writes to American Jews he believes think like him. "We have been thrown into emotional turmoil by the revelations about the Beirut massacre. We strongly oppose the Begin-Sharon Government. Yet we know there are enemies of Israel ready to exploit both the misdeeds of Israeli authorities and the words of Jewish critics. What then are we to do? We want to criticize both the Begin-Sharon adventurism and the anti-Israel excesses of segments of the news media."

"For the American Jewish Establishment, this doesn't seem to be much of a problem. It has publicly supported almost everything Israel governments have done. Sometimes this posture collapses into subservience. Sometimes it's a result of conscience and anxiety. We have real enemies out there."... We opponents of Begin-Sharon believe it would be a political and moral disaster for Israel to keep the West Bank permanently. The supporters of Begin-Sharon believe the opposite... We are experiencing a conflict between the values of democratic conciliation, between the visions personified by Chaim Weizmann's liberal Zionism [?] and Vladimir Jabotinsky's ultra-nationalist Zionism. We are in the midst of a struggle over the character of Jewish life both in Israel and the Diaspora'.... American Jews opposed to Begin-Sharon have hesitated and waffled before going public. No longer. We know that if our criticisms can be misused by enemies of Israel, finally it is the bad policies and the misconduct of Begin-Sharon that provide the most substantial help to the enemies of Israel. Not those who express shame over the Israeli share of responsibility for Beirut, but those who would cover it up give comfort to our enemies." (New York Times, September 23/82)

What is Howe's suggestion? To critically oppose the Begin-Sharon government, without however giving aid to anti-Semites lurking in the wings, and to support an Israeli Labor government which under Yitzak Rabin will act just as murderously toward the Palestinian population as Begin did.

The Globe and Mail of September 23/82 notes that Prime Minister Begin has won a victory in sustaining his government in the Israeli Knesset despite the defection of a few of his previous supporters. Begin still categorically refused to call an independent investigation of the role of Israeli commanders and troops in the Beirut massacres.

In another article in the same issue of the Globe and Mail we are told that Israel's Defence Minister, Ariel Sharon, finally admitted that Phalangists had been permitted to enter the Palestinian refugee camps by Israeli commanders. "The popular daily Yediot Aharonot quoted a Falange officer as saying the militiamen had been ordered to shoot all over over the age of 12. According to the newspaper, the officer expressed surprise at the revulsion in Israel over the massacre and said "Haven't you learned what we have learned a long time ago, namely Palestinians should be killed when they are young."

"The [Israeli] paratroop sergeant interviewed by the Jerusalem Post said the militiamen had entered Sabra camp with the full support of Israeli forces in the
area... Our people in observation posts could make out the progress of their movements inside the camp." (Globe and Mail, September 23/82)

There is also a report entitled 'Massacre in Beirut - as survivors saw it'. It is a horror-filled account of a 17 year old woman fleeing with her mother to the Acca hospital, the wounded being brought in who had been shot at close range but somehow managed to escape. There are tales of witnesses to mass murder. Later the following day four doctors from the hospital went with a white flag into Sabra camp to rescue any of the wounded they could, only to have three of them killed by a grenade and the fourth badly wounded. Reporters who tried to enter the camp during the second day could hear the shots being fired but were turned away by Phalangist militia men.

At about 1 p.m. on Friday a Danish film crew began filming what could be seen from the southern entrance to the camp; they saw women and children being rounded up and put aboard lorries, their bodies later found on the outskirts of a nearby camp. A reporter from Newsweek asked a militia man who said he came from the south of the country what was going on inside. He replied "Well, we are slaughtering them" he replied.

A Lebanese woman who had been raped by the Phalangists on entering the camp to search for her family said that she had lost 26 of her relatives in the killings, including her mother and father who was wheelchair bound. On Friday afternoon tractors and bulldozers were brought into the camp and began burying some of the dead in mass graves they scooped out of the rubble. That evening was Rosh Hashanah and Jewish troops worshipped in the hills and the fortified positions around the camps. The Phalangists continued to kill families and butcher children throughout that night and into the next morning.

According to General Sharon, one Major-General Drori ordered an immediate halt to Phalangist operations after they were finished with their operations. There was a three to four hour gap before the Israeli forces advanced into the camps, giving reporters time to observe and file their initial reports. (Globe and Mail, September 23/82)

The New York Times of September 24/82 reports that Menachem Begin is still stonewalling on allowing an independent commission to investigate the events surrounding the Beirut massacres and the extent of Israeli involvement. Some 31 members of the American Congress, many of them from New York, write him a groveling letter begging him to permit such a commission so that Israel's innocence can be established before the world. In part it reads, 'We write to you as friends of Israel who deeply believe in what Israel stands for. All of us have worked long and hard to strengthen the relationship between our two countries and to muster support for Israel in the Congress and throughout the country.'

The statement said that press reports about the massacre of Palestinians last week 'have created widespread consternation among our colleagues in the Congress'. It says that while none of the signers believed any Israeli soldier was directly involved 'we believe it is absolutely essential for your government to forthrightly address the allegations that have appeared, even in the Israeli press, by allowing a credible and impartial inquiry.' Failure to do so, it said would be widely interpreted in the United States 'as an indication that there was a measure of Israeli involvement in this sorry affair. 'If such an impression became widespread', it said, this could 'have very grave consequences for the future relationship between our two countries.' (New York Times, September 24/82)

One Rabbi David Saperstein, the Washington representative of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, said "If the Government of Israel persists in
actions that appear to obstruct truthfinding' he said, 'Israel will lose the moral high ground, make innocence seem like guilt, tarnish the perception of Israel's position and thereby erode support on the Hill and among the American people.' (I thought the Israelis had taken the 'moral high ground' when they occupied the hills around Beirut to shell that city.)

This erosion of support for Israel wasn't evident in the American Congress, which approved an appropriation of $2.2 billion for Israel in the coming year without any efforts to reduce the amount. (New York Times, September 24/82)

In the same issue another report entitled 'For Jerusalem's Poor, Soul Searching' an unsigned journalist in Jerusalem recounts not so much 'soul searching' but the anger of many Israelis at what they perceived as the world's 'anti-Semitism' in blaming their army and government for doing what it did do in the Beirut massacres. All in all, they seem to reflect Menachem Begin's view of Israel in an anti-Semitic world.

In a piece called 'Israel in Anguish on Moral Questions' we are told of the fundamental morality of Jews and Israelis which had been stunned by the events in Beirut. "Yet from Israel's perspective, the world's cries of outrage do seem hypocritical. Who are the Americans to attack Israel, when their own troops slaughtered innocent Vietnamese women and children at Mai Lai? Who are the Europeans to deplore the massacre, when they barely took notice of other massacres in which thousands of Lebanese Christians and Moslems were murdered by one another through the years of civil strife? How could Pope John Paul II, a personification of high morality, receive Yasser Arafat, head of the Palestinian Liberation Organization, who had ordered guerillas to take over a school and gun down children in Maalot [etc etc]..."

"These are the troubling questions being asked in Israel. The world outside does not seem particularly virtuous. Many Israelis are convinced that the massacre in Beirut has received such attention only because the Israelis were nearby. Many detect in this a whiff of anti-Semitism." (New York Times, September 24/82)

Apparently the Jewish response to the pogrom is to charge those who note Israeli participation in mass murder with anti-Semitism. Even if those charges are true.

A Globe and Mail report of September 24/82 is entitled 'Tide of shock and revulsion sweeps Israel.' This relates to Mr. Begin's refusal to call an inquiry into the killings in Beirut which he holds would inevitably tarnish the reputation of the Israeli army and some of its leaders. However, many of his previous supporters are now beginning to question both his judgement and Israel's 'purity' in the matter.

In the same issue of the Globe and Mail reports that "Israel's original version of its role in the Lebanese massacres of Palestinians in Beirut is falling apart amid contradictions and press allusions to a Watergate cover-up... In his first public statement since the massacres in Beirut's Sabra and Shatila camps, Defence Minister Ariel Sharon had admitted that the Christian militiamen entered the camps in an action coordinated with Israeli forces." This had previously been denied by the army's commander-in-chief, General Rafael Eytan.

In the interval senior Government officials admitted that Israeli commanders (and soldiers) "did know of the entry of the Phalangist militia into the camps and had an idea of what they were up to." Actually they only needed to listen to reports from their own observers and those coming in from the nearby hospital,
to say nothing about just listening to the gunfire and screams coming from the camps.

"But even this modified version of prior knowledge was jettisoned by Mr. Sharon when he told the Knesset that on Thursday, September 16 General Amir Drori, the Israeli officer in charge of the northern command, met the Phalangist commander. He said that a second meeting was held the same day between the commander of the Israeli division around Beirut and Phalangist liaison officers 'to coordinate the entry of Phalangists into Shatila camp'."

However, Mr. Sharon unwisely claimed that Israeli troops had stopped the massacre on the afternoon of Friday September 17, when in fact it had been allowed to continue throughout that day, through the following night and into the next day.

"Israeli newspapers, however, extensively quoted senior officers as strongly opposing the plan to send in the militiamen, precisely because they feared such a massacre. An army spokesman yesterday denied that Gen. Eytan and Mr. Sharon had received such warnings. The same newspaper mentioned a cabinet meeting on Thursday night where the entry of Phalangist militia into the camps was discussed. (Globe and Mail, September 24/82)

Yet another article in the same issue of the Globe and Mail noted that a number of prominent Jewish organizations in Canada have called upon Mr. Begin to establish an independent investigating commission on the matter. 'B'nai B'rith president Jack Spitzer said the 'heinous crime' requires such a probe... However, Phil Given, president of the Canadian Zionist Federation and chairman of the [Toronto] Metropolitan Police Commission disagreed entirely. 'I think it's tragic what these three US organizations have done. Whether or not there should be an inquiry should be decided in that country. Israel is a democracy ...to suggest that people repudiate in blanket fashion the state of Israel because of a decision by the Government is inconceivable'."

A prominent Jewish leader in New York, the Rabbi Alexander Schindler, said that he was "literally sickened by the speech given in the Knesset by Mr. Sharon. It was appalling ... Some of my worst fears appeared to be confirmed." (Globe and Mail, September 24/82)

Anti-Begin and anti-war demonstrations begin to grow in Israel, as does violent support of the Begin government by right-wing Israelis. The demonstrations will soon reach hundreds of thousand demonstrators, clashing with the Israeli police and with each other. It will momentarily seem that Israel is on the verge of a civil conflict. But after the first or second Jewish demonstrator was killed by 'unknown' Jewish gunmen, the nation stands back and the confrontations begin to die down.

The New York Times of September 25/82 reports the six leading rabbis in the US have ecstatically hailed Begin's decision to call an exclusively Israeli inquiry into the Beirut massacres. All their previous qualms about Israeli democracy and 'purity' are resolved by what will prove to be a thoroughgoing whitewash by Israeli judges. One Rabbi Wurzburger, who had previously expressed disappointment at Begin's rejection of an inquiry said "...Jews could not rest on the fact that 'worse crimes have been perpetrated by other nations' because' we are the people who have upheld standards of morality." Right.

Anger within the Israeli army is also said to be growing against Ariel Sharon. "The outrage has been building for some time over several issues, including the conduct of the war in Lebanon and especially Mr. Sharon's contingency plan to send the army into West Beirut against the Palestinian Liberation Organization. But the emotions have been brought to the flashpoint by the massacre of
hundreds of Palestinian men, women and children by Israel's Lebanese Christian allies in Beirut last week combined with Mr. Sharon's insinuation two days ago that [Israeli] army officers had been involved with a previous massacre by Christians in 1976." This is a reference to the massacre of possibly 1,600 Palestinian civilians by the Phalangists at the Tel Al Zaatar refugee camp, in which Israeli officers were involved.

Mr. Sharon rubbed Shimon Peres' nose in the Tel Al Zaatar matter since Peres had been Israeli Minister of Defence at the time. Peres angrily denied that any Israeli had been involved but Mr. Sharon had the Ministry's files to back up his charge. General Binyamin Ben-Eliezer, now in charge of Israeli liaison with the Phalangists, and two unnamed Mossad officers, were in Lebanon clandestinely during the siege of the camp and when the massacre at Tel Al Zaatar was perpetrated. General Ben-Eliezer claimed that they had been there merely as observers and had no hand in planning the operations.

The commander of the Israeli staff college asked to be relieved of his duties in view of the events in Beirut while another brigadier general of the paratroops said he intended to see Mr. Begin and tell him that he refused to serve under Mr. Sharon. Zeev Schiff, a prominent military correspondent said that not only journalists and university professors were protesting developments but also senior members of the army were "... becoming a source of moral pressure. It shows you that we have never lost our soul, we are a real democracy, and we don't need any pressure from the outside." Right.

Writing in the Israeli newspaper Haaretz Zeev Schiff noted that Mr. Sharon had notified Phalangist military commanders on Wednesday September 15, after the death of Bashir Gemayel, that Israeli forces were about to enter West Beirut by force and for them to prepare to enter the Palestinian refugee camps shortly afterward. One Ehud Yaari of Israel television spoke on an hour-long broadcast and said that "..all of the Phalangist commanders were well-known to the Israeli officers, that one had participated in the 1976 massacres at Tel Zaatar and that one Phalangist commander had told Israeli officers beforehand that his troops were out to kill." Elements of the Phalangist Damouri Brigade, especially its commandos and assassination teams, were allegedly prepared to go into the refugee camps. (New York Times, September 25/82)

A BBC report earlier on the same day noted that Israeli commanders were in radio contact with the Phalangist units inside the camp throughout the operation and that Israeli forces fired flares over sections of the camp at the request of the Phalangists - a fact attested to in Parliament by Mr. Sharon. The Phalangists had reputedly told Israeli commanders that they had killed some 300 civilians and 'terrorists' by the late evening of Thursday and this fact was shared with some 20 or 30 senior Israeli officers at that time. (New York Times, September 25/82)

Another New York Times article of September 25/82 notes that "Many Palestinians in the US blame Israelis and Americans for the massacre." It reports that the Palestinian Congress of North America, an umbrella organization of more than 50 Palestinian political and cultural organizations, had called for a 'day of solidarity' in some 70 cities across the country the previous day. The city of San Jose, California, had declared a day of mourning for victims of the massacre. American Jews were beginning to become outraged by all this open anti-Semitism.

Prime Minister Begin meets with Chief [of Israeli] Justice Yitzak Kahan and asks him to establish an investigating committee into the Beirut massacres and whether Israel played any role in it. As it later turns out, this commission will not have
judicial powers and will merely be able to make recommendations to the government. \textit{(New York Times, September 25/82)}

The \textit{Globe and Mail} of September 27/82 runs a two page summary of what is known and suspected so far about the massacre of Palestinians entitled 'The slaughter in Beirut.' It is written by \textit{New York Times} reporter Thomas Friedman. Despite the continuing support of the American and Jewish mass media, the mythology about the moral superiority of Israel and its army is begining to wear a bit thin. However, in a few years time this will all be forgotten in the new western campaign against 'terrorism'.

The following is an extract of Friedman's account in the \textit{Globe and Mail} of September 27/82

Friedman outlines the facts now undisputed. 1) The Phalangist militiamen entered the Beirut refugee camps with the full permission and knowledge of the Israeli army, who provided them with arms, provisions and the support of flares. 2) The Israelis knew clearly of the past atrocities committed by the Phalangists on Palestinians and their fear of them. 3) The Israeli army knew of the commission of current atrocities and killings by the Phalangists a few hours after they had entered the camps on Thursday evening. By Friday morning there was enough evidence of Phalangist mass murder for the senior army command in Lebanon to "order their operations halted." Yet the Phalangists remained in the camps another 24 hours, continuing their killings. 4) The Israeli army, when entering West Beirut, had encountered no resistance from the Sabra and Shatila refugee camps. 5) While there is no detailed information as yet on the makeup of the the Phalangist troops, there is evidence that they were accompanied by members of Maj. Saad Haddad's militia which is inextricably linked to Israel.

"The events leading up to the massacre can be traced back to the decision by the beleaguered Palestinian Liberation Organization, surrounded by a ring of Israeli armor, to leave West Beirut, where it had been based since being ousted from Jordan in 1970." In short, the Israelis had defeated and expelled the one force which protected the Palestinians and had then sent in and supported their murderous enemies, the Phalangists, under justification of 'rooting out terrorists'. The Phalangists then proceeded to massacre Palestinian civilians.

Before leaving Lebanon, Yasser Arafat and the PLO had extracted a seemingly watertight provision from the US that its own and allied forces would be introduced into Lebanon to protect Palestinians from the kind of attack which had now occurred. The US and allied forces had totally reneged on this written agreement. Part of this agreement was that Israeli tanks and military personnel would not be permitted to enter Moslem West Beirut, for fears of exactly what did happen. The Lebanese Premier, Shafiq Wassan, and the former Premier, Saeb Salam, repeatedly expressed this concern during the negotiations. After the PLO forces had withdrawn, by September 2/82, the Lebanese army took over control of West Beirut without any difficulty and kept the Phalangists out. Things began to unravel quickly after September 14 when Bashir Gemayel, the president-elect and leader of Phalangist party forces, was killed by a bomb while at a meeting of the commanders of his militia forces. Within hours the Israeli army seized control of West Beirut and its 500,000 people. Although the Israelis disarmed all of the Moslem militia there they made no attempt to disarm the Phalangist forces. Under the terms of the agreement worked out by US special envoy Habib these too were illegal forces and should have been disarmed. Instead, the Israeli high command, including the Minister of Defense Ariel Sharon,
probably with the support of Begin, coordinated the entry of Phalangist armed forces into the defenceless Palestinian camps.

Wednesday September 15/82

"Throughout the early hours of Wednesday, Israeli troops poured into West Beirut aboard Hercules transport planes that were arriving at the international airport [on the outskirts of West Beirut]. At the same time Israeli tanks and armored personnel carriers were arriving from surrounding areas." The Israelis began entering West Beirut proper at 5 a.m. on Wednesday morning. In some locations fierce gun battles broke out with Lebanese Moslem militias who were soon overwhelmed. Around that time the first wounded were being brought into the Gaza hospital near the Sabra and Shatila camps. At this time the Israelis had surrounded the two camps and set up checkpoints and observation posts. Mr. Sharon said the Israeli command in West Beirut then contacted commanders of the Lebanese army and asked if they were willing to send their troops into the camps on 'search and destroy missions'. The Lebanese army rejected this proposal. Mr. Sharon reported that on Wednesday evening Gen. Drori met with a commander of the Lebanese army and pressed him to convince the Lebanese government to send that army in. Lebanese President, Mr. Wazzan, "turned the request down."

Thursday, September 16/82

Some shooting was heard from the camps on the morning of Thursday, September 16 and Israeli field commander Drori held talks with Phalangist liaison officers. "It was concluded that the armed force of Christian militiamen would enter Shatila and Sabra from the south and west, and would look out for and clear out the terrorists," Mr Sharon reported that it was understood that civilians, "especially women and children, and old people, should not be harmed." Sure.

Most witnesses and survivors indicate that at least 1,500 Phalangist troops were first gathered at the International airport, under full Israeli control, and then made their way into the camps. Other evidence suggests that units of Maj. Haddad's forces were also mobilized and sent in. According to a Phalangist military source, orders were drawn to have some 1,500 of their soldiers assemble at the International airport. At about 4 p.m. of Thursday afternoon they began to move into Sabras and Shatila camps. They began their assault on the Palestinian population in the early evening.

The Israelis had previously established an observation post on top of a five story building on the edge of Sabra camp, equipped with powerful binoculars and had a clear view of where many of the bodies of Palestinians were found. They could observe most of the camp throughout the day and night, while the killings were going on.

"From the moment they entered the camp, the militiamen made no apparent effort to distinguish between Lebanese and Palestinians, let alone between them and women and children." By 5 p.m. some residents of the camps were trying to flee; some reported the killings to Israeli soldiers they encountered at the boundaries. Some of these soldier's later reported to their officers about what they had heard and seen, "but were told not to concern themselves with the matter."

During that night the mass killings really began to get under way. Casualties also began to flood into the Gaza and Akka hospitals near the two camps. "Pandemonium reigned in the operating theater, the physicians said. Palestinian
nurses were breaking down in tears in the middle of surgery out of fear for their lives." In the Akka hospital, an Asian doctor who preferred not to be identified, described a similar situation.

"In the streets of the two camps people were running in terror while the Phalangists sprayed everything with gunfire. Their empty boxes of ammunition, bearing Israeli markings in Hebrew, were scattered around the camp and later found by reporters. At 11 p.m. Thursday Hirsch Goodman, the military correspondent of the Jerusalem Post, received a telegram from Phalangist military sources which claimed they had killed 300 terrorists up to that time. This would be the figure bandied about by the western press for many weeks. Goodman said that he immediately relayed this telegram to General Drori's command post in West Beirut. Drori of course claimed he had received no such notification.

Friday, September 17/82

It was not clear to Friedman what happened on Friday - possibly because so many different things were happening in so many places. We know that mass graves were dug and filled with bodies by the Phalangists. We know that the Phalangists brought in bulldozers and scoopmobiles to do this and later a string of lorries to cart off 'suspects' who were 'disappeared'. We know that mass killings went on throughout that day and long into the night. By then it was perfectly obvious to every Israeli on the scene what was going on. Some of the Phalangist forces came out of the camps and were fed by the Israelis before returning to their task.

In addition to the wounded, hundreds of Palestinians in flight were huddled in the two nearby hospitals. Sniping at the hospitals began on Thursday night; a few nurses and hospital workers had already been killed. At Gaza hospital things were getting worse throughout Friday morning and by noon the director of that institution told all Palestinians to 'run for their lives' away from the vicinity of the camps. About 20 foreign doctors and nurses and two Palestinian male nurses remained to attend those who could not be moved.

At Akka hospital, those Palestinians who had fled there fled again during Thursday night, scattering no one knew where. By Friday morning the medical staff of the hospital was reduced to a single Asian doctor and five Palestinian staff members along with six foreign nurses. By mid Friday two of the Palestinian doctors and a Palestinian patient were kidnapped by armed militiamen. They had not reappeared since. Luckily, at 5 p.m. a convoy from the International Red Cross arrived and evacuated everyone who remained at the hospital, including the medical staff. On leaving, the Asian doctor said he saw bulldozers pushing 80 or 90 bodies along a main street of Sabra camp. "This area can be seen very clearly with the naked eye from the Kuwaiti Embassy traffic circle - the site of the telescope-equipped Israeli observation post. Whether the Israelis actually saw what was happening is unknown." Maybe they were observing the stars.

At 4:30 that afternoon General Drori had ordered an end to the Phalangist operations, but he apparently gave them until Saturday morning to withdraw from the camps - another fourteen or sixteen hours to complete their 'tasks'. "Israeli officers in East Beirut said what happened at the 4:30 Friday meeting was that the Phalangists told the Israelis they needed more time to 'clean up' the area.' Inside the camps the militiamen were continuing with their work.'"

The Norwegian charge d' affaires, Gunnar Flakstadt, who tried to get into the area to witness developments and to prevent what killings he could, was turned back by Israeli troops that surrounded the camps. "Many Palestinian civilians who tried to flee the camps for the comparative safety of downtown were prevented
from leaving by the Israelis outside the camps." A group of Palestinians trying to flee showed a white flag and approached an Israeli checkpoint. They told the Israeli guards that they were fleeing a pogrom. But the Israeli soldier replied there was nothing he could do and that if they did not return he would open fire on them. He fired two volleys into the air and then an Israeli tank appeared. Gunfire was being heard throughout the camp. It is unknown how many of this group survived. The killing continued throughout the day and the following night.

Saturday, September 18

Phalangist forces withdrew from the two devastated and depopulated refugee camps between 8 and 9 a.m. on Saturday morning. The killing had continued throughout the night and observers who first reached the scene discovered the bodies of those who had probably been killed on Thursday, already decaying. Others had been killed more recently. The Phalangist militia had used the extra 12 or 14 hours given them by the Israeli commander to complete their 'cleaning up' operation. Some Palestinian survivors who had hidden themselves away noted that sometime after 6 a.m. Saturday jeeps had come through the Sabra camp with men who claimed to be Israeli soldiers and called on remaining Palestinians to come out to leave the camp. They proved to be Phalangist militiamen who rounded up some 500 to 600 surviving Palestinians. They were marched down the main road at gunpoint but were later turned over to Israeli forces.

At about 7 a.m. armed Phalangists entered the Gaza hospital and seized the foreign doctors and staff, all that remained there, and marched them to another collecting point closer to Shatila camp. One of this group was questioned about his nationality and when he replied 'Syrian' was immediately shot by a militia man in front of all the others. On the way the group encountered an Israeli officer who asked where they were being taken and was told "First they come with me, then they go with you". Their identity papers were closely checked by the Phalangists before they were released to the Israelis. They apparently were nearby watching all this take place. Another group of Palestinian men had been rounded up by the Phalangists and were delivered to the Israelis, who had them interrogated by the Shin Bet.

The last day was used by the Phalangist forces to bury some of their victims, either haphazardly within houses they demolished or in piles of rubble. Mr. Sharon, in his report to the Knesset, said that only then, on the morning of Saturday September 19, information came to Israeli commanders that a massacre had taken place.

This summary account was written by Thomas Friedman, a reporter for the New York Times. (Globe and Mail, Sept.27/82)

A few years later an American magazine was taken to court by Sharon for defaming his character by repeating charges of his role in the massacres. He ultimately won the case but the American judge fined the magazine one dollar. He and many of the leading Israeli politicians and military commanders should have been tried for war crimes by some international tribunal. Of course those who win wars are never tried by anyone.

The New York Times of September 27/82 notes that there is increasing disaffection in the Israeli army over the role of Ariel Sharon as Minister of Defence, despite the fact that they are threatened with being disciplined by their Chief of Staff, general Rafael Eytan.

The Israeli author Amos Elon, "...said he thought the Defense Minister should be brought up on much graver charges. 'This man, by his own confession in the
Knesset last Wednesday, is an accessory to a crime and should be prosecuted' Mr. Elon said. He dismissed Mr. Sharon's contention that he had not expected the Lebanese Christian forces to commit a massacre. Mr Elon said 'A Man who puts a snake into a child's bed and says 'I'm sorry, I told the snake not to bite. I didn't know snakes were so dangerous.' It's impossible to understand. This man is a war criminal'.

Later on Mr. Elon said, "I think from the very start this was Fascism with a Jewish face." Elon then cited an account by a former Israeli Foreign Minister, one Moshe Sharett, about a reprisal raid in 1953 against a Jordanian village led by then colonel Sharon, in which 48 houses were blown up and some 69 villagers, about a half of them women and children, killed. This was in reprisal for one Israeli woman and her child who had been killed by an unknown terrorist who had slipped across the border from Jordan.

The New York Times also reports that the commander in chief of Israeli forces in Lebanon, Maj. General Amir Drori, claimed he knew nothing about the massacres in Beirut while they were going on. That was why he gave the Phalangist an additional 14 hours to conclude their 'rooting out of terrorists' from the two Palestinian refugee camps. Survivors hold that this time was used to kill many more Palestinians. "Asked if he thought the Phalangists would punish those who committed the mass killing, one of the general's aides said bitterly 'They will probably give them medal of honor." (New York Times, September 27/82)

By September 28/82, some eight days after the Sabra and Shatila massacres were revealed to the world, North American newspapers are already on to fresher news. Jewish letters-to-the-editor again begin appearing in the press about the upsurge of anti-Semitic propaganda revealed in the recent criticism of Israel and its brave young soldiers faced by international Arab terrorism etc., etc. One such account, from a Steven Gerber, is published by the New York Times on September 29/82. It excoriates Irving Howe's insufficiently patriotic criticism of Begin-Sharon.

The New York Times coverage of the Middle East of September 28 and 29/82 revolved exclusively around the arrival of contingents of Italian and French troops into West Beirut to protect the remaining Palestinian refugees. There are pictures of these peacekeepers being cheered by surviving Palestinian children in Sabra camp. The US promises to send a contingent of Marines to join the peacekeepers in the immediate future. When they do arrive in Beirut, they dig in around an underground parking lot and rarely venture out to protect anyone. Some two months after their arrival a suicide bomber runs an explosive-laden truck into this parking lot, killing some 250 US marines. President Reagan then quickly pulls them out, leaving the Lebanese to settle accounts between themselves. By this time Israel has pulled out of Western Beirut but continues to occupy the southern half of the country.

Another report in the New York Times of September 29/82 suggests that president-elect Amir Gemayel probably did not know of the plans to carry out the massacres, which were hatched by top Phalangist military leaders. It says that Elias Hobeika, a top aide of Bashir Gemayel, was probably central in planning and arranging the massacres. He was the chief liaison between the Israelis and Phalangist forces, with special ties with the Israeli Mossad. "Another source, who has dealt several times with Mr. Hobeika on political and military matters, described him as tough, direct and absolutely ruthless. He was frequently seen with Bashir Gemayel. Mr. Hobeika is said to be strong enough within the Phalangist forces to deflect a Lebanese government inquiry into his role in the
massacres, even if President Amin Gemayel chooses to pursue one." (*New York Times*, September 30/82)

On October 2/82 the *Vancouver Sun* reports that the Lebanese army (nominally not under Phalangist control) arrested a large number of Palestinian civilians in the preceding week in night raids on their houses. The PLO claims this is part of a strategy to drive hundreds of thousands of Palestinians from Lebanon. The Lebanese army’s officers are mainly Christian and they have just raided the Bourj Barajneh refugee camp, not far from Sabra. Diplomatic sources said that some 2,000 people had been arrested of which some 600 were still being held.

On October 4/82 both *Time* and *Maclean’s* newsmagazine issues focus on the Beirut massacres, replete with a series of full-page color photographs of the dead lying in the camps. Protests broke out in Israel and elsewhere because of them. They are remarkably powerful photographs.

The *Maclean’s* issue contains an article entitled 'Israel on Trial' which deals with the massacre, Israel’s part in it, the initial attempts to cover this up and Mr. Sharon’s admission that he and the upper echelon commanders of the army had facilitated the entry of the Phalangists into the camps. He even discussed the extended period they were given by Israeli forces to carry out their deeds.

When the dead, which are still being recovered, were made known a great many Israelis came out in demonstrations against the Israeli government; allegedly 400,000 in the largest demonstration. They were clubbed and tear gassed by Jewish police forces. If *anything* can redeem the honor of Israel after 35 years of war against the Palestinians, it is the actions of these demonstrators, calling Israel’s leaders murderers and war criminals and demanding that they step down from power." (*Maclean’s*, October 4/82)

*Maclean’s* notes that Marcel Prince, the chief surgeon of the Lebanese army, concluded that "...it was impossible to say how many more bodies were buried under the rubble. He said that he would not be surprized if the toll exceeds 1,000." There are still many mass graves to disinter. The article places a special emphasis on those doctors, nurses and patients killed by Phalangists in the two hospitals near the camps.

"Serious doubt was cast on Israeli claims not to have known at least something of what was going on inside the camps. All activity on the streets is clearly visible from the observation post between Shatila and Sabra, even without binoculars. The reported bursts of automatic rifle fire and the screams of victims, particularly women, could not have been easy to overlook." (*Maclean’s* October 4/82)

Many Palestinians living in the West Bank have close kin living in West Beirut and there was an upsurge of demonstrations against the Israelis. Menachem Begin’s government survives largely because it had established an investigating commission to be headed by Supreme Court judge Yitzak Kahan to look into the matter of the massacres. There is a deepening feeling among many Israelis that much will been covered up.

A conjoined report in *Maclean’s* is entitled 'Anguish in the Diaspora', dealing mainly with Jewish responses in France and Canada. It begins with an account of a Jewish speaker attempting to address a gathering in Paris about his opposition to the Israeli government for its involvement in the massacres only to be howled down and pelted with fruit and stones by a mob of Betar members, the military wing of Begin’s Herut party. On the other hand, a senior member of the Zionist movement in Britain telegraphed Begin saying that he had brought unalterable shame on the Jewish people and for that he would never forgive him.
In Canada, Howard Squadron of the American Jewish Congress and Rabbi Gunter Plaut, the right-wing Reform eminence, castigated those Jews who opposed Israel's invasion of Lebanon "partly out of fear of washing Judaism's dirty laundry in public."

On the relationship between Jews and the state of Israel, one theatrical producer in Paris said, "Some Jews like myself are going to say, 'All right, if this state was set up to be the light of the world has become corrupt and right wing and fascist, we aren't going to support it.'"

*Time* newsmagazine of October 4/82 also devotes most of the issue to the Beirut massacre and those who were responsible for it. In doing so it provides some brutal photo coverage of the dead. The account is from a reporter who accompanied Lebanese Red Cross teams who collected the dead for burial. It is an account of the bodies of men, women and infants, sprawled in various positions, killed in different ways and at various times. Surviving members of families were on hand to find bodies of their kin among the crumpled bodies. "Hundreds of others are listed as missing and the toll is estimated to be at least 800, if it is ever known precisely. Many of the victims, who also included Lebanese residents of the camps, lay buried in a hastily bulldozed site that was dug by the killers near the Shatila entrance as they finished up their murderous spree... Other victims presumably remain in houses that were dynamited in a crude attempt to cover up the extent of the atrocity."

*Time* also runs an article entitled 'Crisis of Conscience', noting the 'deep moral conscience' which allegedly mark Israel's previous wars and assorted killings over the previous 35 years. It notes Menachem Begin's response in widely distributed ads which claim that Israel was the victim of 'Blood Libel' when what is reported is substantiality true. "The anti-Israeli reaction was world-wide. France became the first government to condemn Israel for its role in the massacre. In Italy, dock workers refused to load Israeli vessels and airport workers announced a boycott of all flights between Israel and Italy..." These responses unfortunately did not last long.

In Washington, President Reagan and his cabinet ministers, were having second thoughts about the total support which America was giving Israel. But those qualms also didn't last long.

On October 4/82 the *Globe and Mail* runs a brief piece by one Midge Decter, the prominent American neo-conservative. It is called 'Making Israel the 'fall guy' for Beirut massacre.' Decter is the spouse of the Jewish American ultra reactionary Norman Podhoretz and is herself the executive director of an outfit called 'Committee for a Free World'. She is also given a spot 'explaining' the Lebanese war on CBC radio.

She faults the world's mass media and especially the Israeli press for calling Israel's actions in Lebanon into question. The massacre was simply another 'Arab blood feud' by a bloody people she says. "It is not in the Israeli realm of thought that such a thing could occur. So let's stop pointing the finger at Israel and let's stop this hysterical quest for somebody to blame. If anybody is to blame it's the entire free world for allowing terrorism and wanton killing to run rampant over the past couple of decades." By this she means any organized resistance to the doings of Israel. "The civilized world must stop making Israel the 'fall guy' for every bad thing that happens." Right.
The Investigating Commission on the Beirut Massacre

Following the withdrawal of some 8,000 Palestinian soldiers and the deaths of thousands of Palestinian civilians there still remained some 500,000 Palestinians within Lebanon who now do not know where to turn. It seemed that the Palestine Liberation Organization was finished.

The Vancouver Sun of October 6/82 reports that the Lebanese Forces (i.e. Phalangist militia) had arrested 11 German 'terrorists' allegedly from the Bader- Meinhoff gang and three leaders of the Italian Red Brigades. (Well, well. How handy.) The Phalangist newspapers claim they were taken when the Lebanese forces combed through Moslem West Beirut looking for "...escaped convicts, aliens and hidden arms caches. The army has arrested more then 1,000 people in the Moslem sector of the city in the last week." The so-called 'army' was the Phalangist militia. "The sources said, however, that many members of the international terrorist organizations were believed to have escaped from Lebanon during the evacuation of PLO guerillas from Israeli ringed West Beirut in August."

On October 7/82 the Globe and Mail reports that Prime minister Begin can count on the support of the Sephardic Jews in Israel. Says one Iraqi-born Jew, an Ezra Danon, "We who come from Arab countries know that you've got to take a strong line with them if you want them to respect you... Begin for us represents that hard line."

The same issue of the Globe and Mail contains an article about Ariel Sharon lambasting his critics within the Israeli military. He says that "Anyone who wants to dispute Cabinet policies [i.e. his own] should quit the armed forces." One Israeli newspaper had published an account in which some 260 regular and reserve army officers had signed a petition urging Sharon to step down from his post as Minister of Defence.

On October 13/82 the Vancouver Sun reports that "Lebanese authorities say they recovered 762 bodies from the Beirut massacre and some 1,200 more were buried by relatives." The authorities have yet to investigate reports of possible mass graves beside the stadium behind the refugee camps of Sabra and Shatila, and further south beside the road to Beirut airport because of the danger of land mines. A steady stream of people reporting missing relatives still arrives at government offices. It is impossible to know if they are among the unidentified who were buried."

A few days later the Globe and Mail reports that the first of the Palestinians arrested in Beirut by the Lebanese army have been released. They include an eighteen year old student who provided a detailed account of the conditions under which a hundred men he was part of were detained. He says that they were subjected to systematic torture, whippings and beatings by the Lebanese army. "The allegations are bound to heighten concern about the fate of the hundreds of people detained by the Lebanese Army in the continuing sweep of Moslem West Beirut."

On October 25/82 the Globe and Mail reports that the Phalange fighters vow to continue their fight until the last Palestinian and their Lebanese supporters are driven out of Lebanon. If taken literally, that would mean a substantial proportion of the Lebanese Moslem population. They will talk that way as long as they have the military support of the Israeli army but after the Israelis leave they will sing another tune.
On October 27/82 the Vancouver Province, a tabloid geared to illiterates, runs a story about Lebanon by its emigre journalist, one Ilya Gerol. He finds all the western news coverage biased and distorted, especially citing the CBC for its extravagant claims about Israeli atrocities. All the damage in Lebanon is highly localized, he reports from the half destroyed city of Tyre, and almost all those killed were hard core terrorists. Besides, the PLO is part of a world wide plot by Red Communists to gradually destroy democracies in the world and extinguish freedom.

On November 1/82 the Globe and Mail reports that an Israeli army lieutenant testified before Judge Kahan's commission set up to investigate Israel's involvement in the massacres at Sabra and Shatila refugee camps. He swore that he personally witnessed Phalangists killing civilians in one of those camps a full twenty four hours before they finally withdrew. He immediately reported this to his superior officer who told him to report it to the commanding officer. Nothing was done!

"Major-General Drori, commander of the Israeli troops in Lebanon, testified he had only heard of 'irregularities' in the camps that morning. Nevertheless, General Drori said he ordered the Phalangists, who had been allowed into the camp to root out Palestinian guerrillas [i.e. everyone living there], to halt their operations around 11 a.m. [Friday] ...Defence Minister Ariel Sharon has testified that he first heard of the killings 24 hours after they had started. Premier Menachem Begin has said he first heard of the massacres in a British radio broadcast on Saturday."

None of them heard the gunfire and the screams which were quite audible outside the camps, nor did any of the Israeli troops on watchtowers overlooking the camps see or hear anything. Nor were the relevant politicians informed of the developments until they were over. Sure.

General Ariel Sharon told the commission "I want to say on behalf of the entire defence establishment, that not one of us foresaw, or could have foreseen, the horrors that were perpetrated in Sabra and Shatila." General Drori, senior Israeli commander on the spot, backed him up. (Globe and Mail, November 1/82)

However, they didn't have to foresee anything, they could simply have listened to the reports of the massacre coming in an hour after it started or during the intervening day when they fed the Phalangist troops before they returned to the camps to continue their killing.

A few days later an Israeli cabinet minister, Mordecai Zipori, told the investigating commission that he had been apprised of the killings taking place in the two camps early on Friday, September 17/82 by Israeli reporter Zev Schiff and had immediately forwarded this information to Foreign Minister Yitzak Shamir. "Mr. Zipori's evidence reenforced earlier testimony given to the commission that senior Israeli figures had received word of possible killings before midday Friday." Some 24 hours before they ended. (New York Times, November 2-4/82)

On November 5/82 the New York Times reports that Brig. General Amos Yaron, in charge of the Beirut sector, testified that he had heard reports of killings being carried out by Phalangists in the two camps as early as the evening of September 16 but did not know of the full extent of the killings until the next Monday. He conveyed this information to his commander, General Drori, who informed the Phalangists that they must cease their operations the following day. They remained in the camps and continued their killings until the morning of September 18.
On close questioning by commission member Aharon Barak, General Yaron admitted that after the order for the Phalangists to halt their operations he permitted them to provide replacements to their forces and to restock their ammunition - extending the massacre by 24 hours. When asked by the head of the investigating commission, Yitzak Kahan, on whether he trusted the reliability of the Phalangist militia when they were inflamed by the loss of their leader, General Yaron replied that he had had dealings with them and that he did trust them.

Yaron also said that he assumed that all the civilians had fled from the camps "...because it's natural for human beings from where they are attacked they flee in the opposite direction." However, a ring of Israeli troops and armour surrounded these camps which halted the outflow of those attempting to escape. He said he presumed that no civilians were left in the camp and was shocked when he later learned that probably most of those killed had been women and children and old people. The Phalangists also asked for tractors and bulldozers to be brought into the camps, which General Yaron again permitted. According to witnesses and reporters these bulldozers were used to dig mass graves in which the bodies were buried. He said that he only had solid evidence after the massacres were over and reports came in from press sources. (New York Times, November 8/82)

On November 8/82, Menachem Begin testifies before the Investigating Commission. This testimony is reported in the Globe and Mail by their resident pro-Israeli journalist Abraham Rabinovich. He notes that Menachem Begin said that he was aware of the hatred of the Phalangist forces for the Palestinians, especially after the recent assassination of their leader, but that he had no idea that putting an armed Phalangist force inside a Palestinian refugee camp could possibly lead to a massacre. It was unthinkable. But Israelis played no part in it. Yeah?

When questioned about a previous discussion Begin had with US special envoy Morris Draper, in which Begin noted that the Phalangists might take revenge on the Palestinians for the death of their leader, Begin replied that "They [the Phalangist militia] were put in [the camps] to fight terrorists and terrorists only." There were few "terrorists in those two camps, unless one counts the 'terrorist' women and children and old people' who were killed. If there had been Palestinian fighters left the Phalangist troops would have had a fight on their hands.

"The Premier said he learned of the decision by Defence Minister Ariel Sharon to send the Phalangists into the camps only two to three hours after the operation began in a cabinet meeting held on the night of Thursday September 16." It is highly unlikely that the minister of Defence would organize and facilitate a massacre without discussing it with the Israeli Premier. So, the highest Israeli command knew of the massacre almost from the start and did nothing to stop it. (Globe and Mail, November 9/82)

The New York Times of November 9/82 carries a long transcript of Menachem Begin's testimony before the Kahan commission. Begin contradicted himself a number of times and was discovered making some outright lies. For instance, when he claimed that "...nobody conceived of the danger of acts of atrocity' he was confronted by minutes showing that General Rafael Eytan had spoken during the session of 'the breakout of acts of revenge' saying' it will be an outburst the likes of which have not been seen. I already see it in their [the Phalangist's] eyes, what they are waiting for'."

This was at an Israeli cabinet meeting held as the Phalangists were entering the Palestinian camps.
"When Mr. Begin insisted that no one had imagined that atrocities could occur, he was presented with minutes of a September 19 Cabinet meeting, in which he recalled this discussion before the Phalangist operations. The Prime Minister was invited to read his own words aloud, which he did."

"This was our pure and real intention. That night I also discussed this with the chief of staff, who told him that we had to capture positions, precisely in order to defend the Moslems from the vengeance of the Phalangists. I was able to presume that after the assassination of Bashir, their beloved leader, that they would take revenge on the Moslems. In short, Begin and the entire Israeli military knew full well what would happen if the Phalangists were allowed to enter a disarmed Palestinian camp.

Later on Begin testified that "There is a malicious tendency in saying that Israeli tanks are surrounding and inside the camps while horrible things are happening. Then I was told what happened. I was also told that these things were halted and that the Phalangists were already taken out of the camps." It was not just Israeli tanks which surrounded the refugee camps but Israeli soldiers, some of whom could see and hear everything going on. Moreover, some people fleeing from the camps were halted by Israeli soldiers and forced to return to them. In any case, Begin didn't know anything, didn't hear of anything and couldn't conceive of anything like what was going on.

Begin later made another contradiction in saying that Israeli forces were advanced into Beirut in order to prevent Phalangist attacks on the Palestinians, and then claiming that neither he nor any other senior Israeli military leader could imagine a pogrom like that produced by the Phalangists. Begin also claimed that the decision to allow the Phalangist militia to enter the undefended camps was definitely not discussed with him beforehand and the first that he heard of it was through a BBC newscast after the massacre. The New York Times provided a full page of transcripts from the commission's questions and Begin's answers on these and other matters. (New York Times, November 9/82)

The same issue of the New York Times recounted Lebanese reactions to the massacre - they are quite muted. "Reluctantly, painfully and with a sense of guilt, more and more Lebanese, both Moslems and Christians, are beginning to admit that Lebanese Phalangist militiamen were probably the killers in the massacre at the Palestinian refugee camps in West Beirut in September. Most Maronite Christians initially believed that their forces would not carry out such atrocities and are now coming to view the Israelis as the instigators of the action. While some Phalangist leaders are proudly proclaiming their role in the massacres, most simply did not want to talk about it. The Moslem sections of the city feel too crushed to discuss it.

On December 1/82, a leader of a faction of the Phalangist forces., one Etienne Saqa, told reporters, "First of all, I want to ask you why the world is upset by Sabra and Shatila ... For eight years during the civil carnage in Lebanon, Mr. Saqa said, the world was asleep and ignored the killing of Christians in Lebanese towns such as Damur. 'Speaking of these killings Mr. Saqa said the refugee camp killings 'was a Lebanese reaction from the relatives and parents of our martyrs.'"

"'Look', Mr. Saqa told a roomful of reporters, 'this is an interior problem in Lebanon. We have the full right to deal with our enemies in Lebanon in the way we find suitable.' (New York Times, December 1/82)

On the following day the New York Times reports other sayings by Saqa, this Lebanese Christian friend of Israel. He expressed his condolences to Menachem Begin for the loss of his wife but praised him and Israel for 'a generous
intervention' in Lebanon. He also noted that Lebanon was a small country that had 500,000 Palestinians refugees living in it. He feared that if they were allowed to remain a new PLO would emerge so he called for their complete expulsion from 'his' country. He also claimed that his party was the nucleus of democracy in Lebanon. (New York Times, December 2/82)

The New York Times, December 2/82 reports that 1,200 bodies have been recovered from sites in and around the Sabra and Shatila camps so far. These are part of the 6,775 people killed in Beirut since the beginning of the Israeli invasion on June 4. The total casualties for all Lebanon is put at some 19,085 killed and more than 30,000 wounded - more than 85% of the victims were civilians, about 60% of them under 15 and over 50 years of age. Israel rejects these figures. They are mourning the 368 Israeli dead.

On December 9/82 the Globe and Mail reports a surprise visit by Israeli Defence Minister Ariel Sharon and two other top Israeli military leaders to Honduras for talks with that country's military. "Israel already has an agreement with Costa Rica to help build up its internal security. It is clear with this latest visit that Israel is playing an increasingly prominent role in Central America as a proxy for the United States when it is politically delicate for the latter to provide as much military or intelligence support as the Reagan administration deems necessary.

"Israel's most important role so far was been in Guatemala, where human rights violations have made it impossible for Washington to provide military assistance on the scale it would like."

The Globe and Mail of February 4/83 reports that nine more Palestinians have been killed in the Sidon area while many more had their autos and property stolen by people they claim were Phalangists. The Phalangist leadership denies this charge. The Israeli occupying power in the region is apparently unable or unwilling to protect anyone from Israel's Lebanese proteges."

In Beirut, a confrontation between Israeli tanks and American Peace keeping forces came to a standstill, with the Americans trying to block the Israelis from entering an area the Americans are 'protecting'. No shots were fired by Israelis defending their right to live in peace.

On February 5/83 the New York Times reports that the Kahan Investigating Commission has delivered its findings to Prime Minister Menachem Begin. The part dealing with Israeli intelligence about the matter is to be kept secret.

"Midway through its investigation, the panel issued a formal warning to nine of the country's top civilian and military leaders, including Prime Minister Begin, Defense Minister Ariel Sharon, and foreign Minister Yitzak Shamir. They were told that they might be found to have failed to fulfill their duties by ignoring the dangers of having the Phalangists enter the camps, or by neglecting to act promptly on reports that a slaughter was taking place. "No Palestinian was allowed to testify before this commission.

It is also reported that this panel and its findings have no judicial power. Mr. Begin apparently is still the most popular political figure in Israel, according to recent polls. This despite the fact that his testimony to the commission was riven by inconsistencies and contradictions. This account is overshadowed in the New York Times by reminiscences from Lyon about Gestapo leader Klaus Barbie and his ongoing trial. Nazis of forty years earlier are so much more saleable than Nazis of today.

In the same issue of the New York Times is an account of how Israel will neither negotiate with the PLO nor with any Palestinian or other Arab who represents it.
Nor will it consider any negotiations over its occupation of the West Bank, which has been 'rechristened' Judea and Samaria. It is God-given Jewish land, they say.

On February 9/1983 the *New York Times* prints a full four pages of extracts from the findings of the Israeli commission investigating crimes committed at the Sabra and Shatila camps. Following its general conclusions about the events which occurred it surveys nine Israelis who were of special concern to the commission and notes the recommendations about them. This is a fairly long summary of the commission’s conclusions, if you will bear with me.

"The Direct responsibility"

"All the evidence indicates that the massacres were perpetrated by the Phalangists between the time they entered the camps on Thursday 16/9/82 at 18.00 hours and their departure from the camps on Saturday 18/9/82 at approximately 8 a.m... No other military force aside from the Phalangists was seen by any one of the witnesses in the area of the camps where the massacres were carried out or at the time of the entrance into or exit from this area. The camps were surrounded on three sides by the IDF [the Israeli army] forces and one the fourth side was a city line that was under Phalangist control..."

"Here and there hints, and even accusations, were thrown out to the effect that IDF soldiers were in the camps at the time the massacre was perpetrated. We have no doubt that those notions are completely groundless and constitute a baseless libel." (A blood libel, presumably.)

The dog tags of two Israeli soldiers found by an American reporter after the end of the massacres are invalid, because the individuals they belonged to were documented as being in hospital far away when the massacres were carried out. "The discovery of documents belonging to an IDF soldier in the camps does not indicate that any IDF soldiers were in the camp while the massacre was being perpetrated." The same applies to the empty ammunition boxes marked with Hebrew characters found in the camps.

"Contentions and accusations were advanced that even if the IDF personally had not shed the blood of the massacred, the entry of the Phalangists into the camps had been carried out with the prior knowledge that a massacre would be perpetrated there and with the intention that this should indeed take place; and that therefore all those who had enabled the entry of the Phalangists into the camps should be regarded as accomplices to the acts of slaughter and share in the direct responsibility. These accusations, too, are unfounded." (Although they are perfectly correct.)

"...We assert that in having the Phalangists enter the camps, no intention existed on the part of anyone who acted on behalf of Israel to harm the noncombatant population, and that the events that followed did not have the concurrence or assent of anyone from the politician or civilian echelon [of Israel]. It was alleged that the atrocities being perpetrated in the camps were visible from the roof of the forward command post, that the fact they were being committed was also discernable from the sounds emanating from the camps. Moreover, the senior IDF commanders had observers on the roof of the forward command post for two days certainly saw or heard what was going on in the camps." This is perfectly correct, but the commission ruled that neither the command post nor the watchtowers were manned around the clock or that Israelis stationed in them didn't have a perfect view of the Palestinian refugees being pulled out of their huts and shot in the streets. Sure, right.

The doctors and nurses from the nearby Gaza hospital who repeated their accounts of how they had treated Palestinians from the camp who had been shot
in the initial hours of the assault and had tried to contact Israeli authorities to stop the massacre were also dismissed by the commission.

"Our conclusion is therefore that the direct responsibility for the perpetration of the acts of slaughter rests on the Phalangist forces. No evidence was brought before us that Phalangist personnel received explicit orders from their command to perpetrate acts of slaughter, but it is evident that the forces who entered the area were steeped in hatred for the Palestinians, in the wake of atrocities and severe injuries done to the Christians during the civil war in Lebanon by the Palestinians and those who fought alongside them." This feeling was compounded by the assassination of their leader, Bashir Gemayel, some days earlier.

"The Indirect Responsibility"

"...If it is determined that the blood of those who were killed was not shed by IDF soldiers and IDF forces, or that others operating at the behest of the state were parties to the atrocities, then there is no place for further discussion of the problem of indirect responsibility." That however is not the case here, said the investigating commission.

"...If it indeed becomes clear that those who decided on the entry of the Phalangists into the camps should have foreseen - from the information at their disposal and from things which were common knowledge - that here was a danger of massacre and no steps were taken which might have been taken to prevent this danger or at least to greatly reduce the possibility that deeds of this type might be done, then those who made the decisions and those who implemented them are indirectly responsible for what did occur, even if they did not intend this to happen and merely disregarded the anticipated danger."

"A similar indirect responsibility also falls on those who knew of the decision: it was their duty by virtue of their position and their office, to warn of the danger, and they did not fulfill this duty... If the territory of West Beirut may be viewed at the time of the events as occupied territory - and we do not determine that such indeed is the case from a legal perspective - then it is the duty of the occupier, according to the rules of usual and customary international law, to do all it can to insure the public's well-being and security."

"Even if these legal norms are invalid regarding the situation which the Israeli Government and the forces operating at its instructions found themselves in at the time of the events, still, as far as the obligations applying to every civilized nation and the ethical rules accepted by civilized peoples go, the problem of indirect responsibility cannot be disregarded. When we are dealing with the issue of indirect responsibility it should not be forgotten that the Jews in various lands of exile and also in the land of Israel when it was under foreign rule suffered greatly from pogroms perpetrated by various hooligans; and the danger of disturbances against Jews in various lands, it seems evident, has not yet passed. The Jewish public stand has always been that the responsibility for such deeds falls not only on those who rioted and committed the atrocities but also on those who were responsible for safety and public order, who could have prevented the disturbances and did not fulfill their obligation in this respect."

"In our view, everyone who had anything to do with events in Lebanon should have felt apprehension about a massacre in the camps if armed Phalangist forces were to be moved into them without the IDF exercising concrete and effective supervision and scrutiny of them."

"To sum up this chapter, we assert that the atrocities in the refugee camps were perpetrated by members of the Phalangists and that absolutely no direct responsibility devolves upon Israel or upon those who acted in its behalf. At the
same time, it is clear from what we have said above that the decision on the entry of the Phalangists into the refugee camps was taken without considerations of the danger - which the makers and executives of the decision were obligated to foresee as probable - that the Phalangists would commit massacres and pogroms against the inhabitants of the camps...

"Similarly, it is clear from the course of events that when the reports began to arrive about the actions of the Phalangists in the camps, no proper heed was taken of these reports, the correct conclusions were not drawn from them and no energetic and immediate actions were taken to restrain the Phalangists and put a stop to the actions." (New York Times, February 9/83)

In short, the Kahan Commission's report was largely, if not totally, a whitewash of Israel's role in the massacres. However, there are other findings of senior Israeli politicians' and military commanders' parts in the massacres.

Menachem Begin is cited for his indifference in allowing the Phalangists to enter the Palestinian camps but his conduct does not warrant a call for his resignation. Defence Minister Ariel Sharon is charged with "not foreseeing the massacres when he sent the Phalangists into the camps" and for not immediately giving orders that they were to be withdrawn as soon as news of the massacres started coming in. He should resign or be replaced immediately. Foreign Minister Yitzak Shamir was censured for not passing on early information he received about the massacres to the army authorities but this criticism does not justify his resignation. Lt. General Rafael Eytan was criticized for his dereliction of duty as the supreme commander of the region but his resignation is not asked for because he is about to retire in the following April. Maj. General Yehoshua Saguy, the director of military intelligence is accused of indifference and neglect of the situation and his immediate dismissal is called for.

Maj. General Amir Drori, the head of the Northern command of Israeli forces is criticized for taking a 'passive position' and not stopping the Phalangists but the panel issues no recommendation about him. Brig. General Amos Yaron, the divisional commander in direct charge of Israeli forces around the camps is charged with failing to act immediately (actually, he did not act at all and even helped to resupply the Phalangist militia while they were carrying out the massacre). The recommendation is that he should be relieved as a field commander for three years. Avi Dudai, an aide to General Sharon, is accused of not passing on reports of mass killings in the refugee camps but he is cleared of wrong doing. The head of the Mossad intelligence (unnamed because his identity is a state secret) was criticized for not voicing his view on the dangers inherent in sending the Phalangists into the Palestinian camps. But no action is required beyond this criticism. (New York Times, February 9/83)

So, of the nine leading Israeli figures involved in the massacres (to say nothing of the lower level commanders responsible for the safety of the camps) only two are called upon to resign while a third was to be removed from field command for a period of three years. This is something less than a slap on the wrists for the Israeli commanders and forces involved.

In fact, the entire hearings and commission report is, as predictable, little more than a whitewash. If this had been the Nuremberg tribunal many of the accused would have been hung and most of the others sentenced to long term imprisonment. It was however the victors absolving themselves of the crimes which they had committed.

However, the commission's findings are immediately hailed by the American Jewish 'community' and the press as an example of the extraordinary
commitment to legality and human rights by the state of Israel. The American press in general concludes that 'It is their shining hour', it is yet another example of Israeli 'purity of arms'.

Menachem Begin and Yitzak Shamir continue calling the concern for the massacred Palestinians an example of world-wide anti-Semitism and a Blood Libel against the Jewish people. Gen. Yehoshua Saguy does resign, the others continue in their posts, while Ariel Sharon, who has a string of mass murders behind him, refuses to resign as Minster of Defence. Since he has the support of Menachem Begin and the investigating commission has no legal powers, he remains in public office for the meantime. Two of these murderous thugs will later become Prime Ministers of Israel.

The Globe and Mail of February 9/83 reports that Mr. Begin had told the members of his government that "'a weakness of mind' was sweeping sections of the Israeli public, and he defiantly declared that the four senior officers criticized in the report were men to be honored. He said they had given their hearts and souls "in the defence of Israel."...."As the Cabinet met, crowds of right-wing and religious demonstrators paraded outside with placards reading 'Begin and Sharon, stand strong and brave.' (Globe and Mail, February 9/82)

The same issue of the Globe and Mail presents an interview with surviving Palestinians in Sabra and Shatila camps. One, a potato seller, said "All the animals who slaughtered our women and children should be killed, with Sharon at their head." Another older man noted that 'Even if the whole Israeli Government resigned, it wouldn't bring back my family... It's all a farce." And so it was too.

The following day, February 10/83 the Globe and Mail notes that the Israeli government has accepted the report of the investigating commission. The newspaper account has a large photograph of young, right-wing Israelis demonstrating with signs which read "No America, No France, No England. No one can teach us morality'." That is probably true, no one can teach the Israelis morality - they are irredeemably chauvinistic and bloodthirsty.

The same issue of the Globe and Mail also carries an account of the Phalangist response to the Israeli commission's report. They simply dismissed the findings and suggested that it was Communist infiltrators who had carried out the massacres to give the Phalangists an evil reputation. They were about twenty years too late for such a fantasy to stick in the United States.

By this time there is a deep division in Israel between those right-wingers who oppose the recommendations of the Kahan commission and 'the left' which supports them. A New York Times report of February 11/83 notes that a demonstration of about 1,000 supporters of the 'Peace Now' movement were first heckled and then attacked by youthful supporters of Begin who chanted "Begin, Begin King of Israel." Later, as the peace protesters were withdrawing a hand grenade was thrown into their midst, killing one person and sending others to the hospital. The dead man turns out to be an emigre from Czechoslovakia who had been a teacher at a kibbutz. The reporter notes that the Peace Now group appeared to be mainly European Jews while the Begin supporters allegedly were mainly Sephardic Jews from North Africa.

"'They shouldn't have rescued you from Hitler in 1945' one young man shouted at the passing throng of Begin opponents. 'The terrorists get encouragement from you so they can come in and kill you too.' He then spit on a young woman who was marching. 'They're all Ashkenazai' shouted another". 'That's why they're out there.'
"Some of Mr. Begin's supporters called the demonstrators 'Arabs'. An elderly man wearing a yarmulke shouted at a group of women in the march 'You are Arab women. You should have been in Sabra and Shatila. They could have killed you instead'." (New York Times, February 11/83)

Said a Labor Parliamentarian, one Shulamit Aloni, "The barbarous tribal forces are here and they exist in the streets. Our Prime Minister inflamed them. We saw during the last elections how he succeeded in making a thinking public shed their individual responsibility and be driven like a flock with tom-toms. He spoke and they replied 'Begin, Begin' exactly like a roll of tom-toms in a savage tribe. We'll survive only if we return to civilized responsibility." (New York Times, February 11/83) But it turned out that the Israelis survived without ever returning to any kind of civilized responsibility.

On February 15/83 the Globe and Mail reports that Ariel Sharon was removed from his position as Minister of Defence by a majority vote in the Knesset, despite Mr. Begin's continuing support of him. Sharon however remained in the cabinet as a Minister without portfolio. At the same time Mr. Begin demanded a full apology from Time magazine which had recently reported a meeting between Mr. Sharon and members of the Phalangist Gemayel family and his support of their call for revenge for the slaying of Bashir Gemayel.

"Mr. Sharon repeated his charge that the judicial inquiry's conclusions constituted a 'blood libel' which would leave 'the mark of Cain on Israel for generations'. One Moshe Arens was pulled from the Israeli embassy in Washington to replace Mr. Sharon as Minister of Defence. Arens shares the same right-wing views as Sharon. (Globe and Mail, February 15/83)

In a think piece in the same issue of the Globe and Mail David Shipler writes that "Mr. Begin, like other Israelis, has a deep respect for their military leaders, especially those like Ariel Sharon, and discards them only for most serious reasons - if then." That newspaper also carries a report which notes that Israel's ally (its creature really) in Lebanon, Major Saad Haddad, then controlled the southern quarter of that state. However Haddad could only operate with strong Israeli support and when they retreated further south Haddad had to pick up and follow them.

On February 16/83 the Globe and Mail reports that the Lebanese army has taken control of East Beirut with the support of the Phalangist forces, which had withdrawn to the hills around the city. That army is said to contain about 25,000 men while the Phalangist militia comprises another 5,000. The Israelis, with 25,000 soldiers, occupy the southern part of the country. Some 4,500 men of the international peacekeeping forces are deployed in Beirut, but they stick pretty close to their camps and do not protect anyone. About 30,000 Syrian troops occupy the eastern and northern portion of the country. The Phalangist forces are equipped with heavy artillery and tanks supplied by the Israelis.

On February 21/83 Time newsmagazine comes out with a damning account of the massacres of Palestinians in Lebanon. The account reads "The Verdict is Guilty" and is accompanied by graphic pictures of the Palestinian dead left lying in the alleys of Sabra and Shatila camps as well as mug shots of those Israelis, charged by the commission. However the Time report is filled with praise about the 'honor of Israel' and how this report 'gives the world a new lesson in democracy' etc. etc. Now that they've got that out of the way they can return to supporting Israel again.

The Time article summarizes the 120 pages of the Kahan commission findings and provides an account of what each of the nine leaders did or did not do. The
*Time* report in general damns all of them. If they were 'indirectly responsible' for the massacres that indirection was powerful enough to spell death for some 1,000 Palestinians.

"Who shared the 'indirect' responsibility for the deaths? Prime Minister Begin, said the commission, was not a party to the decision to have Phalangists move into the camps. Nonetheless he had displayed an 'indifference' to the whole affair, and 'for two days after the Prime Minister heard about the Phalangists' entry, he showed absolutely no interest in their actions in the camps.' The commission concluded that Begin's 'lack of involvement in the entire matter casts on him a certain degree of responsibility." (*Time*, February 21, 24-25/83)

Similarly so for the actions of Yitzak Shamir and most of the political and military leadership involved. All of the Israelis investigated knew quite well what would occur, watched or received reports of what was happening, and did absolutely nothing about it over the course of 38 hours.

Appendix B of the investigating commission's report was not released because it contained information said to be sensitive for the security of Israel. These included discussions which Ariel Sharon had with the top Phalangist leadership after the assassination of Bashir Gemeyal, including his promise that Phalangist militia would be allowed to enter the camps and his understanding of the 'need' for revenge by the Phalangists.

A brief letter to the editor by one Robert Buckley to the *Globe and Mail* on April 17/83 reads as follows: "Defenders of the massacre of Palestinians in Lebanon present an unctuous defence, it seems to me, in claiming that an Israeli commission of enquiry ends the matter." I'm not sure if it did or not.

"It bears repeating that the Israeli commission did not hear from any Palestinians or any survivors. Only a handful of foreign doctors and nurses were heard from and they were immediately ruled to be biased or unreliable in their testimonies. The overwhelming majority of those giving evidence were Israeli commanders and civilian leaders who had something to do with the massacres. Hardly a range of evidence to make one feel that a thorough-going investigation was being carried out.

This commission, like royal commissions, was appointed to confuse and obscure, not to clarify - an expedient of escape when political pressure becomes embarrassing. And their success rate is high, as the results of this Israeli investigating commission into events occurring in September 1982 in Beirut seem to attest." (*Globe and Mail*, April 17/83)

Almost none of the Israeli generals who had overseen the operations in Beirut received more than a slap on the wrist. One of them, Maj. General Amos Yaron who was the paratroop commander with direct control over the two Beirut refugee camps, was stripped of his command but reappeared three years later as Israel's military attaché to the US. As such he was central in obtaining and directing the $1.8 billion of military aide which Israel gets from the US each year.

General Yaron, the Israeli Investigating Commission determined, "was standing on a command post on a roof in the first hours of the massacre when Elie Hobeika, the Lebanese Christian commander, gave an order to kill Palestinian women and children." In fact, Yaron would have witnessed those orders being carried out. "Yaron, who was then the Beirut commander, was found to have failed to act on reports that the killings were under way," the Israeli investigating commission held. (*New York Times*, September 10/86)
The On-going Lebanese War: A Brief Overview

Israel withdrew from West Beirut late in 1982 and moved somewhat south where it ran into increasing guerrilla activity. It withdrew again to the Litani river, north of Tyre, and fought over that region for about two years. The Litani river would have been a great prize for Israel since it would have permitted the diversion of its waters to farming settlements in northern Israel.

Israeli forces made continuous raids and prolonged incursions into districts in central Lebanon from its bases behind the Litani river. Guerrilla activity was growing daily and beginning to have some real impact on the morale of the Israeli army. Somewhat later Israel withdrew once again to a southern strip of Lebanon about 25 to 40 kilometers north of the Israeli border.

The stretch of territory along Israel's northern boundary was a region partly policed and administered by its puppet forces, led by one Maj. Saad Haddad. This was not an especially large force, some 2,500 men, who were armed and supplied by the Israelis. They were given tanks and artillery and all the personal weapons they could absorb. They were also paid by Israel. Israeli war planes bombed and rocketed villages in the periphery of the Haddad forces on an almost non-stop basis, invariably calling them 'raids on terrorist training camps.' Almost every village in that region was either bombed or shelled by Israeli long range artillery over the succeeding years. A great many of the inhabitants naturally fled their villages for safer places; the region became partially depopulated and something like a 'free fire zone'. After many additional years Israel liquidated its position in Lebanon and withdrew, leaving behind Haddad's fighters who continued to be supported by Israeli forces long into the 1990s.

Israeli air raids were also laid on against targets in West Beirut and elsewhere in Lebanon, often creating enormous civilian casualties - 500 dead in one raid, 300 in another. The Lebanese had absolutely no defense against such raids. Most of the aircraft and virtually all of the munitions expended in these raids came from American stockpiles which continued to flow into Israel without let up.

The War in Lebanon Continues

Let us backtrack a little to cover this topic.

The New York Times of October 1/82 reports that when Ariel Sharon visited a Sephardic 'development town' of northern Israel yesterday he was greeted by chants of 'Arik King of Israel'. He and those speaking at an impromptu rally of some 500-600 persons rejected all claims about Israeli responsibility for the Beirut massacres. "Because of this one incident we forget why we went to war," said Mayer Shitrit, a member of Parliament and mayor of Yavneh, a kibbutz near Tel Aviv. 'We didn't kill. The Lebanese killed." Others said that Israel was the victim of international prejudice, catering to oil interests and the treason of the Labour party in charging Israel's leaders.

When Sharon spoke he said "No one on earth can teach us about attitudes toward human life. We know the meaning of life better than anyone in the world. What is being done to Israel around the world is character assassination - it is character assassination" he shouted. There was a roar of approval." Israel should know since it specializes in character assassination.

On October 2/82 the New York Times provides the text of a letter recently written by Menachem Begin to US Senator Allen Cranston, one of the leading Israeli supporters in the American government. In it Begin says that blaming Israel for the Beirut massacres is 'totally despicable.' He writes "The whole campaign of
the last 10 days of accusing Israel, of blaming Israel, of placing moral responsibility on Israel - all of it seems to me, an old man who has seen so much in his lifetime, to be almost unbelievable, fantastic and, of course, totally despicable. In fact such charges amount to blood libel, a defamation which may result in Jewish blood being spilled."

While reminding Cranston of the indissoluble links between Israel and America, Begin totally rejects any negotiations with the PLO and refuses to consider a separate homeland for Palestinians. This would put Israel under 'intolerable pressure' and because of the external ties of the PLO, also provide a base for Soviet advances in the region. Right.

US 'peacekeeping' forces are now deployed in a small district of Beirut. The Israelis are still in their positions in and around Beirut and are reluctant to leave. The US ambassador there said that he knew of no timetable for Israeli withdrawal. As an aside, the Phalangists have captured an individual they claim was a participant in the assassination of Bashir Gemayel. He was Lebanese with no ties to the Palestinians. \( \text{New York Times, October 2/82} \)

In Egypt President Hosni Mubarak said that Israel is on the verge of expanding their war and was 'beating the war drums'. "At the same time the Egyptian leader praised those Israelis who publicly condemned the massacre last month in two refugee camps in Beirut. 'We hail the Israelis who within Israel have condemned the massacre as conflicting with the basic doctrine of the Jewish religion and Jewish history.' \( \text{New York Times, October 4/82} \)

The \textit{New York Times} of October 5/82 reports that Israeli planes have bombed a number of refugee camps termed 'training bases' in the Syrian controlled Bekaa valley. Apparently there was no resistance offered. In the Commentary section of that issue Jewish-American hawks are again in full war cry. One Bernard Avishai, who teaches writing at MIT, contributes a piece which warns President Reagan from doing anything which might jeopardize Israeli security. Sydney Zion, an author and reporter, writes that Jordan is the state which was set aside for Palestinian settlement. He holds that the West Bank is inherently Israeli and that it had merely been conquered and annexed by Jordan during the 1948 war. That if Palestinians feel uncomfortable living in Israel they should return of their homeland, Jordan. Flora Lewis, another of the supporters of Israel offers a column in which she says 'The War Isn't Over.' She holds that the Israeli government has the right and duty to wage war against the Palestinians and their terrorist PLO until it is totally crushed.

The \textit{New York Times} of October 6 reports that the Lebanese army is engaged in a house to house search for weapons in West Beirut. In a related article in the same issue is an account of Ain Hilwe, the largest of the refugee camps on the outskirts of Sidon in southern Lebanon. This camp was the scene of a courageous Palestinian resistance to the Israeli invasion and had been blasted into rubble. Some 3,000 tents had recently arrived from UNRWA, the United Nation relief agency, with 8,000 more expected to arrive. These tents are raised on the rubble of the camp. "Said Abid Mahmoud, a 60 year old storekeeper, as he watched a bulldozer begin clearing the south end of the camp 'We don't know what to do. Where can we go?"' He said that his house was now packed with relatives who had lost their own dwellings either through the shelling or in the clearance projects.

The \textit{New York Times} of October 7 reports that "...the US government has informed the Lebanese government that it expects it to safeguard rights of Palestinians living within its boundaries. The recent detention of thousands of
Palestinians arrested in the Lebanese army's search for weapons in the refugee camps have raised worries about a second massacre taking place."

On October 8/82 the New York Times notes that Ariel Sharon addressed a reunion of veterans of the Irgun Zvai Leumi, a right wing Jewish underground organization which had fought to drive the British out of Palestine after 1945. He loudly decryed the US proposal to establish a Palestinian state on the West Bank. He described Reagan proposals "...as a proposition for a second Palestine state, in addition to Jordan." Hell, they've only been there for 1,500 years.

The New York Times of October 11/82 carries a full page ad from an outfit calling itself 'American Friends for Israel'. It carries a bold title reading 'The Real Issue' which lists all the killings which have gone on in the Middle East during the past decade. Among other things it says "Last month, several hundred innocent men, women and children were massacred in Beirut. Arabs were murdered by Arabs. Again. No one demanded that the murderers pay for the blood they spilled. Instead, guilt was placed on Israel, the single nation in the world to display genuine concern for civilians caught in war - even at the cost of its own soldiers."

The ad goes on to say that once again Israel has chosen the moral route by impaneling a commission to investigate the killings in Beirut. Let no one now charge Israel with any crime.

A letter to the editor of the (October 11/82) comes from one Nathan Nagler, the National Commander of the Israel Commission of B'nai B'rith International. He says that he is amazed that a distinguished sociologist such as Immanuel Wallerstein could be so blind to the facts to propose that a national homeland be established for Palestinians on the West Bank. How could the Israeli government or anyone negotiate with so murderous a gang as the PLO? Impossible! The only thing which will provide lasting security for Israel is a strong army and airforce, says Commander Nagler.

The Globe and Mail of October 12/82 reports that the continuing searches through the Palestinian refugee camps by the Lebanese army are now accompanied by bulldozers knocking down and flattening houses under various pretexts. There are no provisions made for those left homeless. In Beirut, the Lebanese army continues its search of refugee camps for hidden arms while allied authorities demolish 'unlicensed' houses and shops. In addition to the damages caused by four months of shelling and the rampages of the Phalangists, Palestinians are being driven from their homes to live in tents.

The New York Times of October 13/82 carries a full page close-up of a glowering Yasser Arafat, with the notation "Next Year in Jerusalem?" Below it is an appeal for funds by NATPAC (National Political Action Committee), possibly the most influential of the Jewish lobby groups in America. The slogan of this outfit is "Faith in Israel strengthens America". This ad will run a number of times over the coming two years. By most accounts there were then about 200,000 Palestinians still living within the old quarters of Jerusalem, where they have lived for well over a thousand years.

The same issue of the Times reports a meeting held between Ariel Sharon, still Israeli Minister of 'Defence', and a delegation of 1,000 American Jews from the United Jewish Appeal. The United Appealers say they have come to appreciate the defence problems which face Israel and will return home to urge others to support Israel to the hilt. Sharon promises that Israel will never withdraw from a 25 kilometer zone in Lebanon on the Israeli border because this would again permit PLO terrorists to attack Israel. He also raises the proposition of 'resetting'
those Palestinians who live near the narrow central neck of Israel, thereby expanding Israel’s defence capabilities. He also denounces the world press for maligning Israel’s invasion of Lebanon and its role in the Beirut massacres. They are all distorted portraits, he 'thunders', and reminds his listeners of the 1,300 Jews who have died in 'terrorist' attacks over the previous 35 years. The United Jewish Appealers love it and rush Sharon for his autograph.

On October 14/82 the New York Times notes that Israel has released an additional 600 of the 6,000 prisoners it had taken during its invasion of Lebanon. Some believe that Israel will hang on to a substantial number of such prisoners as a bargaining chip with the PLO. Elsewhere, the Lebanese army has resumed its searches of West Beirut for hidden arms caches. The Lebanese government is at sea about what to do with the 8,000 full-time Phalangist militiamen and its 8,000 reservists. They continue to fight the Druze militia in the mountains about 15 miles southeast of Beirut.

The same issue of the Times reports a horrendous outbreak of anti-Semitism at Dartmouth college, in New Hampshire, where vandals overturned a Succah (harvest festival) booth. Assorted rabbis and Jewish community figures blame the outrage on the lax attitude of the college newspaper which has dared to criticize Israel.

The New York Times of October 16/82 reports that the Israeli army is to court-martial eight of its soldiers accused of using excessive violence against demonstrators in the West Bank the previous spring. "At least 15 Arabs were shot and killed and about 100 were wounded during weeks of rioting as youths threw stones at troops trying to contain demonstrations. Two or three of the deaths were said to have occurred after Jewish settlers fired into crowds of demonstrators but no civilians have been charged." The Times goes on to say that "In the past, soldiers and settlers were rarely prosecuted for killing Arabs in the West Bank and those charged invariably received light sentences. The Advocate General’s statement appeared to mean that the eight trials would be regarded as test cases to see whether it would be worth pursuing others."

On October 18/82 the Israelis formally thank the US for blocking a UN vote calling for the expulsion of Israel from the UN. Since they have such utter contempt for that organization it is puzzling why they want to remain in it.

The October 18/82 issue of the Times contains a long essay by their resident venom pedlar, William Safire. After expatiating about the inherent anti-Semitism of the UN as witnessed by its current criticism of Israel, Safire issues the war cry "Get the US out of the UN and the UN out of the US."

On October 19/82 the New York Times reports that Menachem Begin has told the Knesset that all of Israel’s borders are now secure and that he had achieved the goal which Israel had set itself. In Washington, President Gemayel is pressing President Reagan for a withdrawal of all foreign forces from Lebanon. The US Marines are now dug in at a seaside district of Beirut. The US ambassador to the UN, one Jeane Kirkpatrick, supports the Phalangist president all the way. In Lebanon itself the Israeli army has seized a town southeast of Beirut and refused to surrender it to the Lebanese army until it could be fully assured that sectarian battles between the Phalangists and the Druze would not break out again.

In the October 20/82 issue of the New York Times is an article about Amin Gemayel’s visit to the UN and his claims that the Phalangists had nothing to do with the Beirut massacre. "'The responsibility is borne by the Israelis for the massacres in Sabra and Shatila', he was quoted as saying, 'and the Phalangists had nothing to do with it'..." He then reportedly added "International conventions on
war are very clear. The occupier is directly responsible for what happens in the territory it controls." This does not go down well with the Israelis, who now consider him an ungrateful wretch.

The same issue of the New York Times carries an article by one Shmuel Schnitzer, an editor of the right-wing Israeli newspaper Maariv. It once again holds that Jordan is the Palestinian state and that Israel has rights to the entire region west of the Jordan river going back 3,000 years. He says that Jordan is where the Palestinians belong and the US's proposal for a Palestinian homeland west of the Jordan river is only maintaining unachievable hopes among them. (These hopes are unachievable because Israel intends to settle hundreds of thousands of Jews on the West Bank on land taken from the Palestinians.)

The New York Times of October 21/82 reports that Israelis are denouncing Mr. Gemayel for his remarks about who caused the Beirut massacres. They hold that he is turning his back on Israel which had provided arms and equipment to the Phalangist militia for years. He is also apparently unwilling to sign a security treaty with Israel which would leave it in control of a portion of south Lebanon. Yosef Rom, a member of Mr. Begin's Likud said, "Alluding to the stream of Israeli aid sent to the Christian forces over the years. Mr. Rom added 'Very ungrateful and even forgetful'."

The New York Times of November 5/82 notes that the Prime Minister of Lebanon, one Shifik al Wazzan, has asked parliament for emergency powers for president Gemayel to rule by personal degree for his coming eight months. During his speech to the Lebanese parliament he also criticized Israel for its continuing occupation of the country. In part he said, "Israel attacked us, penetrated our borders, occupied our country and reached our capital. Even though it has withdrawn from some areas, it still occupies large sections of the country in defiance of United Nations decisions and despite the lapse of five months since the occupation." He also stressed Lebanon's desire to live at peace with its neighbor, Syria.

The Globe and Mail of November 17/82 carries a piece by its pro-Israelfantast Abraham Rabinovich. He tells us that Beirut "has long been acknowledged as the headquarters of international terrorism." However, during their occupation of Beirut the Israelis had found no record linking local groups with international terrorist networks. Nevertheless, "Several hundred foreign citizens who allegedly served in the ranks of the Palestine Liberation Organization were seized by Israel in its sweep through Lebanon." Allegedly, most of them come from Asia, followed by Arabs from foreign nations. But in the Ein Hilwe refugee camp near Sidon the Israeli army discovered 15 Germans disguised as Arabs and thought to be connected with the Red Army terrorist group. (There were also terrorist doctors, terrorist nurses, terrorist aid workers, to say nothing of terrorist children in the refugee camps.)

On December 9/82 the New York Times runs an article entitled "Israel's Military; Doubts on Lebanon". It notes the Israeli military leaders fear that Israeli power may have overextended itself. "The forces are concerned not only about the campaign in Lebanon but also about the attitude of the United States toward Israel and the overall military situation in the middle east. They are aware that television pictures of the bombing of West Beirut helped form in some Americans minds the image of a ruthlessly aggressive Israeli military machine."

In Lebanon the guerrilla campaign deepens, despite on-going Israeli bombing.
The On-Going Israeli Occupation of Lebanon and Mounting Resistance

In the year following the withdrawal of the PLO and the Beirut massacres a kaleidoscopic array of forces had emerged in Lebanon and were fighting each other. What still remained of the Lebanese army appears to have been largely taken over by Phalangists. Both they and the Phalangist 'Lebanese forces' were involved in assaulting Palestinian refugee camps around Beirut. So too was Amal, the Shiite militia which had recently risen in strength. The Phalangists were also fighting the Druze, who would soon begin to drive them out of Druze inhabited regions. There was conflict among the Palestinians as well, with a brigade of Palestinian forces organized by Syria fighting those Palestinians still loyal to Arafat's PLO. Some left-wing Sunni militias in Beirut retained their alliances with remnants of the PLO but in the north of the country other Sunni forces were attacking Palestinian camps. The Syrian army had occupied the eastern half of Lebanon, especially the Bekaa valley, and were far stronger than any of the Lebanese militias alone or in combination. Within a few years they would gradually advance and bring a degree of peace to central and northern Lebanon.

Over the next year or two the Phalangists would be driven back to their heartland in the center of the country and would then remain on the sidelines in the power struggle for the country. The Syrian backed Palestinian forces broke off their assaults on the PLO while most of the other forces began to concentrate on guerrilla warfare against the Israeli army, to drive it out of Lebanon. This they finally accomplished after another seven years of combat. The Israelis relied on long distance shelling of villages thought to harbor Lebanese resistance fighters and bombing raids on sundry targets further afield. This earned them a growing hatred among much of the Lebanese population.

In the course of that first year the Israelis gradually fell back to positions in southern Lebanon. Between 1983 and 1986 they came under increasing attack there. Finally, in 1986 they withdrew from Lebanon completely but left behind Maj. Haddad's puppet forces in a region 25-40 kilometers north of the Israeli boundary. Whenever pressure became too great on them the Israelis launched bombing raids and long distance artillery attacks on Lebanese villages outside of Maj. Haddad's control. Additional thousands of Lebanese civilians lost their lives in those attacks. Possibly the most outrageous case occurred when hundreds of Lebanese from surrounding villages encamped around a UN observers' base for protection were shelled by Israeli artillery. More than a hundred Lebanese civilians were killed there and unknown hundreds more injured. The artillery fire directed on them was with pin point accuracy. The message which the Israelis were delivering presumably was that the UN could not provide protection for refugees camped at their very doorstep. After a brief burst of furor this massacre was soon forgotten.

The following overview of events in Lebanon ranging from 1983 to 1987 is mere a skeletal outline. This will have to suffice.

1983

On February 17/83 the Globe and Mail reports that a conflict has developed between the Israeli forces in Lebanon and the Lebanese army, now heavily staffed by Phalangist officers and men. An Israeli tank patrol was halted by the Lebanese army from entering West Beirut. In this case the Lebanese army was supported by small contingents of French and Italian troops sent into Beirut earlier to help keep the peace.
Battles between the Druze militia and Phalangist forces had broken out again around the Chouf hills south of Beirut. The Lebanese army was continuing its drive to disarm ‘leftist’ militia forces in West Beirut.

The *Globe and Mail* of May 10/83 reports that anti-Israeli riots have broken out in a number of towns of central and southern Lebanon which are said to have been instigated by various Shite militia forces. It is said that the Israeli military ordered all inhabitants of the town of Qaraoun between the ages of 13 and 60 to assemble on the town square and then arrested and hauled away 63 of them to detention camps.

The *Globe and Mail* of June 9/83 reports that Lebanese and Palestinian prisoners have repeatedly "rioted within the Ansar prison camp on the first anniversary of the Israeli invasion. The camp then contained some 4,700 prisoners. These are just some of the people who Israel suspects as being connected with 'terrorists'. Ansar is just one of the prison camps built or operated by the Israelis in Lebanon.

The *Globe and Mail* of July 27/83 reports that the Israeli Druze (a highly localized Islamic sect) are torn between their loyalty to Israel, with whose forces they have fought in the past, and loyalty to their kinsmen in Lebanon. Said one prominent Druze spokesman in Israel, "Hundreds of Israeli Druze are ready to defect to Lebanon to help our brothers in their war of survival' if heavy fighting breaks out in the Chouf, said Zaidan Atashi, a Druze and former member of the Israeli Knesset (parliament) who was once the Israeli consul in New York."

Another Druze member of the Knesset, a member of Begin's Herut party, disagreed. But one Sheik Harbaw, a reserve captain in the Israeli army, "...accused the Israeli government of making a 'fatal mistake' in not backing Mr. Jumblatt [the leader of the Lebanese Druze] at the start of the invasion of Lebanon, and predicted there would be Israeli Druze defection to Lebanon once Israel withdraws from the Chouf."

In the same issue is an account of bitter battles taking place in settlements in the Bekaa valley between those sections of the PLO loyal to Mr. Arafat and Palestinian forces organized by Syria. It also reports that a front of non-Phalangist groups has been put together by the former president Suleiman Franjieh who says that he will not request the removal of the Phalangist government of Amin Gemayel as long as he preserves 'democratic freedom.'

In Hebron, Israel, the police are investigating a machine gun attack on a crowd of Palestinian students which killed three people and wounded 33 others. It is generally believed that the assailants were Jewish settler-extremists but the Israeli police naturally have no leads.

On September 21/83 two letters to the editor appear in the *Globe and Mail*. Menachem Begin had recently stepped down from his office of Prime Minister and been replaced by Yitsak Shamir, another right-wing Jewish terrorist. The *Globe and Mail* had provided a brief editorial outlining Mr. Shamir's background and past deeds. Monty Robins, the Executive Director of the Canadian Zionist Federation, denounces the *Globe and Mail* for raking up past "myths and illusions" (which happen to be true) and holds that the Israelis in their wisdom will be able to select a successor to Mr. Begin without the intrusion of any foreign advice. He also holds that the Israeli investigations into the massacres in Beirut have finally been put in the right perspective – simply a case of Christians massacring Moslems without the slightest involvement by Israelis.

On October 5/83 the *Globe and Mail* runs an article on conditions in the Israeli Ansar prison camp in Lebanon. After 18 months imprisonment, on no
charges whatsoever, the 4,700 men and boys still live in crowded tents with little in the way of sanitation. They are responsible for food and conditions inside the jail. Interviews with prisoners suggest the conditions have gradually improved from when they were first interned. Says one prisoner, a Mr. Taamri, "beating was a daily habit, insults were another daily habit." He added "The first thing everybody would think in the morning was if it would be his turn for interrogation.' ...Israel does not regard the inmates as prisoners of war under the Geneva Convention.' ...they [the prisoners] obtained a copy through the International Committee of the Red Cross, Mr. Taamri said."

"The second stage started when we started to get our rights', he said. They stopped making us put our hands on our heads each morning at the counting. The beating was less than before, and then stopped after we complained after each incident.'"

To date, five prisoners have been killed by the Israelis running the prison, although what the number of 'unexplained' deaths or death 'due to heart attack' etc. is unclear. However, on the previous August 25 prisoners were wounded by Israeli gunfire when one prisoner approached the fence and asked for water. Some Israeli officers feel that the prison camp will be a recruiting ground for future PLO militants. (Globe and Mail, October 5/83)

On October 23/83 the New York Times reports that the American Marine contingent in West Beirut, which has been housed in an underground garage, was attacked by a suicide bomber driving a truck load of explosives into their shelter. In the year that they had been in Lebanon the Marines had managed to protect virtually no one because of their lack of response to unfolding events. Some 258 Marines are killed along with some 58 French soldiers plus those injured to one degree of another. President Ronald Reagan was outraged, blustered, and ordered the battleship Missouri (recently recommissioned from the world war 2 mothball fleet) to fire its huge shells into distant Lebanese villages. But within a month all American troops were pulled out of Lebanon and were soon followed by the French and Italian contingents.

On December 12/83 it emerges that Yasser Arafat has either not left or has returned to northern Lebanon and is at PLO bases in the vicinity of Tripoli, then under attack by Palestinian forces allied with Syria. The Israelis send in gunboats to shell the PLO camp there. "Meanwhile, Prime Minister Yitzak Shamir denounced the United Nations yesterday for deciding to help Mr. Arafat leave Lebanon, while controversy erupted in Israeli Government circles over whether to try to kill the PLO leader or block his escape." Ariel Sharon, then a minister without portfolio, holds that "Arafat should not be allowed to leave Lebanon alive." (Globe and Mail, December 12/83)

1984

On January 4/84 the Vancouver Sun reports the ninth massive Israeli bombing raid in Lebanon since early November. These are concentrated on settlements in the Becka valley and directed at villages which support the Shiite militia Amal (Hope) and the radical Islamic Hezbollah. At least 73 people are killed in the latest raids. The Israelis dropped delayed action bombs.

On the following day, January 5/84, the Globe and Mail reports some 500 casualties, mainly among civilians, due to Israeli air strikes against Baalbek in the Becka valley. "Beirut radio said the toll was "nearly a 100 dead and 400 wounded." The bombers hit a mosque and a school just as classes had begun.
The Israelis claim these were air strikes with 'pin point accuracy' which killed only guerillas from the Amal and Hezbollah movement. (Very smart bombs). They are still retaliating for a suicide bomber who killed 29 Israeli soldiers and 32 Arab civilians in Tyre last November.

The *Globe and Mail* of January 18/84 reports the death of Maj. Saad Haddad, who had lead Israeli puppet forces in the south of Lebanon. Israeli is in the market for another pliable military leader. There are increasing attacks on Israeli forces throughout the region.

In early February 1984 the Amal militia is still fighting against PLO forces in the refugee camps of West Beirut, with substantial casualties on both sides, while in the Chouf mountains advancing Druze militia say they have discovered the bodies of some 100 Druze civilians killed in the previous November when the Phalangists occupied the region. The Lebanese army is apparently in the process of disintegration while the Phalangist government of Amin Gemayel is under strong pressure to resign.

On March 22/84 there is a high level meeting in Switzerland between some of the major figures in Lebanese political circles. They include Amin Gemayel of the dominant Phalangist fraction, Sulieman Franjieh of an opposition fraction, Walid Jumblatt of the Druze, and Nabih Berri of the Shia Amal militia. There is no love lost between them and Mr. Jumblatt demands that Amin Gemayel resign and be tried as a war criminal. However Syria, which now occupies much of Lebanon, is looking for a stable neighbor and is expected to impose a peace among the various factions. (*Globe and Mail*, March 22/84)

There is a gap in my files between April 1984 and February 1985. However events unfold much as they had before. Israeli troops are still in the southern portion of Lebanon while Israeli naval vessels and aircraft keep up their bombing and shelling of Palestinian and Lebanese settlements throughout that country. Within Lebanon the Christian Maronite clique still controls the government while Shiite military forces are trying to defeat PLO forces and expel Palestinians from the camps. For God knows what reason. Additional hundreds of people die in these conflicts during this 10 month period.

In Israel, the Intifada has not yet begun but a substantial number of Palestinian protests arise. Israel's government and army repeatedly proclaim that they have been successful in driving back 'terrorists' from the Israeli border, even if they haven't succeeded in controlling southern Lebanon as a quasi-Protectorat. We return now to a running account of the Israelis in Lebanon.

1985

On February 18/85 the *Globe and Mail* reports that Lebanese President Amin Gemayel has lauded the Moslem resistance to Israel and the Israeli withdrawal from Sidon in the south of the country. He appears to be in deep trouble. Walid Jumblatt, leader of the Druze forces, called for Mr. Gemayel's overthrow. Mr. Shamir, the Herut Prime Minister of Israel, holds that a full Israeli withdrawal from Lebanon will depend upon guaranteeing that there will be no attacks on its Galilee settlements. Ariel Sharon is against any withdrawal whatsoever from Lebanon.

On February 22/85 the *Globe and Mail* reports that Israel has launched a coordinated ground attack from its southern occupied enclave to strike at four Shia villages that are thought to be bases for Amal guerrillas. Some Lebanese are killed and large number rounded up for interrogation.
On February 23/85 the *Globe and Mail* notes that "Israel initiated what its Defence Minister Yitzak Rabin called an 'iron fist policy' last week to try to suppress the guerrillas after three Israelis, including a colonel advising the South Lebanese army, were killed three days after the Israelis pulled back south of Sidon."..."Details of the Israeli action are coming out slowly because the Israelis have kept foreign journalists out of the area and have closed the smaller roads between villages, hindering local communication."

Yitzak Rabin, the Labor minister of Defense, will later utilize this 'iron fist policy' against Palestinian youths in the West Bank and Gaza.

As an example of what such an 'iron fist policy' means the *Globe and Mail* of March 4/85 reports an extensive sweep by some 800 Israeli soldiers and 'intelligence' agents through the village of Maarake near Tyre, in which one villager was killed, three wounded and 17 taken away under arrest.

The following day, March 5/85 the *Globe and Mail* reports the explosion of a bomb which had been placed on the roof of the central mosque in the village of Maarake, which had been occupied until the previous day by Israeli forces. Twelve people were killed, about 25 wounded and the mosque reduced to rubble. At nearby Tyre, the *Israelis arrest at least eight people who had gone to the local hospital to donate blood for the victims of Maarake.*

On March 6 the Israeli raids on South Lebanese towns continue while the Lebanese ambassador to the UN charges Israel with planting the bomb which killed people in Maarake. In Jerusalem the Israeli government has summoned the ambassadors of the US and other nations to 'explain' why its 'iron fist' policy in Lebanon is absolutely essential for their withdrawal. They blame virtually everyone in Lebanon for the increase in guerrilla activity, including President Gemayel, formerly their man.

The *Vancouver Sun* of March 9/85 reports that a truck bomb in West Beirut had killed 72 and wounded about 250 Moslems. Lebanese authorities say they suspect Israel in the bombing but no conclusive evidence is available. The same issue of the *Sun* notes that Israel has raided nine southern Lebanese towns east of Tyre within the previous few days. Some 14 residents had been killed, more wounded and an undetermined number of arrests made.

Two weeks later on March 22/85 the *Vancouver Sun* reports that the Israelis have arrested some 300 persons in another town, Qlaile, in southern Lebanon. "The raid came a day after police said Israeli troops killed 30 people, including two members of a CBS News camera crew, in a similar operation. Police said 68 people were wounded in Thursday's action against suspected guerrillas."

In a letter to then Prime Minister Shimon Peres, CBS says that the Israelis had deliberately attacked the camera crew. The Israelis responded by saying one of their tanks in the village of Kfar Meiki had opened fire on 'armed men who have taken up firing positions.' They added 'it appears that the CBS crewmen were among the armed men in the village.' In other words, 'If foreign correspondents are going to cover actions in Lebanon they run the risk of being killed.'

CBS vice president for news Ernest Leiser said on March 24/85 that his discussions with a spokesperson for Shimon Peres had failed to provide a satisfactory explanation for the killings. "In an interview, Mr. Leiser refused to comment on President Chaim Hertzog's strong condemnation of CBS over its reaction to the incident. Mr. Hertzog said 'Many journalists have been killed in war zones in different parts of the world and never has CBS or any other network reacted in such a prejudiced and hysterical manner.' (Globe and Mail, March 25/85)
The Vancouver Sun of March 30/85 reports another 29 people were killed in South Lebanon, partly in the attack of combined Phalangist and Haddad forces on a Palestinian refugee camp in Sidon and partly by an Israeli armored force 'storming' three villages in the vicinity.

This is the pattern for the first half of 1985. Ever week or so Israeli forces launch an armored raid against some Shia or other villages near their periphery or launch a bombing raid against more distant Lebanese cities - killing more people, destroying homes and orchards and arresting others as they fall back.

The Globe and Mail reports on April 5/85 that some 750 prisoners have been released from Ansar prison after having been detained for almost three years. The prisoners tell reporters of life in the tiny, crowded and stinking cells, the lack of sanitary facilities, the shootings of prisoners who approached the wire too closely and the systematic torture imposed at the camp’s interrogation center. They said that conditions became especially bad after the prison was manned by Israel's 'elite' Golani Brigade'.

"All captives arriving at Ansar were put in concrete close-confinement cells for up to 10 days, the former prisoners said. 'They put us in cells two meters by two meters without any blankets on the bare concrete... There were 13 of us like sardines in a tin. It was freezing at night and boiling during the day'."

Many of those released had undergone torture by the Israelis. This included sleep deprivation and starvation. It "included beatings to keep men awake while sitting on a wet concrete floor, confinement in a room cooled by an air-conditioner during the winter and repeated electric shocks under the fingernails and head." (Globe and Mail, April 5/85)

The Globe and Mail of April 10/85 reports Israeli aircraft have carried out some 40 bombing strikes against totally undefended villages and towns in south Lebanon in the previous six weeks. In Israel however, some two thirds of the population favours a complete and immediate withdrawal of Israeli forces from Lebanon.

In Beirut the battle between the Shia militia and the Palestinian forces continues, with increasing desperation. At one camp the Palestinians broke out of Shia encirclement and poured fire on their besiegers while in two other camps men, women, boys and girls joined with their defenders and threw grenades at their besiegers. It is estimated that about 120 people have died and some 630 have been wounded in these most recent battles. Said one Amal (Shia militia) commander "Everybody's fighting in there. Men, women, boys, even girls are throwing hand grenades". Palestinian sources say that many of their wounded bled to death because medical teams could not reach them. The Shia militia wants to stop the Palestinians from rebuilding their power base in Lebanon.

The following day the Globe and Mail reports that an additional 52 persons have been killed and 325 injured in a three way fight between the Palestinians and Amal, with Phalangist forces also attacking the West Beirut refugee camps with troops and heavy artillery. It sounds like a larger version of the battle for the Warsaw Ghetto.

On June 6/85, three years after the beginning of the Israeli invasion of Lebanon, the Globe and Mail reports Israel's last troops are beginning their final withdrawal. They will however support the forces of the so-called South Lebanese Army along a twenty-five kilometer strip between Lebanon and Israel. This force will be strongly supported with Israeli artillery, air cover and armour. The battles to defend this zone will go on for many more years, with Israeli forces penetrating deep into Lebanon with helicopters or armour to attack suspected guerrilla bases.
Ordinary people, civilians, men women and children, as well as combatants, continue to die in this kaleidoscopic conflict which the Israelis have initiated but have now withdrawn from.

1986
On February 21/86 the Globe and Mail carries a report saying that a five day long incursion into southern Lebanon by Israeli troops backed by artillery armour and helicopter gunships had run into stiff resistance in the village of Srifa east of Tyre. Three Cobra helicopter gunships blasted the town and the olive groves around it while Israeli tanks moved in. The Israelis said that the village was the base for and controlled by Islamic extremist forces.

The Globe and Mail of February 24/86 reports that Israeli leaders were beginning to have second thoughts about their puppet forces in south Lebanon, the south Lebanese Army. They have apparently been engaged in independent killings and torture of prisoners in the villages which the Israelis had just left.

On April 8/86 the Globe and Mail reports that Israel had again launched air bombardment of Palestinian camps and 'hideouts' around Sidon. Sources "said four US-built F-16 and two F-5 fighter-bombers struck six times in an hour at targets in and around the refugee camps of Miyeh-Miyeh and Ain el-Hilweh on the edge of this southern port." In Beirut the Amal militia has lifted its siege of the Sabra and Shatila refugee camps, which they had attacked with tanks acquired from Syria. The heroism of the Palestinian fighters seems simply incredible, unmatched since the Vietnamese war.

On May 19/86 the New York Times reports that tensions have developed between Syria and Israel and that the latter has begun full scale military maneuvers on the Golan Heights. Shimon Peres is trying to down grade any idea of war with Syria while others, such as Marc Heller, deputy commander of the Israeli Centre for Strategic Studies in Tel Aviv, holds that Israel should prepare for such a war. He believes that Israel should not be drawn into a conventional war but immediately strike deep into Syria to knock out its airforce and then destroy its armour on the ground by air attacks.

Presumably this sabre-rattling on Israel's part is to halt the Syrian penetration of Lebanon, to which it is bringing a degree of peace.

Still in Lebanon
While all this is going on there is a mounting, not a slackening, of guerrilla activity in southern Lebanon against the Israeli forces stationed there. On the West Bank and Gaza, sporadic riots and demonstrations by Palestinians are beginning to break out with increasing frequency. Israel's bloody suppression of them do not go down well among many members of the European Union or in third world countries.

The New York Times of June 4/86 reports the deaths of 53 persons and 242 wounded in 'fierce fighting' between Amal and Palestinians in West Beirut. How the Palestinians can defend themselves from tanks with machine guns and self-propelled grenades is unfathomable. Amal is allegedly concerned that its own position among Lebanese Muslims would be compromised if a strong Palestinian force were reestablished.

The Globe and Mail of July 11/86 notes that six armed Palestinians who attempted to enter Israel by sea have been killed off the coast. This is followed by Israeli aircraft bombing Palestinian refugee camps in Lebanon. On the following day Israeli jets and gunboats were seen off the coast of Lebanon and Palestinian
camps were again bombed in reprisal for the failed attempt. Many Palestinians fled from Ain Hilweh camp on the outskirts of Sidon. "I left after my 9-year old daughter was wounded" said Um Mohammed. I will not return to the camp for the time being, especially as Israeli planes are still flying over it."

A few days earlier Syrian troops had entered Beirut, ostensibly to control fighting between Lebanese Muslims and Palestinians. They are not favorably disposed toward Yasser Arafat's PLO.

On July 15/86 another Israeli air strike deep into Lebanon is reported by the New York Times. This raid hit the village of Ainab, in the hills behind Beirut, and was apparently aimed at Walid Jumblatt's Druze militia there. The same issue of the New York Times carries reports of the gradual return to Lebanon of PLO guerrillas from Tunisia.

On August 11/86 the Globe and Mail reports Israeli helicopter gunships and fighter planes strike two Palestinian camps in the vicinity of Sidon. Both camps are said to be strong holds of support for the PLO. "The raid came hours after mortar bombs hit positions held by the Israeli-backed South Lebanese Army militia near Yater village, five kilometers from the Israeli border."

On September 22/86 the Vancouver Sun reports that Israel says that it will send tanks and helicopter gunships into south Lebanon to halt attacks by the Shiite militia. Israeli Defence Minister Yitzak Rabin said "We are using attack helicopters ...We are using our airplanes to cope with terror in Lebanon as we are using artillery and tanks... We feel free to use them whenever it is needed to cope with terror." It may be noted that all the bombing, shelling, helicopter raids and armed Israeli incursions do not count as 'terror'.

The Vancouver Sun of September 24/86 reports that Yitzak Shamir has said that he has no plans for a new invasion of Lebanon. He repeated Israel's decision not to withdraw its troops from the Israeli designated security zone along Lebanon's border, as demanded by the UN's Security Council.

On October 4/86 the New York Times notes another series of Israeli air attacks on Sidon and on alleged 'guerrilla bases' in the northeast of Lebanon. Large fires are left burning at Sidon but the death toll goes unreported.

On October 17/86 the Globe and Mail reports that Shimon Peres and Yitzak Shamir have swapped jobs and reshuffled the Israeli cabinet in a power sharing agreement they had worked out after an inconclusive election in 1984.

On November 28/86 fighting is still raging between Palestinians and Amal forces around the southern Lebanese refugee camps. Israeli jets have bombed ten suspected PLO guerrilla bases in the region. This has become so common that it rates only a small notice in the back sections of the New York Times (New York Times, November 28/86)

The fighting between the PLO and Amal continues into early December, when the Globe and Mail reports some 105 persons killed in Palestinian refugee camps in West Beirut. "More than 1,300 people have been killed and 3,000 wounded since May 1985 in an intermittent war between Amal and Palestinian guerrillas." All Palestinian factions united to repel the Shia advance into Shatila camp." (Globe and Mail, December1/86) The fighting continues well into December, with Palestinians occasionally breaking out of the refugee camps to undercut the sieges. Most of the camp inhabitants now live day-round in the deep tunnels which have been built under the camps since the Phalangist massacres of 1982. (New York Times, December 5/86)

The Vancouver Sun of December 8/86 reports that the death toll in the Beirut refugee camps amounts to 433 killed in the previous 15 days. A National
Salvation Front composed of Sunni Moslems, Syria, and fractions of the PLO not under Arafat's command are trying to arrange a peace deal between Amal and the PLO.

On December 12/86 the New York Times reports Israeli air strikes on Palestinian positions in northern Lebanon, near the port of Tripoli. Elsewhere, the fighting between Amal and the PLO has ground down to a sporadically interrupted truce. Israeli helicopter gunships also attack Amal bases in southern Lebanon. (Vancouver Sun, December 12/86)

The Globe and Mail of December 16/86 notes that the three week armed defense of the refugee camps by the PLO marks a significant upturn in the prestige and support for that organization. Many of its fighters have allegedly been reintroduced into Lebanon and have been resupplied with arms and ammunition, although no heavy weapons. Sunni Moslems in Lebanon are beginning to look askance at the Shiite militia.

Lebanon - The Year 1987

On January 2/87 the Globe and Mail reports that nearly 2,700 people have died in battles in Lebanon during 1986. This is down from 3,675 dead during 1985. The article lists the casualties in the kaleidoscopic range of armed conflicts.

The New York Times of January 8/87 reports that the PLO and the Phalangists have agreed to a pact to cooperate against the Shiite and Syrian military forces. Israel responds with worry that it will loose its ally in Lebanon, the Maronite Christians, while some of its war strategists complain that Israel isn’t adept enough at shifting its support to whomever can help fulfil its aims.

On January 10/87 the Globe and Mail reports that four Lebanese have been killed and eight wounded in a Christian village overlooking Sidon. Israeli jets made three passes and then leveled the main church with rockets.

On February 16/87 the New York Times reports a new outbreak of fighting in West Beirut when Amal militia men attacked the newspaper of the Lebanese Communist party and then shifted to assaults on Palestinians. Amal refuses to lift its blockade of the West Beirut camps until the PLO withdraws into camps near Sidon. Water, food and medical supplies within the camps have been exhausted. In the south, Amal and Druze militia traded fire, while Phalangist militia exchanged fire with the Lebanese army. It sounds like the conditions which prevailed in Yugoslavia during world war 2.

The New York Times of February 19/87 reports street battles throughout West Beirut as Druze forces allied with Communist party militia battled with Amal and a brigade of the Lebanese army composed mainly of Shia soldiers. The battles are the heaviest yet waged between these militia forces, some of which are equipped with tanks and heavy artillery.

The New York Times, February 24/87, reports that Syrian soldiers have now taken over patrols through West Beirut and armed clashes between the Druze and Shia militias have abated. The Lebanese army is being reconstructed with Sunni, Shia and Druze officers while Lebanese army and Syrian forces are beginning to go on joint patrols together. Food supplies are being allowed to enter the Palestinian camps. The Phalangists are seemingly being edged out of the picture.

Back in Palestine, the Globe and Mail reports on April 14/87 that "Orthodox Jews threatened Arab bakers with violence yesterday if they sold leavened bread during Passover. Arab bakers in the Jewish quarter of the walled city of Jerusalem removed bread from their display windows to avoid clashes with Jews, who eat unleavened bread during the seven-day holiday... 'There will be blood', said
Shalom Rosenblat, a 69-year old Orthodox Jewish teacher.' These bakeries are a provocation, as if I were to sell alcohol in Mecca." One wonders what this Orthodox teacher teaches.

On April 26/87 the Manchester Guardian Weekly runs an interview with one Dr. Pauline Cutting, who until recently served as a surgeon in a Beirut refugee camp, right through the bombing, shelling and hand to hand combat. Her story is a grim one; of surviving for days with almost no food, of operating under the most primitive conditions and without the proper medicines, of watching the maimed and torn Palestinians - men, women and children - come in to be treated. All this while under enemy fire.

She says that she is not a hero, the children are. It was they who brave snipers and gunfire to bring food to their embattled defenders. She says that "...Britain owes a great debt to the Palestinians. By the Balfour Declaration we helped create the problem. We should do something now to alleviate the suffering of these people. Nurse Susan Wighton, who had also been in the Palestinian refugee camps throughout the struggles, had similar feelings. They had both returned to Great Britain for a rest.

"A few weeks ago, British doctor Pauline Cutting, described the siege when she left Burj al Barajneh [camp]; 'The whole thing was more brutal than anybody can imagine. It is not just a war of malnutrition or a war of disease. It is war to deprive people of everything." (Vancouver Sun, June 20/87)

The same issue of the Vancouver Sun runs a long article on Dr. Chris Giannon, a Canadian surgeon who worked within Shatila refugee camp over the past 20 months. For 134 days last winter the Syrian-backed Amal Shia forces pounded that camp into rubble and people retreated deep underground. Giannon and his fellow doctors at the improvised Shatila hospital performed 180 major and 400 minor operations, some of them by candlelight. He is considered by Palestinians in the camp as a hero, which he probably is.

The New York Times of September 12/87 reports that a new Israeli computer data bank, which has cost $8 billion, can be used to keep tabs on all Palestinians within the occupied territories. It is expected to contain data such as ownership of real estate and property, family ties, political attitudes, licensing and consumption patterns, occupations, past illegal activities and much more on all Palestinians on the West Bank and in Gaza. By pressing a single button any Israeli agent can determine the background of an individual and use this information when authorizing or not authorizing any of the mountain of passes, licences and permission papers which Palestinians require in their everyday lives.

The Globe and Mail of September 17/87 reports a number of separate incidents in which Lebanese guerrillas had killed three Israelis and wounded four more. Also, elements of the puppet South Lebanese Army fired at Swedish troops who are part of the UN peacekeeping venture in the region.

On November 27/87 the New York Times recounts one of the most spectacular suicide missions in the present war. Two members of a Palestinian guerrilla organization allied with Syria took off from southern Lebanon in ultra-light, powered hang gliders and flew over the front lines. One landed near an airstrip and was immediately taken prisoner but the other landed near an Israeli military camp behind the lines. This occurred at night.

This second raider then walked up to the military barracks but was stopped by a guard who ran away when he threw a grenade at him. He then stormed in upon the sleeping Israeli troops, fired with his assault rifle and threw more hand
grenades. He killed six Israeli soldiers and wounded five or six more before he was himself was killed.

Israeli soldiers quickly began an armed search for accomplices but were so trigger happy that they shot and seriously wounded an Israeli farmer out in the fields from a nearby kibbutz. Israel promised exemplary retaliatory raids against anyone living in south Lebanon and immediately began a military investigation into why the security procedures were so lack at the time. Palestinians and others took a grim satisfaction in the self-sacrifice and effectiveness of this novel raid.

The following day the New York Times (November 28/87) recounts the reproaches leveled at the Israeli army for its lack of security arrangements. It turns out that the Israelis had detected the hang glider coming across the border and that a general alarm was sounded at 9 pm that night. Somehow this alarm did not register in the military camp in question. It is now held that the guard on duty did not confront the attacker at first sight but instead ran back to the base. This allowed the attacker to enter the base unhindered and to kill the sleeping Israeli soldiers.

This ends my account of the Israeli attack upon Palestinians and Lebanese and the kaleidoscopic conflicts and killings between factions in Lebanon, four and half years after the Israeli invasion in June of 1982. The same kind of fighting and guerrilla activity will continue to weigh upon the Lebanese for more than a decade. Amal and the PLO will continue to resort to armed conflict around the Palestinian refugee camps.

The Syrians will gradually impose a kind of peace over most of the country outside the South. They will stay well away from the Israeli supported enclave while the Israelis will generally refrain from bombing them. The Druze will drive out the Phalangists from their heartland in the Chouf mountains. The ability of the Palestinians to resist so many of their foes will strike some observers abroad like the Vietnamese fighting vastly more powerful forces a decade or two earlier.

Israel will keep up its sporadic and murderous bombing raids of Palestinian refugee camps and its incursions into Lebanon throughout that and the following period. It will be given plenty of American aircraft and hardware to do so.

The Palestinian Intifada within Israel will soon be in full swing, with atrocities which will gradually begin to compare with those at Sabra and Shatila. By then Israel’s supporters will have long since put the events of September 1982 behind them and will be engaged in backing Israel in whatever it does to whomever it does it to.
PART EIGHT
Chapter 14. The Palestinian Intifada and Its Suppression

The Murder of Two Palestinian Prisoners by the Shin Bet

As a prelude to the Intifada proper let us consider a case in which two Palestinian bus hijackers who surrendered to Israeli forces were then beaten to death by Paratroopers and the Shin Bet. This case was notable in that it was publicly investigated and had certain limited consequences for the killers. An unusual outcome.

The Shin Bet (the Israeli Gestapo) had systematically beaten its prisoners to death in plain sight, with the explicit permission of their head. The event which started this process was the hijacking of a bus south of Tel Aviv in 1984 in which four Palestinians seized a bus and held the 30 passengers hostage in a bid to have Palestinian prisoners released from Israeli jails. This occurred on the morning of April 12, 1984. They were surrounded by Israeli commandos and in a brief fire fight two of the hijackers were killed and the other two captured uninjured. All of the bus passengers survived unharmed. The two surviving Palestinian hijackers were killed by Israeli forces.

On May 31, 1984 a top secret report on the incident and its follow-up was presented to Israeli Defence Minister Moshe Arens. It reported that the two surviving Palestinians were first interrogated on the street and then beaten by members of Shin Bet so that they died from blows by a blunt instrument on the back of their skulls. In short, their skulls were crushed. This case was investigated because of demands by members of the Israeli Parliament that if there was anything to these rumors the commanding officer and those involved should be removed and tried in court,

"A police officer was recently suspended for leaking some information to the press. Here we are talking about murder, and the suspicion is so widespread and so clear that it is inconceivable that these people should be allowed to carry on in their posts as if nothing happened", said Shulamit Aloni, an opposition member in the Knesset.

The Koteret Rashi, a weekly magazine, questioned Mr. Arens' claims that the 'primary findings of the report' had been published. "It said there were other, 'blood-curdling' details that had been kept secret and that appeared to back up reports by relatives who said the eyes of the murdered hijackers had been pooped out. Referring to a right-wing member's statement last month that he would rip out the eyes of Arabs who murdered Jews, the magazine said 'He knew what he was talking about when he used that phrase 'their eyes should be ripped out'.

The military censors have just allowed photographs of the two dead Palestinians to be published, providing that the faces of the Israeli security police, the Shin Bet, are blacked out. The newspaper photographer who took the photos said that Defence Minister Arens and his aides were there when he photographed the hijackers. "It is inconceivable that they did not see what I saw", he said. (Globe and Mail, May 31/84)

In the intervening two years little was done to determine who the actual murderers were and who was behind them, although a low level ferment grew within the ranks of some Israeli Parliamentarians. Then, some two years later, the affair broke into the open again and this time proceeded to public investigations.

A year later the Globe and Mail of August 15/85 reports that the Israeli military decided that it would not court martial General Mordecai for his part in the beating deaths of the two Palestinian hijackers. "The announcement came
after Israel's chief rabbi said the army would be violating Jewish law if it took action against General Yitzak Mordecai. 'Let not a hair on the head of a savior of Israel be harmed', Chief Rabbi Mordecai Eliahu declared. "A holy man defending holy killers.

"Rabbi Eliahu, in a speech in Jerusalem yesterday, said the army should not take legal action 'According to Jewish ritual law ... one cannot try a person who misjudged or even committed a criminal act in the course of performing a good deed or a rescue' he said." (Globe and Mail, August 15/85)

Of course, all Jewish killings, no matter how numerous or brutal, are always acts of rescue.

The Vancouver Sun of August 15/85 reported that General Yitzak Mordecai had been identified by an official inquiry as one of nine military and security service men who struck the hijackers with pistol and rifle butts. The court accepted the general's testimony that he had pistol whipped the hijackers to force them to reveal whether they had left a bomb on the civilian bus. The military court's ruling that he was innocent of using excessive force (although the two suspects died of the beating) was greeted with relief by politicians and generals alike. "About 5,000 Israelis, among them officers, signed a petition supporting the general and Israeli Chief rabbi Mordecai Eliahu stated it would be against Jewish law to take legal action against him."

On May 26/86 the Vancouver Sun reported that the Israeli cabinet had split over a demand by the Attorney General of Israel to proceed with prosecutions of those Israelis involved in the matter. By this time the case involved the head of Shin Bet. "Citing national security considerations, officials refused to discuss the details of the case, which became public Sunday after Israeli newspapers reported that the cabinet had held a 'heated debate over the involvement of a top government official in an incident first investigated two years ago.' That official's name was not reported but it is generally believed to be the head of Shin Bet. "The identity of the head of the Shin Bet is a state secret and censorship laws forbid publication of this name either at home or abroad." The Israeli military had originally announced that all four hijackers had been killed but Israeli newspapers published photographs of two of them being led away.

On May 27/86 the Globe and Mail reports that the chief of the Shin Bet had been charged with the murder of the two Palestinians. "Israel's Attorney-General has decided to prosecute the chief of the country's internal security agency over the 1984 deaths of two captured Palestinian guerrillas. A cabinet minister said Attorney-General Yitzhak Zamir has rejected appeals from government officials to drop the matter, touching off a bitter dispute within the cabinet of Prime Minister Shimon Perez."

Zamir set out to prosecute one Avraham Shalom, head of the Shin Bet when the two murders occurred. Prime Minister Shimon Perez had attempted to quash an investigation into the case but the Attorney General had held firm on the prosecution.

"Ariel Sharon, Israel's former defence chief and current Industry Minister demanded that Mr. Zamir drop the matter. "'The witch hunt and unceasing publicity must be stopped', Mr. Sharon said in a radio interview, 'What must be done now is to stop being bleeding hearts and allow the war against terror to continue without damaging one of the most effective tools we have." Sharon is probably the leading war criminal in Israel.

"The commander of Israel's paratroops, Brigadier General Yitzak Mordecai, was reprimanded for his part in the case." (Globe and Mail, May 27/86)
The *New York Times* of May 30/86 contains a fuller account of how the case was emerging. It reports that Israeli newspapers are speculating whether the current Foreign minister Yitzak Shamir had a role in the attempted cover-up of the murder of the two Palestinian prisoners. "For the past two days Israeli newspapers have been filled with disclosures from 'official sources' asserting that Avraham Shalom, the head of the Shin Bet, the domestic intelligence agency, received approval from his political superiors for his agency's actions during and after the hijacking of an Israeli bus south of Tel Aviv on April 12, 1984... The daily newspaper *Maariv* today quoted sources close to Shin Bet as saying the 'political level' - Yitzak Shamir was Prime Minister at the time - 'was aware of all the events concerning the bus affair.' ...'The Attorney General, Yitzak Zamir, has gathered evidence showing that [a] Mr. Shalom [the head of Shin Bet] ordered that the two Palestinian hijackers be clubbed to death, Israel radio reported. The Palestinians were captured alive when Israeli troops stormed the bus and rescued the passengers."

"Mr. Shamir, asked today by the Israeli radio to respond to reports that he knew of the Shin Bet activities said 'I don't have to tell anyone what I knew and what I did not know. I knew what a Prime Minister has to know. I am in favor of leaving the head of Shin Bet alone. I think that this issue has been spoken about and pried into too much.' So spoke the leading Jewish terrorist of the 1940s.

"The initial investigation into how the two captured Palestinians were killed minutes after they were photographed being escorted from the bus alive, was carried out by an army commission of inquiry led by Meir Zorea, a retired major general. In this inquiry, the head of the rescue operation, Brig. Gen. Yitzak Mordecai admitted that he had beaten the two surviving Palestinian terrorists to find out immediately whether they had left any booby-trapped explosives on the bus. He said, however, that after he finished beating them he turned them over 'alive' to the Shin Bet officers on the scene for further questioning, during which time the two high-jackers stopped breathing." Investigations found that the head of Shin Bet was on the scene and that the two Palestinians survived their secondary beatings only to be taken away and clubbed to death under the explicit order of Mr. Shalom. (*New York Times*, May 30/86)

The Shin Bet replied that they had received the prisoners almost dead from the hands of the paratroops but the evidence suggests that they had cooked up their accounts to obscure the fact that they had clubbed the two prisoners to death under orders of their chief.

The investigation so far has revealed that at least eleven people delivered blows to the terrorists at various times - these involved policemen, soldiers and Shin Bet officers. "The net result of all the investigations was that the two Palestinian hijackers had been killed but no one was found responsible."

The case only came to the fore after three senior Shin Bet officers confronted Mr. Shalom with his deeds and suggested that he resign over the cover-up. When he didn't they took the matter outside the agency. (*New York Times*, May 30/86) It might be noted that these two Palestinian terrorists were young teenagers with no past history of involvement in radical or Islamic politics.

The *Globe and Mail* of May 30/86 also reports that Israeli Foreign Minister Yitzak Shamir denied yesterday that he had ordered the killings of two Arab guerillas captured in 1984. "On Wednesday night, Israeli television had quoted an unnamed senior minister as saying that Mr. Shamir, who was prime minister in 1984, gave the order to kill the guerrillas. Mr. [Shimon] Peres, then opposition leader, supported the decision, it said."
The *Globe and Mail* of May 31/86 runs a piece by one Abraham Rabinovich, a recurrent contributor on Israeli affairs, who notes the 'terrible pressure' under which Israel's security forces operate, the terroristic nature of the criminals, and the cover-up of the events due to the pressure cooker of Israeli internal politics. He notes that even Shimon Perez had backed the actions of the Shin Bet commander but muses that even if Mr. Shalom is cleared of all charges he may still have to resign. This is portrayed as a victory for Palestinian terrorism. In fact it is a minor, partial, victory for human decency.

Immediately following these events the Israeli cabinet dismissed the Attorney-General Yitzak Zamir and replaced him with a more pliable Yosef Harish. Mr. Harish said that he did not know the particulars of the Shalom/Shin Bet case except what he has read in the press. He added to Israeli reporters "Who knows better than you that you don't always write the truth." The Justice minister, one Yitzak Modai, added, "that if Judge Harish came to the same conclusions as Mr. Zamir, he would try to dissuade the Attorney General (from pursuing the case)"

"Today the daily newspaper *Yediot Aharonot* quoted unnamed sources as having said Mr. Shamir [Prime minister at the time] approved steps to conceal the involvement of Shin Bet in the killings." (*Globe and Mail*, June 2/86)

On June 4/86 the *Vancouver Sun* reports that Yitzak Shamir "branded as slander and lies" allegations that he had ordered the cover-up of murders carried out by the Shin Bet. Possibly he saw such reports as akin to Blood Libel.

On June 18 /86 the *New York Times* reports that the commando teams sent to rescue the bus prisoners had been told to kill all four hijackers but that two survived. "...the prisoners, Majdi Abu-Jumma and Subhi Abu-Jumma, were later killed 'as in a lynching' by five Shin Bet operatives who said they had acted under orders of their chief, Avraham Shalom." Sources also reported a ballet of cover-ups, destruction of secret data, and suborning of witnesses who testified to the investigators. The new Attorney-General, Mr. Harish, said that there would be no whitewash of the case. However, 12 lawyers and a member of the Likud bloc in Parliament demanded that the former Attorney-General be investigated for illegally revealing information obtained while he had been on the case. One Ehud Olmert, another Likud member, had demanded that Mr. Harish investigate his predecessor.

On June 25/86 the *Globe and Mail* reports that the head of Shin Bet had resigned on the condition that he would be given immunity from prosecution for his past deeds. "Outraged left-wing parliamentarians said the move was aimed at ensuring Government leaders would not be implicated in any investigation into the deaths of the Palestinians after the bus hijacking on April 13, 1984". President Chaim Hertzog granted the amnesty to Mr. Shalom and three of his aides who had been implicated in the cover-up. The *New York Times* of June 26/86 provides further particulars on the deal struck. Apparently at a lengthy late night meeting between the Prime Minister Shimon Perez, Foreign Minister Yitzak Shamir, Defense Minister Yitzak Rabin, Justice Minister Yitzak Modai, Shin Bet chief Avraham Shalom along with a battery of lawyers had come up with the deal allowing Mr. Shalom to resign without having to face any future charges. He was pardoned for any past crimes by President Chaim Hertzog. "Attorney-General Yosef Harish said there was now no point in pursuing a police investigation launched by his predecessor." The role of higher Israeli government figures in the cover up will apparently now remain in obscurity.

It is suggested that a full blown investigation into Shin Bet affairs might uncover many similar actions in the past.
"Jurists in the Justice Ministry were quoted on Israeli radio as expressing 'shock and outrage' at the immunity arrangement. They described the arrangement as without precedent or any basis in law. They pointed to the times last year when Mr. Zamir, the Attorney-General, was asked by right-wing politicians to grant amnesty to Jewish terrorist suspects while their trials were still in progress. Mr. Zamir ruled such a move illegal."

One Haim Zadok, a former Minister of Justice, said "If anyone there is guilty, he has received full cover. The message of all this to men in the security services is 'You can commit serious offenses. You are immune from justice. You will not be punished. You will receive amnesty, and in the worst case, you will resign. The message to the politicians is 'You can do whatever you want, and you will not bear responsibility.'"

One might note that the 'Government and Opposition', Labor and Likud, seem to have become inextricably intertwined.

On July 8/86 Avraham Shalom confessed to ordering the killings of the two Palestinian hijackers. This was a precondition for him to receive a Presidential pardon. Shalom's actions came in response to the Attorney-General Harish's determination to hand the matter over to police investigation should there be no public admission on the part of Shalom. Shalom said, in his admission, that he was acting under the orders of his superiors in government. This was thought to be a reference to Yitzak Shamir, who was then Prime minister.

"Shamir was quoted Tuesday as saying he told the head of Shin Bet to try to ensure that Palestinian hostage-takers were killed in the heat of combat, but denied he sanctioned the killing of guerillas who were captured alive." (Vancouver Sun, July 9/86)

The Globe and Mail of July 14/86 reports that Attorney-General Harish has reversed himself and is now threatening a police inquiry of the case, especially the cover-up involved. "Mr. Harish's demand for an inquiry by a team of judges and public figures was based on his belief that the Government could not explain to the court its failure to investigate the scandal, said one official who demanded anonymity." A number of appeals have been launched by Israelis against President Chaim Hertzog's blanket immunity from prosecution for leading members of the Shin Bet. These are being considered by the Israeli supreme court.

The New York Times of July 14/86 expands on the latest developments in the case. It appears that the former Attorney-General, Mr. Zamir, had already turned the case over to the police to investigate as a common crime. They had the file but had not yet acted on it. Mr. Harish, the new Attorney-General has come to the conclusion that regardless of the amnesties supplied by President Hertzog either a formal police investigation or a full scale official inquiry into the matter must be launched. "The Attorney-General's statement that he will order a police inquiry if the Cabinet does not set up a special commission leaves Mr. Shamir in a difficult position. In the past, he had threatened to break up the government over the issue and go to elections. The latest polls on the matter published Friday in the Yediot Aharonot newspaper, found that 57 percent of the public is against any further investigation while 41 percent favor some kind of inquiry... Both Mr. Shamir and President Hertzog have also justified the amnesties granted to the Shin Bet officials, and their appeals to close the case before the domestic intelligence agency...on the grounds that is what a majority of the public wants."

"Both men have bitterly attacked the Israeli press in recent days for being out of touch with the public mood. Mr. Shamir referred to Israeli journalists in this regard as 'barking dogs'."
A small blurb in the *Globe and Mail* of July 15/86 informs us that the Israeli cabinet had vetoed any consideration of public inquiry into events surrounding the killings and cover-up by the Shin Bet and instead had shifted investigations to a lower level, more controllable police investigation. *(Globe and Mail, Jul22/86)*

On August 7/86 the *New York Times* reports that the Israeli supreme court sitting in Jerusalem upheld the amnesty given to four Shin Bet agents involved in the beating death by President Chaim Hertzog. Apparently the same day *eight* additional Shin Bet members also implicated in the killing had applied for presidential pardons. An appeal of this ruling would have to have the permission of Chief Justice Meir Shangar, who had voted for the amnesty's legitimacy.

"The case appears to have stirred little interest among most Israelis. A poll last month by the newspaper *Hadashot* found that when asked who was 'guilty' in the Shin Bet affair, 34 percent named the Israeli press and 29 percent named former Attorney-General Yitzak Zamir, who uncovered the scandal."

"Officials said the Shin Bet chief, Mr. Shalom, who was at the scene, ordered the two handcuffed hijackers to be clubbed to death.

"After the Government ordered several commissions to investigate how the hijackers had died, Mr. Shalom was said to have tampered with evidence and coordinated testimony of Shin Bet officials to make it seem that he and his men had nothing to do with the two cousins' deaths and that General Mordecai [the paratroop general] was responsible." *(New York Times, August 7/86)*

On August 12/86 the *Globe and Mail* reports that seven more Shin Bet agents have applied for presidential pardons for their involvement in the beating death. That made more than a dozen Shin Bet agents who had applied for Presidential pardons in this case.

This particular case was unusual mainly because of the investigations it generated, the direct involvement by the Shin Bet chief himself and that of leading Israeli politicians who were entangled in the cover up. Some of course would see the case as another triumph of Israeli humanity and adherence to legal procedures - 'where else in the middle east could one see such a case played out in public?' The fact remains, however, that all the participants in this murder were allowed to go scot free, even after they and their crime had been clearly identified. Most Israelis agreed with that course of events.

Most of the pardoned Shin Bet officers went on to other careers in Israel. But its chief, Avraham Shalom, turned up in Central America a year or two later, acting as a semi-official arms merchant selling Israeli weapons to the death squad regimes in that part of the world.

After the above case was finished there was little oversight of Shin Bet operations, which apparently continued as before, with the Shin Bet murdering, beating and torturing people, and creating false evidence to present to the courts. Further investigations into Shin Bet's procedures were quickly papered over and the Shin Bet absolved of all the crimes it continued to commit.

While all this is going on, Israeli settlers and other civilians are murdering Palestinians as they saw fit. Lawyers representing two Israeli officers charged with helping Jewish terrorist groups plan attacks against Palestinians. Investigators "said yesterday the officers had advanced knowledge of a plot to assassinate an Arab mayor on the occupied West Bank."... The lawyers said that their clients had not reported the plot to kill El-Bireh Mayor Ibrahim Tawil because they felt solidarity with the people planning the attack. Tuesday, in the first trial in the affair, a Jewish settler pleaded guilty to transporting stolen mines used by the groups in attacks against Arabs." *(Globe and Mail, May 31/84)*
The *Vancouver Sun* runs a brief blurb that some 60 percent of Israelis supported the actions of a Jewish 'underground group' [i.e. terrorists] which had been convicted of deadly attacks on Arabs. About twenty-five Jews had been sentenced to various terms of imprisonment for their parts in these attacks between 1980 and 1984, including a plot to destroy the Dome of the Rock Mosque in Jerusalem. They are all settlers from the occupied West Bank. Some 60 percent of Israelis believe that they should be released from prison, forthwith.

**The Palestinian Intifada. The First Stages**

The Palestinian Intifada (uprising) arose from a gradually growing series of demonstrations, stone throwing, and Israeli repression in Palestine reaching back to the invasion of Lebanon five years earlier. Any chronological account of this struggle must necessarily be curtailed since a day by day record would be impossibly encyclopaedic.

As a general overview let it be noted here that it was carried out mainly by Palestinian youths and children. Although there must have been underground Palestinian organizations supporting these actions, the intifada appears to have been the largely spontaneous acts of those utterly frustrated by the Israeli occupation and its endless restrictions over their lives. It was a completely weaponless uprising - unless one considers throwing stones at Israeli tanks as using weapons.

The Israeli response was to meet the demonstrations with police and military force. They used tear gas, 'rubber' bullets (which soon demonstrated their ability to main and kill) and, increasingly, rifle and machine gun fire to counter the 'rioters'. In some clashes the Israelis utilized police armed with plastic batons, which broke the limbs and cracked the skulls of the demonstrating Palestinian youths. For three years Palestinian hospitals and doctors in the West Bank and Gaza were overwhelmed by the streams of those seriously injured by the Israelis. What the figures are for those permanently injured is anyone's guess.

The heroism of those young demonstrators is beyond anything that one can reasonably expect from human beings. What sustained their actions over years is beyond calculating - it was certainly nothing which the Palestine Liberation Organization had counted on, although they supported the Intifada after it had begun. Maybe it was the cumulation of more than twenty years of Israeli occupation - the seizures of Palestinian farmland, the disposessions, the endless papers and searches and identity checks, the contempt and humiliations that they had seen their elders having to endure. If one were on the receiving end it would be very difficult not to hate the Israelis for imposing all this.

Israeli moralists and their supporters abroad continued expatiating on the wondrous "purity of Israeli arms" because they were not utilized to commit mass murder of the Palestinians. These same moralists also venomize about the inhumanity and callousness demonstrated by Palestinian elders who sent their children to be clubbed and shot by the Israelis. The arrogance of this switch of victims into 'wrong doers' should require no comment.

Such moralists also began peddling their 'deep concern' about the stresses borne by Israeli soldiers (young recruits barely older than the demonstrators) who were forced to face and put down the Palestinian demonstrations. At the same time Israeli settlers in West Bank communities, also armed to the teeth, went rampaging through Palestinian villages and sniping at stray Palestinians they found in the countryside.
Israeli repression continued to mount. Israeli troops began raiding Palestinian homes in regions affected by the Intifada. These soldiers broke into homes, shouting and with guns drawn, to drag out and beat and arrest men, women and children. Not a few Palestinians were murdered in this process, especially if they offered any resistance whatsoever. The Israeli jails and prison camps, massively expanded, were soon filled to overflowing. Internment camps were established in the southern desert regions of Israel. At the end of the first Intifada it was noted that some 60,000 Palestinian prisoners had been processed through the system. This from a population of little more than 2 million Palestinians. It was clearly the open repression of an entire people.

It was only after the suppression of the Intifada, despite all its heroism and all its dead and crippled and jailed victims, that some Palestinians turned to suicide bombings. A tactic which initially stymied the Israelis since they couldn't punish the perpetrators. These suicide bombings were explained away as the acts of religious fanatics, the acts of fanatic anti-Semites. By the time of Ariel Sharon's rise to the Prime Ministership of Israel in 2001, the majority of Israelis, not just the Jewish 'settlers' of the West Bank, wanted to hear and know nothing about the Palestinians. They just wanted them suppressed or expelled from Greater Israel. That is the phase we are in today.

None of this made supporters of Israel abroad significantly reconsider what it was they were supporting. Indeed, the American religious right moved to back Israel in all and everything it did and to revile whoever they did it to.

**The Year 1987 in Palestine. The Intifada Begins**

December 9/87 is the date which, in retrospect, is given for the beginning of the Intifada. There is nothing particularly memorable about that day, other than a Palestinian demonstration against the deaths of three Palestinians killed in a traffic accident by an Israeli truck in Gaza. Two demonstrators were killed and 14 wounded in that clash. (Globe and Mail, December 10/87) It is a purely formal date, the struggle had been building ever since the Israeli invasion of Lebanon.

On January 7/87 the New York Times reports an interview with one Eliya Khoury, the Anglican bishop of Christian Arabs in Jordan, a total of about 200,000 people. He notes that Christian Arabs have suffered as much in Palestine as have Moslems and have played as great a role in the Palestine Liberation Organization. He fears that the political deadlock and the repression of Palestinians in Israel will lead to increasing extremism among Moslems in Jordan and elsewhere, a factor to which the church has no answer. His voice is a reminder that some 10% of the Palestinian population is Christian, not that it matters one way of another.

In the same issue of the New York Times Thomas Friedman presents a long, sometimes thought provoking, article dealing with the bitterness now ingrained in most Palestinian youths who have grown up under Israeli occupation. He says that they know that the Israelis hate them and that they hate the Israelis in turn. Confrontations of stone-throwing Palestinian youths and Israeli troops are a more than weekly occurrence by now. The PLO has gained the overwhelming support of the Palestinian people and their youth are fired by an anger and desperation born of hopelessness, it would appear. (New York Times, January 12/87)

The New York Times of February 26/87 reports the Israeli arrest of an American history professor teaching at the Palestinian Bir Zeit University. He claimed that he was apolitical but that he protested against the closing of that university and the killings of 2 unarmed students and the wounding of 10 others
by Israeli troops in a protest demonstration on the previous December. Professor Heathcock said, "The point of my arrest later, I think, was to tell foreigners that the preference was they not be in the occupied territories and that if they are, they not look and not tell [what they see]."

"Israeli authorities say Bir Zeit and other campuses attended by Palestinians should be viewed as the main outlets, along with refugee camps, of anti-[Israeli] Government violence and tension orchestrated by the PLO. 'The universities are central to PLO activities' said Capt. Elice Shazar of the Israeli Civilian Administration in the West Bank."

Professor Heathcock said he was merely a witness to a women’s demonstration at Bir Zeit university and that his arrest was a warning to all foreigners who conceivably might take an active role in the defense of human rights.

The Vancouver Sun of March 23/87 reports that Israeli planes have again struck 'guerrilla bases' in Lebanon. This is the second massive attack in four days. On closer inspection these 'guerrilla bases' turn out to be nothing but Palestinian refugee camps in the country. It appears that the Israeli plan is to blast all these camps into rubble. They are proceeding in doing this.

On March 26/87 the Globe and Mail reports that Israeli president Chaim Herzog has markedly reduced the prison sentences of three Jews previously sentenced to life imprisonment for a racist attack on students at Hebron university which left three dead. A presidential spokesman called the reduction of sentences 'routine'.

The New York Times of April 13/87 reports that the Israeli army has bulldozed orange groves near the village of Qalqilya in the occupied West Bank because an Israeli settler had been killed in a fire bomb attack on her car. At the same time dozens of Israeli settlers from the region rampaged through the village, 17 miles northwest of Tel Aviv, smashing windows, flourishing guns and setting fire to Palestinian fields and vehicles. At this point about 60,000 Jewish settlers live in the West Bank beside more than 800,000 Palestinians. Likud members of Parliament excoriated Shimon Peres' government for holding peace talks with the Palestinians, claiming that increasing terrorist attacks were the only outcome of such discussions.

The Globe and Mail of April 14/87 notes that the Israelis have shot and killed another university student and arrested dozens of activists at Beir Zeit University. "The army said soldiers opened fire with live ammunition only when their 'lives were endangered' by rock throwing demonstrators. The New York Times of the same day adds that the Israeli also rounded up nine alleged 'top PLO people' in the West Bank, including the editor of a major Palestinian newspaper and a number of other intellectuals. They are to be held under 'administrative detention', a process which Israel inherited from the British mandate and use it to imprison individuals who have broken no specific law.

On May 10/87 the Vancouver Sun reports Israel's 13th air raid on Lebanon during that year, in which 14 people were killed and some 20 wounded. It was an attack on Palestinian camps near Sidon, Lebanon.

The May 26/87 issue of the New York Times carries a report that the Israeli Supreme Court has ruled that a loyal Moslem officer of the Israeli Defence force had been framed on trumped up evidence and sentenced to 18 years imprisonment by the Shin Bet. It held that the officer had been interrogated and confessed under conditions which approached torture by the Shin Bet. He had been convicted of passing information to the Syrians in 1980. This, following the recent revelations about the Shin Bet's murder of two Palestinian hijack prisoners,
has placed that agency under a dark cloud. The Israeli newspaper *Yediot Aharonot* wrote, "It shows that the fabrication of evidence uncovered last year ...was not an isolated incident but part of a system used by Shin Bet interrogators and their superiors."

More 'Palestinian rioters', men and boys, are shot and killed throughout the West Bank and Gaza, during April and May of 1987. They are invariably described as being part of mobs 'throwing stones' at the Israeli army.

On June 1/1987 the issue of *Maclean's* magazine focuses on "Israel's Angry Peace" or "Children of the Occupation 20 years after the Six Day War." It says, in effect, that since the Six Day war Israel had witnessed a sharp increase in Jewish extremism, especially among those who were moving into the West Bank and particularly among the Gush Emunim (Block of the Faithful), who saw the victories of that war as the operation of divine will to restore Jews to the exclusive ownership of the original Israel. Although less mystical than the Jewish fundamentalists, Menachem Begin and his Likud Bloc also considered the West Bank as recovered Jewish land and had won the 1977 election partly on the promise to never relinquish control over it. By 1986 there were 46,000 Jews living in separate settlements among 800,000+ Palestinians in the West Bank. In the following 20 years this number will increase geometrically.

"As the Israeli bulldozers advanced, the Palestinians reacted - increasingly violently against what they viewed as a creeping annexation. In response, the Israeli military occupation became increasingly heavy handed, although not heavy-handed enough for some extremist [Jewish] settlers who frequently took the law into their own hands... As regard for the Israelis waned, sympathy for the Palestinians grew... The David of the 1960s was being cast as the Goliath of the 1980s. And although successive Israeli governments sought to portray the PLO as nothing but a terrorist organization, the 1.3 million people of the West Bank and Gaza - and three million Palestinians living abroad - persisted in regarding the PLO and its leader, Yasser Arafat, as heroes." (*Maclean's*, June 11/87: 23)

Other articles in this issue of *Maclean's* report the bitter hatred which has grown up between Jews and Palestinians in the occupied territories, a hatred which has deepened over time and which is stronger among youth than among their elders. It is a hatred based upon the increasing expropriation by the Israelis, upon the endless series of permits and papers one required to live in their former homeland, upon the endless searches, insults and indignities which Palestinians old and young are forced to bear. Among the Israeli settlers, it is the hatred based upon - to speak clearly - a racism which despises all those it has forced to live in a degraded position. Mixed with a rabid religious nationalism.

"...the number of acts defined by the Israeli authorities as 'violations of law and order' - including illegal demonstrations - has risen to a current level of more than 3,000 a year on the West Bank from about 400 to 500 a year in the late 1970s." Roughly nine a day.

There is absolutely no mixing of Jews and Palestinians in the occupied territories and the young on both sides clearly hate each other. Says Hanna Siniora, the editor of the daily *Al Fajr* (The Dawn), "The young people don't fear the Israelis the way their parents do... They lived with Israel, and they know its limitations and they aren't impressed by the superpower image of Israel. And one result is that they are more uncompromising, more disposed to a military response.'* (*Maclean's*, June 1/87: 27)

The *Maclean's* articles briefly outline the lives of some of these young Palestinians, including that of a 24 year old man who had been arrested for anti-
Israeli activities some five times before he was fifteen years old. Each time he was taken off to prison, interrogated, sometimes beaten, and then released after a couple of weeks. He returned to his impoverished existence in one of the Palestinian refugee camps in the West Bank. When he was fifteen he was arrested again for the crime of not informing Israeli authorities about alleged terrorist activities of others, for which he was sentenced to six years in an Israeli prison. He had been released shortly before the interview.

Of the Israeli settlers in the West Bank, especially the young, the author finds them slipping ever more to the right. "In recent years Israeli youths have increasingly sought answers on the political right. Many also hold decidedly undemocratic views, particularly on the treatment of Arabs. A 1984 poll of 15 to 18 year-olds found that 60 percent of respondents thought that Arabs living in Israel should not have full civil liberties. A 1986 survey of high school students indicated that 42 per cent of those polled favoured expelling Arabs from Israel... A few spout blatantly racist stereotypes, 'The Arabs I see are dirty' said one 14 year-old student at a Jerusalem religious school. 'They smell. And they're wild!'"

According to some more liberal Jewish American observers, this is the kind of attitude bred by living in a state of constant alarms and war for more than twenty years. That does not seem exactly correct to me. It is rather the sort of attitude developed by being placed in an all-pervasively superior position, through conquest, over another people.

The author of the Israeli side of the coverage holds that all this racism would gradually disappear, and the now growing religious extremism might possibly wane, if only Israeli would be left to live in peace with its neighbors. 'Living in peace' here means allowing it to expropriate most of the lands still held by Palestinians and having them accept a role of racial inferiors.

On June 5/87 the Vancouver Sun notes that a Palestinian youth had been shot and killed by Israeli troops in the town of Nablus on the 20th anniversary of the Israeli occupation. A ten-year old had also been wounded by Israeli gunfire. They had been part of a group 'throwing stones at the soldiers'.

The New York Times of June 10/87 carries a piece about Roger Heathcock, the American professor of history teaching at Bir Zeit University. He has been convicted by an Israeli military court for 'disturbing the peace' and being present at a Palestinian demonstration. He had originally been charged with leading protesting Palestinian women in a demonstration against the occupation. On conviction he was put on probation for three years and fined about a thousand dollars. However, since his work permit in the occupied territories will soon expire, it seemed likely that it would not be renewed and he will be expelled from Palestine.

The New York Times of June 12/87 carries a letter-to-the-editor from one Rabbi Isidoro Aizenberg of Queens, NYC. Indignantly but confidently he holds that Palestine has always been a part of Israel, "there have always been at least some Jews there awaiting the return of a Jewish state. All others who have had authority over the region during the previous 2,000 years have all come and gone. If the Palestinians wish to come to some sort of an arrangement with the Israelis they must recognize, first and foremost, that Israel is Jewish land." And Peru belongs to the Incas and their descendants.

The Globe and Mail of June 13/87 carries an article on the generalized repression of Palestinians in their homeland and the systematic torture committed by the Israeli secret service. It begins with the tale of one Amzi Jaber, a prominent businessman in the Palestinian town of Ramallah, whose son had been accused
(but never tried) on charges of terrorism. Mr. Jaber's home was invaded by Israeli soldiers, the inhabitants were ushered out, and the home demolished by explosives. This is a procedure increasingly used by the Israelis, who punish relatives of alleged terrorists although they themselves have committed no crime.

As for the Shin Bet, "Prisoners report techniques such as prolonged beating, hot and cold showers, being left hooded and handcuffed for long periods of time, sleep deprivation, threats and other forms of intimidation' says the Ramallah-based Law in the Service of Man, a civil rights organization affiliated with the International Commission of Jurists." "Israeli legal experts have expressed concerns that the revelations about the security service reflect a growing contempt for the rule of law in a country that has grown accustomed to the very different standards of justice being meted out to the 1.3 million Palestinians living under occupation."

These cases, however, do not concern a large proportion of the Israeli population. It is a land which, after all, was born out of violence and disregard for the law.

The Globe and Mail reported on July 8/87 that at least five Shia guerrillas were killed in southern Lebanon in a 16 hour gun battle between them and Israeli and its puppet forces in the region. It was the most sustained resistance the Israelis have encountered to date.

The Globe and Mail of July 20/87 reports on a study made by a group headed by an Episcopalian bishop in the West Bank, one Riah Abu El-Assai. It found that Palestinian teenagers arrested by the Israelis are regularly beaten and subjected to physical pressure under interrogation. "Children, according to the report, 'are frequently hooded, made to stand outside with their hands raised for several days, deprived of sleep, forced to take cold showers, beaten on the soles of their feet or thrown on the ground and kicked'."

The Israelis, somewhat self-contradictorily, deny that any such torture occurs in military prisons and that they have already disciplined individual members of the security forces for such acts of violence.

On August 6/87 the Globe and Mail reports the trial of Hanna Sinora, the editor of the Palestinian daily Al Fajr, for printing a photo of Yasser Arafat and thereby identifying with the Palestinian Liberation Organization. At present, it is illegal for anyone to either identify with that organization, to distribute any of its literature, to show the colors of the Palestinian flag, or in anyway to suggest that the PLO is the representative of the Palestinian people. "Charges against the editor involve a placard and portrait of PLO chairman Yasser Arafat that Mr. Sinora allegedly placed on a wall at the newspaper's offices, Mr. Bar-Lev [the Israeli Police Minister] said. He could be sentenced to a maximum three years in jail if convicted." I don't believe this requires any comment.

The New York Times of August 14/87 reports that Israeli police tear gassed and clubbed a group demonstrating against Israeli occupation of Gaza and the West Bank in front of the US consulate in East Jerusalem. Most of those attacked apparently were Americans and Belgians. Two of the injured are expected to be charged with resisting arrest while the others are guilty of holding a demonstration without a proper permit.

The Globe and Mail of August 31/87 reports that Palestinian guerillas have shot and killed the top Israeli police officer in the Gaza strip as he was riding through the streets. It is absolutely illegitimate to consider such acts as comparable to the assassinations of Nazi officers by resistance groups in regions of occupied Europe during world war 2.
As an example of Chutzpah, other Israeli agencies are still tracking down and ferreting out alleged anti-Semitic war criminals of 40 years previously while their own repression is reaching full force.

The *New York Times* of September 9/87 reports that a senior Israeli army officer, one Major-General Moshe Bar-Kochba, was severely reprimanded by the Israeli Chief of staff, for publicly criticizing the Israeli army for the deaths of at least 40 civilians when that army attacked refugee camps around Sidon. "An attack on women and children does not enhance our honor" he told the press. He was told to keep any such ideas to himself or broach them only among senior officers of the Israeli army."

The *Globe and Mail* of October 17/87 asks itself the question - why the violence has flared up in the occupied territories now? Palestinians answer this question by simply pointing to twenty years of life under an Israeli occupation. "Since October 1 eight Palestinians and one Israeli have been killed in the unrest that has swept the territories, and there have been daily incidents of stonings, fire-bombings and anti-Israeli rallies in a number of towns and refugee camps. The climax of the violence occurred on Monday, when a 35 year old [Palestinian] mother was shot through the heart by troops during a demonstration she had nothing to do with in Ramallah, 15 kilometers north of Jerusalem."

According to Defense Minister Yitzak Rabin, the demonstrations are part of an orchestrated attempt by external forces to create an atmosphere of unrest to accompany the efforts of the US special envoy to find a peace agreement between the two sides. It's all due to foreign PLO agitation.

The *New York Times* of November 2/87 notes that a growing debate has arisen in Israel whether convictions involving investigations by the Shin Bet are to be relied upon. Growing evidence indicates that that organization has obtained false confessions by torture, has manufactured evidence against those it had charged, has lied about what it was doing to judges and those intended to oversee their activities. No one could be sure how many innocent people, including Israelis, it had convicted, how many people it had tortured and how many it had killed over the preceding years. The reassessment began with the report of a Landau commission inquiry into the Shin Bet which noted that it "had routinely committed perjury to convict terrorist suspects."

"The report said limited use of physical force against terrorism suspects who may be withholding information was unavoidable and justified. It said agents who were singled out in two scandals that rocked Shin Bet recently had been acting according to established norms and it recommended that they not be punished."

The mass circulation newspaper *Yediot Aharonoth* hailed the report as a courageous admission that physical torture may be justified in cases involving terrorist suspects. Israeli democracy in action.

Lawyers representing Palestinians jailed for involvement in anti-Israel activities say they will consider demanding a retrial of their clients on the current evidence about Shin Bet's use of torture to obtain confessions. *At least 3-4,000 Palestinians have been convicted of crimes to which they confessed during Shin Bet interrogation since 1972.*

The noted Israeli civil rights lawyer Felicia Langer stated that she was skeptical about whether any past convictions would be repealed due to the evidence now arising about Shin Bet perjury and torture. There is no court of appeals in the occupied territories and applications for retrial must be filed through the local military commander.
The Globe and Mail of November 2/87 adds that "Palestinian prisoners, 90 percent of whom are convicted on the basis of confession, have long alleged they were beaten, kicked, humiliated, psychologically harassed and subjected to sensory deprivation during interrogations." It also notes that civil rights activist Felicia Langer asked why no one in the Israeli Secret Service had been punished for the crimes they have committed?"

The Globe and Mail of November 9/87 reports that the Israeli cabinet have decided that agents of Shin Bet will not be prosecuted for lying to the court about how they 'extracted prisoners' confessions.' The 88 page report of the Landau commission "severely chastised the Shin Bet for more than 18 years of systematic perjury and demanded a broad house cleaning of the agency. However, Chief Justice Landau recommended against prosecuting any shin Bet personnel because legal actions against them might hamper the agency's work! It also cleared the Israeli political leadership of any charges that they had known of such crimes.

On November 11/87 the Globe and Mail reports that Israelis are debating the use of long range snipers rifles by Israeli forces engaged in the suppression of Palestinian demonstrators. One Major-General Amram Mitzna, the army commander in the West Bank, defended the use of the long range Beretta rifle because he said his men could target leaders and other specific targets to suppress rioters. The Geneva-based International Commission of Jurists noted the Palestinian death toll over the preceding 10 months and said "It is hard to escape the conclusion that these figures show a callousness toward the lives of the population of the occupied territories... It is inconceivable that similar methods would have been used toward Jewish people."

On the same day an 18 year old Palestinian woman was shot dead by Israeli settlers during a pro-PLO demonstration in the Gaza strip.

On November 12/87 the New York Times reports another investigation of the Shin Bet over the death of a Palestinian prisoner in their custody. It is believed that 23 year old Salam Hamdan may have been tortured to death. Initially the International Red Cross had informed his family that he had died of a heart attack, which was later changed by military authorities claiming he died of snake bite and lastly to the effects of a scorpion sting. He had been a student of accounting and all these alleged causes of death had happened while he was in an Israeli jail.

A few paragraph item in the back pages of the same issue of the New York Times reports that two Palestinian school girls had been shot by an Israeli settler in Gaza. One was in critical condition while the other was in stable condition. They were both 14 years old. This follows the death of a 17 year old high school girl under similar circumstances in another district of the Gaza strip a few days previously. The Israelis said they had shot them because they feared for their lives. All West Bank settlers are permitted to own and use arms.

It should be underlined that only a few of the newspapers' accounts of Palestinians killed by the Israeli army and police are mentioned here.

The Globe and Mail of December 12/87 carries an account titled "Border police killings kindle unrest among bitter Palestinian refugees." It deals with the outbreak of demonstrations at Balata refugee camp, a 30,000 member settlement near Nablus earlier in the month. According to one Palestinian account, when worshipers left their mosque on Friday morning they were confronted by a line of Israeli border police (the Israeli version of the Guardia Civil). They began protesting their presence. "There was one girl who just stood there and shouted at the soldiers 'Kill me' and they did." The Israeli version is that their police were
attacked by a rain of bricks and stones and responded by firing in the air and only then at the protestors themselves. The toll was four Palestinian killed, including a 12 year old boy, and scores wounded. The entire Batala camp was immediately put under curfew.

Both the *New York Times* and the *Globe and Mail* of December 15/87 report a fresh outbreak of confrontations between Palestinians and the Israeli army in Gaza. Israeli administrators are beginning to talk of 'outright civil rebellion'. The *New York Times* reports that approximately 10 people have been killed in the previous five days of confrontations with Israeli army and police. A *Jerusalem Post* reporter said that there had been earlier outbreaks of rioting but that now "...it lasts longer, more people are involved, and they are not afraid to confront the army. It's like a fire, it catches and spreads. They're in despair. I'm talking about the youth, they have nothing to lose."

Said a UN relief official in Gaza. "'Increasingly the younger kids are no longer afraid,' he added. 'They are willing to stand in front of the Border Police and bare their chests. And when they throw a stone they hit what they're aiming at. Now the Israelis are shooting first'."

The *New York Times* of December 16/87 reports continuing and growing demonstrations against Israeli occupation in Gaza in which 4 to 6 Palestinians were killed by gunfire. "The hospitals in the area were treating nothing but gun shot wounds and ignoring lesser injuries while young Palestinian women in some sections of Gaza were breaking up concrete rubble into throwable sized pieces. At one point a young Palestinian demonstrator shouted 'Kill us all... Come and kill us all or get out.' The Israeli army responded with short bursts of fire from automatic rifles. The fighting raged throughout the day, shifting up and down the 30-mile long strip of territory which is Gaza."

"A Palestinian teenager was tied to the hood of an army jeep, apparently as a shield against rock throwing, and driven through the Palestinian district, according to Mr. Mills [the UN aid director in the region] and other United Nations officials. The officials said the incident had been witnessed by two of their foreign staff members."

Shops in the Gaza area remained closed and shuttered and most of the 45,000 Palestinians employed, mainly in menial jobs in Israel, have not reported for work. A team of western journalists who had been filming events was set upon by the Palestinians, who believed they were filming to make identification possible by the Mossad. The group had to be rescued by doctors from a near-by hospital.

The following day, December 17, the *New York Times* reports continuing demonstrations and rocks thrown at the Israelis in the Gaza strip. A number of young men were wounded by gunfire and at least one 17 year old woman was killed by being shot in the head while attending the funeral services of another Palestinian youth killed earlier. The Israeli army in the region has been reinforced by troops brought in from Israel itself.

"'This is our struggle', said an old man, his voice rising as he thumped his cane for emphasis. We must fight the Jews to get our green homeland back'."

The same issue of the *New York Times* reports that Ariel Sharon has purchased an apartment in the old Moslem quarter of Jerusalem, presumably as a statement of Israeli control over and ownership of that locale. He moved in on the eve of Hanukkah, guarded by hundreds of soldiers who cordoned off the street to his apartment. "Among Mr. Sharon's neighbors are several Yeshiva students. 'Soon', one of them said, 'the whole road will be lined with candelabra.' The Moslem population in the area totally rejected Sharon.
The same December 17/87 issue of the *New York Times* contains a commentary by Anthony Lewis entitled 'The Worst Option'. It begins with a reporter questioning Defense Minister Yitzak Rabin about whether Israel has now become like South Africa, with its own apartheid system. Rabin angrily replies that there is no comparison because there are still more Jews than 'Arabs' in the combined regions of Israel and the occupied territories. Lewis reviews the various policies which Israelis have had toward the Palestinians in the past and notes that they have all been overtaken by the current policy of expanding Jewish settlement and Palestinian expropriation in the West Bank, thereby inextricably linking that region to Israel. Rabin, allegedly a Labor representative, is even more of a hard-line Jewish expansionist than were some of his predecessors.

Said one of his fellow cabinet ministers, Ezer Weizman, about the Palestinian uprising. "Who ever thinks this is a passing thing is making a very serious mistake... It is a result of the failure to find a political solution, and the lack of a desire to look for one."

The *Globe and Mail* of December 18/87 reports that confrontations have tapered off in Gaza today after some ten days which has left some 14 Palestinian dead and hundreds wounded. Prime Minister Yitzak Shamir said on Israeli radio "I don't think any Jew is responsible for the disturbances. Arabs and only Arabs are to be blamed for this unrest."

Elite Israeli soldiers patrolled the streets of Gaza today, ordering Palestinian shop owners to open their stores, while in the West Bank, a group of left-wing Israelis entered the Batala refugee camp, which was under curfew, to attend a funeral of a local youth killed by the Israeli army.

A related article in the same issue of the *Globe and Mail* reports that television coverage of a man dressed in civilian cloths seen firing an Uzi submachine gun at the backs of retreating Palestinians in Gaza was really an agent of the Shin Bet. The general Israeli line has been to claim that their forces only fire in self defense. Shin Bet officials are furious at the exposure of one of their agents engaging in shooting fleeing youths.

Hugh Schofield, the *Globe and Mail* reporter in Israel, writes that 3 more Palestinians were slain by Israelis in Gaza the previous day. He notes that a 30 man team of the Israeli Border Police had raided a hospital compound in Gaza, fired into the air, and dragged away some 30 people for 'questioning', including a number of patients under treatment. "It's absolutely inhuman' one doctor told reporters. 'I don't care if they beat me, but if they prevent me from treating people, this is inhuman.'" (*Globe and Mail*, December 19/87)

In another article in the same *Globe and Mail*, Schofield notes that the strongest support for the Intifada comes from the youth of the impoverished refugee camps in the region, comprised of Palestinians who had fled from Israeli terror during its war of independence 40 years earlier. Added to that are the indignities imposed by 20 years of Israeli occupation. According to one Palestinian observer on the scene, whatever organization youths have in the Gaza strip they are unrelated to either the PLO or to developments in Iran, but are purely local. He suggests that will not make them any easier to crush.

The *Globe and Mail* of December 21/87 reports seven more Palestinians wounded in Gaza. The left-wing Israeli newspaper *Al Hamishmar* quoted official sources in saying that at least 25 Palestinians had been killed in the previous 12 days of violence while the main stream *Haaretz* newspaper holds that the figure is only 20 killed - so far.
A number of Islamic and other colleges in the West Bank, as well as entire refugee camps and towns, have been closed and put under curfew by Israeli authorities. The Israeli cabinet has voted its unanimous support of the Israeli army and police forces engaged in the suppression.

On December 22/87 the Globe and Mail reports that Israeli troops have killed an additional three Palestinian protesters in the West Bank. The demonstrations are spreading and a general strike has been observed by most shops and workers in the Palestinian areas. For the first time, this strike has been widely honored by the 700,000 Palestinians living within the border of the Israeli state. This has effected those Israeli firms which employed Palestinian workers.

The front page headline of the December 23 Globe and Mail reads 'Israel sends extra troops to quell rioting'. It describes just that, an increased use of violence against Palestinian demonstrators and settlements throughout Gaza and the West Bank. The Israeli troops seem to be rather trigger happy and incidents of bystanders and people not at all involved in the demonstrations being shot begin to pile up. "In other incidents, hospital officials said a 10 year old girl was shot in the lung as she collected laundry on the roof of a home in the West Bank village of Yatta near Hebron." There were other similar cases.

At the Jabaliya camps on the outskirts of the city of Gaza, Palestinians shouted slogans and threw rocks at a military post. The Israelis responding by opening fire. "An Israeli official said that 'the soldiers lives were in danger and they had no choice but to fire'." A case of verbal terrorism?

In Canada, Conservative Prime Minister Brian Mulroney held that he saw no examples of violation of human rights in Israel's occupied territories and chided senior staff of the Department of Foreign Affairs for saying that there were. (Globe and Mail, December 23/87)

Also on December 23/87 the New York Times reports that the Likud and Labour factions in Israel are circling the wagons in defense of Israel against a UN resolution calling on Israel to cease its oppressive measures in the occupied territories. A world wide sentiment against Israeli actions has developed and the US government had decided not to use its UN veto to block such a resolution.

On December 24/87 the Globe and Mail reports that Israeli troops have been ordered to fire on any seeming leaders of the Palestinian Intifada. The one doing the ordering was Yitzak Rabin, the 'Labour' Minister of Defence. This comes as stone throwing and rioting has reached a level never seen before in the occupied territories. Many districts have already been placed under curfew and collective punishments are being handed out.

For Christmas Day, 1987, the New York Times carries a commentary by A.M. Rosenthal. Rosenthal has by now sunk to the lowest dregs of Jewish reaction and is akin to Meir Kahane of the Jewish Defense League. He begins by saying that Israel can neither leave the occupied territories nor continue to treat the Palestinians as second class non-citizens. Either will endanger the safety of Israel. But, he says, there is already a Palestinian state, which is called Jordan. The solution to the Palestinian problem in Greater Israel is to uproot and transfer all Palestinians in Israel-controlled territories to Jordan. Why some two million Palestinians should be removed to make way for some 50,000 or so Israeli settlers is not discussed. Wouldn't it be simpler and more just to simply remove the Jewish settlers?

The Globe and Mail of December 26/87 reports that some 800 Palestinians have been arrested by the Israeli army in Gaza and the West Bank during the previous day. Some were heavily armed, with sling shots. The New York Times of
the same day puts the arrest figure at 1,000. It notes that the army is arresting suspects in their own homes from information taken from videotapes made at the scene of protests. Yitzak Rabin accuses a handful of PLO leaders as those responsible for the 'riots', but the massive and growing participation in them make it clear that the Palestinians have now reached the limits of what they will accept from the occupiers.

The Vancouver Sun of December 28/87 notes that Israeli and Palestinian defence lawyers have begun boycotting the military courts before which their Palestinian clients are to be tried because they cannot get a fair trial there. They also hold that the prisoners are being mistreated and beaten while in Israeli custody. The sentences being handed out en masse by the military judges range from a few months to a two year sentence for an individual convicted of throwing a stone which injured an Israeli driver. "Brig. General Amnon Strashnov, the chief military prosecutor, said courtroom rights of the defendants were being preserved. He said Israel wants to give them speedy trials to deter future rioting."

The New York Times of December 29/87 carries an article entitled "Israeli Officials Object to US News Coverage of Riots". It notes that Israelis are concerned about how foreign countries view them and see themselves as a particularly moral nation. They are also concerned about the dependence of that state on financial contributions from the US government and wealthy Jews around the world. Israeli leaders have been especially stung by the comparison of Israel with apartheid South Africa.

Moshe Arens, the then Ambassador to the US, said "The American public cannot grasp what is going on here from what it sees on television... The television cameras naturally seek the most dramatic scenes and not pictures of the Foreign Ministry', Mr. Arens said. 'One cannot see on television that the soldiers would be in great danger if they did not defend themselves.' He furthermore asserted that there was "a perverse pleasure that Jews are having such troubles, that they are cast in the role of oppressors." Another Israeli Foreign Ministry official said, "By and large Israel was wronged by the exaggeration. There was a constant stress on unarmed people being shot by armed soldiers... These are people not trained for police activities, they are soldiers. They felt obviously threatened with stones and bottles. By and large the press and the media was with the people who instigated the thing."

The December 29/87 issue of the Globe and Mail reports that Israel has been deporting people from the West Bank and Gaza who it believes have instigated the Palestinian Intifada. The Israeli authorities are outraged that their legal system has prevented them from deporting an additional 50 persons they had earmarked. Yitzak Rabin, the 'Labor' Minister of Defence, favours deportation as a way to curb the riots. But neither Jordan nor Egypt will now accept expelled Palestinians.

By now some 2,500 Palestinians have been arrested. "Meanwhile, dozens of Palestinian teenagers were bused, handcuffed and blindfolded, to makeshift courtrooms in the occupied territories yesterday to appear before military judges on rioting charges. Those who plead guilty to stone-thrown generally receive prison sentences of about three months."

These courts have a remarkable conviction rate, with the vast majority of those dragged in being convicted of something or another. Most Palestinian lawyers have boycotted these kangaroo courts, saying that they in no way offered even the semblance of fair trials.
**The Intifada - Year 2, 1988**

During 1988 and 1989 the Palestinian rising and its suppression by Israel contains so many items that it is impossible to note them all within a book of this size. One can only provide an impressionistic overview of events which I hope will capture the ongoing developments. In brief, the conflict reached new heights with Israel applying its military force, mass jailings, raids on Palestinian homes and systematic beatings. Private killings and terror were also unleashed by the rightist Jewish settlers of the West Bank. Palestinians, especially their youth, responded with a courage which was quite incredible. This did not gain even a grudging respect from the Israelis, citizens or soldiers. The suicide bombings were still to come, as were the use of Israeli tanks in the Palestinian districts of the occupied West Bank and Gaza. The Palestine Liberation Organization remained hated by the Israelis, as were other organizations supported by the overwhelming majority of Palestinians.

The photographers of this conflict captured a mass of moving and revealing images, some of which made it into western newspapers. It would be valuable if someone were to set about collecting copies of these photographs for a future generation to consider. Unfortunately none of them can be used here. Their absence leaves a gap.

The *Globe and Mail* of January 2/88 reports that Yitzak Shamir addressed something called the 'Israel-American Chamber of Commerce' in Tel Aviv claiming that only a handful of Palestinians are involved in riots, whom his government intends to seize and deport to some foreign country. He denounces US pressures against Palestinian deportations, saying it is an 'illegitimate pressure' which Israel has learned to discount. He also says "It is impossible from a distance to tell someone in this land how to defend himself against anarchy, riots and attacks against the state, its citizens, its peace and security." This is the line which Israel takes throughout the intifada. Crush the rioting wogs.

At the time Shamir spoke, three refugee camps in the West Bank, with a population of 75-90,000 people, have been placed under curfew with no one permitted to enter or leave. In Arab East Jerusalem about 850 Israeli police are stationed to keep order on Fatah Day. Allegedly, some 25 Palestinians have been killed so far, about 200 wounded and some 1,200 arrested and threatened with deportation.

A reporter in one of the refugee camps notes the following comment: "For us the uprising is not a one-time event... As long as there is an occupation, there will be an uprising. The fact that Israel has turned our camp into an army depot is a source of pride to us.' Even as Israeli army presence clamps a lid on the disturbances, there is a sense in the West Bank and Gaza that the struggle between occupiers and occupied has entered the very fabric of daily life." (*Globe and Mail*, January 2/88)

The *Globe and Mail* of January 4/88 notes that nine Palestinians activists have been ordered deported from the West Bank where they were born, by Israel. These individuals are charged with being leaders of the Fata youth wing and presumably are 'intellectual-terrorists' (i.e anyone opposing Israeli occupation).

The same issue of the *Globe and Mail* reports that a 25 year-old Palestinian woman was shot and killed while hanging out laundry by an Israeli soldier chasing and shooting at a 'rioter'. Also, the war in Lebanon continues, as underlined by the fact that 21 people have been killed in a midnight air raid against three suspected Lebanese guerilla strongholds. Six of those killed are suspected guerrillas while the others are what is known as 'collateral damage'.
The Israeli cabinet unanimously approved a visit to apartheid South Africa by a sitting minister, despite the fact that the US Congress had threatened to reduce aid to any country which failed to honor a 1977 UN embargo of South Africa.

The *New York Times* of January 6/88 reports that Israeli troops have shot and killed another Palestinian 'rioter' in Gaza. Thomas Friedman notes that while Israeli leaders recurrently say that the demonstrations are running down, every day brings a new clash somewhere in the West Bank or in Gaza. The 'rioting' which led to the killing of a young Palestinian occurred in Khan Yunis refugee camp at the southern end of the Gaza strip. It came as part of a demonstration against the Israeli expulsion orders of nine Palestinians. Says the *Times* reporter, "Despite arrests and expulsions, the teenagers seem unafraid." Hanna Sinora, editor of the East Jerusalem newspaper *Al Fajr*, said "the Israeli government has to rescind the deportation orders of local leaders and abrogate the laws which allow for such things."

An Israeli organization, Peace Now, called for the negotiation of a sovereign Palestinian state.

At the UN the United States joined all other members of the Security Council "in voting for a resolution calling on Israel to drop plans to deport nine Palestinians involved in disturbances in the occupied territories."

The *Globe and Mail* of the same date carries an article by Thomas Friedman which describes the different looks which Palestinians give the Israeli troops patrolling their districts, ranging from fear to seemingly undying hatred. Friedman has doubts about using regular Israeli soldiers for policing in the Palestinian territories. At least two Palestinian rioters were killed that day and seven badly wounded. Israel has shifted soldiers from the Syrian, Jordanian and Lebanese fronts to suppress the uprising. (*Globe and Mail*, January 6/88)

An altogether too typical response of North American Jewish intellectuals comes from one A.Y. Ellencweig, a visiting professor at the University of BC. His letter to the editor in the *Vancouver Sun* of January 6/88 under the heading of "Palestinians to blame for their predicament", reads as follows. "There is a saying that half truths are worse than lies... To state that the Palestinians have no say in the running of their economic and political lives may be correct, yet it neglects the major component - the Palestinians are the ones who rejected the proposal for autonomy under the Camp David Agreement. ...Moreover, the Palestinian Liberation Organization began its murderous attacks against Israeli civilians long before the 1967 war, which led Israel, then having a vulnerable waist of only 12 kilometers between the West Bank and the Mediterranean Sea, to administer the territories. The Palestinians still adhere to the Palestine National Covenant, the ideological document that calls openly for the destruction of Israel and expulsion of its Jewish inhabitants [long since repealed by the PLO]. To condemn Israel for the outcome of Palestinians' violent and uncompromising behavior is practically untrue and historically unjust. It is a classic example of blaming the victims. (*Globe and Mail*, January 6/88)

The *New York Times* of January 7/88 reports that Israel expressed 'its disappointment and regret' on America's vote with the UN Security Council to demand that Israel halt its deportation of Palestinian rioters. In Israel, many Palestinian towns and refugee camps throughout the occupied territories are under curfew. Defense Minister Yitzak Rabin stated that 1,978 Palestinians had been arrested so far, something over 250 have been killed, and an undetermined number have been wounded by Israeli gunfire. So far there has been no armed response to the Israelis and the Palestinians are exclusively armed with rocks and
bottles. Of those arrested, more than 900 have been released and 300 tried, of whom 6 were found innocent. The remainder still have to come to trial.

Lawyers for two Palestinian 17 year olds said their clients had been arrested on December 19/87 and had been taken to a prison camp north of Nablus where they confessed to assorted crimes after being tortured with electric shock apparatus by Israeli soldiers. The Israeli military rejected all such claims, naturally. However, the facts of mass brutalization of Israeli prisoners in the Lebanese war has made these denials highly suspect.

The Globe and Mail of January 8/88 carries a commentary by Gabor Mate, a Hungarian emigre, a former Zionist and now a doctor in Canada. Commenting on events in Palestine and Canada at around the time of Hanukkah he says "The tragic irony of such events during a holiday that commemorates an ancient battle for freedom - and in the very places where the Jewish Maccabees made their stand against a foreign occupier - seems to have escaped the moral leaders of Jewish communities in North America."

"Writing in these these columns on the first day of Chanukah an eminent Toronto rabbi [W. Gunter Plaut] drew a link between the fight of the Maccabees 2,000 years ago and the present movement to gain for Soviet Jewry the right to emigrate. Although he asserted that the issue is 'human rights in general' the rabbi made no reference to the suppression of Palestinians' protest against Israeli rule. It is a narrow conception of justice that denounces only wrongs done to us but fails to recognize the ills we perpetrate."

"Epitomizing this tunnel-vision morality is the Nobel Peace Prize winner for 1986, Elie Wiesel, whose extensive writing and speaking about the Holocaust have gained him stature as an international voice of human conscience. Mr. Wiesel has consistently refused to rebuke Israeli actions. He said little even faced with the mass killing of defenceless Palestinian men, women and children in the Sabra and Shatila camps by the Israeli-sponsored Phalange - an atrocity denounced by demonstrations of hundreds of thousands of Israelis. 'I support Israel - period. I identify with Israel - period. I never attack, never criticize Israel when I am not in Israel', Mr. Wiesel has stated, expressing a point of view prevalent among Jewish leaders." (Vancouver Sun, January 8/88)

The Globe and Mail of January 8/88 also reports that the Israeli army is now using snipers equipped with telescopic rifles to wound and maim Palestinian demonstrators. Seven protestors were brought into hospitals shot in the legs and neck, others had broken arms and head injuries from clubs used by the Israeli police. One fifteen year old Palestinian was shot dead in Gaza. There are still no reports of Israeli soldiers killed.

Prime Minister Yitzak Shamir said that it will try to prevent UN Undersecretary Marrack Goulding from inspecting Israeli-occupied Palestine and members of his government will not attend any meetings with him.

The New York Times of January 9/88 reports two more Palestinian youths have been shot to death by Israeli troops. Demonstrations have again broken out throughout the occupied territories and many towns and refugee camps have been placed under curfew. Strangely enough, despite the mounting daily toll the total number of Palestinians killed does not seem to mount in the North American press.

Israel has shifted to jailing some Palestinians without trial under a statue of 'administrative detention', a hold over from the British colonial administration. It allows individuals to be held for up to 6 months without trial, a process which can be then renewed indefinitely. At the time, this struck most non-Jewish Americans
as fundamentally unjust, until a comparable process was instituted by their government some fifteen years later.

A set of biographic sketches of the nine Palestinians the Israelis intend to expel are published in the January 9/88 issue of the *New York Times.* They range from a 45 year old West Bank lawyer who is a supporter of the Marxist Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine to a 27 year old Islamic fundamentalist from Gaza. They are by no means all backers of the PLO, the then devil incarnate of Israeli propaganda. A few of them support the Islamic fundamentalists which the Israeli secret service had been backing in order to divide Palestinian support for the PLO. This is a tactic they will later come to regret.

The *Globe and Mail* of January 9/88 carries two pieces about the Israel-Palestine conflict. In one, Edward Said, a Palestinian professor of English at Columbia University, notes that Gaza was "'pacified' by the Israelis in 1971, with thousands of Palestinians torn from the homes and herded into more controllable camps where their conditions remain desperate. He says that until the Israelis are willing to understand 'the Palestinian narrative' despite the smoke-screen of nonsense about 'terrorism' and the 'peace process' and until there is a willingness to hear the truth unadorned, without the mendacious pieties about 'a made-in-Mars Jordanian solution' of 'moderate' Palestinians," the insurrection will continue.

Said says that the Palestinian determination is not to lose their national identity. "Against those facts, the droning chorus of praise for Zionist ideals sounds hollow indeed."

This is 'answered' by a commentary of one Emmanuel Sivan, currently an Israeli visiting professor at Princeton. He, almost on cue, provides an example of the pseudo argument which Said alluded to. He rules out any possibility of negotiation with the PLO, which he holds are committed to the destruction of Israel. (This is the claim of all those committed to the destruction of the PLO.) He raising once again the problem of finding 'moderate Palestinian notables' and opts for further negotiations with the King of Jordan. Moreover, he holds that the West Bank is rapidly being integrated into the Israeli economy - about 100,000 Palestinians work in Israel, 90% of the imports of the occupied territories come from Israel and 70% of their exports go there. It is an 'integration' which cannot now be stopped, says Sivan. (No, not if the Israelis continue to rule over those occupied territories.)

In the January 11/88 issue of the *Globe and Mail* David Marshal writes that in the 20 years after its conception Israel had become an urban and powerful state, with its own right to existence. However, "Since 1967 Israel has become an expansionist power, occupying the full extent of the original Palestine mandate. Now, not even crumbs remain for the Palestinians. Jewish settlement of the West Bank is political and is intended to produce legitimization of territorial control, with Israel itself. [They hold that] "We are here, we have developed the land, it is ours."

"Israel needs to find an accommodation with Palestinian interests (including territorial concessions) but instead Israel practices a policy of exclusion of those interests. ...In 1973 Shimon Peres said '"Israel is moving from the realm of poetry to the realm of prose.' Fifteen years later Israel is expressed not in prose, but simply a curse on the Palestinian people." That seems true enough.

The *New York Times* of January 11/88 reports that two more Palestinian youths have been killed by Israeli troops in Gaza and about 50 reportedly wounded by gunfire. Battles continued into the night. In addition, a pregnant 35
A year old Palestinian woman by the name of Wijdan Fares, of Khan Yunis camp, had died of tear gas fired into her house.

Yitzak Rabin, Israeli Minister of 'Defense', was meeting much of the night with the cabinet and held that all necessary measures would be taken to suppress Palestinian rioters and assorted 'terrorists.' He said that the suppression of the Intifada would take a considerable time and no one should expect it to collapse soon. More Israeli troops are deployed throughout the occupied territories.

In Gaza, parents and older people are said to be joining, or at least supporting, the young people of the region in their opposition to the Israelis. The streets are littered with rubble and barbed wire. In the refugee camps which have been placed under Israeli curfew older men and some women are trying to smuggle food in to the inhabitants. The curfew makes it impossible for those affected to leave their homes to obtain food or anything else. Food runners sneak in through back roads and over back walls (like the Warsaw Ghetto?).

The New York Times of January 12/88 reports that a West Bank settlers' leader and his bodyguard fired at Palestinian demonstrators killing one teenager and wounding several others. In addition, two Palestinians shot earlier died of their wounds today. The Israeli army called it a clear case of self defense. However Palestinian witnesses gave a conflicting account, saying that the demonstrators were shot while building a barricade across a road.

This is the first prominent case of Palestinians being killed by Jewish civilians in the Intifada, although there had been ongoing terrorist attacks on Palestinians over the previous years. At this time the Jewish population of the West Bank and Gaza stood at some 60,000 settlers, who are heavily weighed by religious-nationalist fanatics. The killers in question here come from a settlement called Ofra, a stronghold of the Gush Emunim.

The two Jewish killers were Pinhas Wallerstein, the leader of the regional council of the local settlements, and his bodyguard Shai Ben Yosef. "Many militant settlers in the outlying areas carry military rifles and there have been clashes in the past. The incident today was the most serious since a Jewish settler in the Gaza strip shot dead a Palestinian girl in similar circumstances two months ago. The entrance of armed Jewish militants would be a volatile new element in the situation."

Mr. Wallerstein had been connected with a series of bomb attacks which killed Arab mayors in the West Bank eight years previously. He said he 'felt a certain satisfaction' at the wounding of one of the mayors, Bassam al Shaka of Nablus. 'I can't say I was sorry', Mr. Wallerstein said. 'On the contrary'.

The Globe and Mail of January 12/88 reports more or less the same thing but adds that Shimon Peres has met with the visiting UN Undersecretary Marrack Goulding, "making clear Israel's displeasure at what it calls UN interference in its internal affairs." However, Israeli actions have now reached the level of ongoing war crimes and these are not simply 'internal affairs'.

The New York Times of January 13/88 carries a lengthy account by reporter John Kifner on the process of 'curfews' as applied by the Israelis. The article is subtitled "Frustrated, the army is trying 'collective punishment.'"

It notes that the army is sealing off refugee camps and Palestinian settlements, often making the residents stay in their houses days at a time. They hope to create such a degree of discomfort as to discourage the uprising. Kifner notes that that day some 200,000 Palestinians are living under curfew, something more than 1/10 of the population. The curfews run for various days duration and the areas under curfew are constantly changing. During a curfew no one may leave his
house or wherever he is caught. This, strangely does not halt the demonstrations and stone throwing - the army is frustrated after having tried its usual stock of repressive tactics and does not know what to do next.

Some of the refugee camps in the Gaza strip have been under curfew for five days, which means that food must be very short in them and people cannot get to work or even hold a job. "United Nations relief workers say that soldiers have sometimes stopped their food trucks and medical and other aid workers from going into the Palestinian districts." Israeli soldiers blocked UN Undersecretary Marrack Goulding from entering key Palestinian areas, saying that they were 'closed military districts'.

The Israeli government is considering whether to stop Palestinian workers from the occupied territories going to work in Israel, and thereby threaten their livelihood. Prime Minister Yitzak Shamir said "It's true that we say to the citizens of Judea, Samaria and Gaza, 'If you don't go to work, you won't have anything to live on.'" The Israeli military has adopted a practice of rounding up Palestinian men in areas effected by stone throwing and making them stand outside at attention all night, allegedly making them too tired during the day to throw stones. Another example of collective punishment being applied by the Israelis.

The New York Times of January 14/88 reports that four alleged Palestinian leaders have been deported to Lebanon in a region controlled by its South Lebanese Army. The UN interprets this as a calculated snub of its efforts at peace-making since it occurs while UN Undersecretary Goulding is still visiting Israel in an investigation tour. The present president of the UN's Security Council, Britain's Crispin Tickell, expresses his 'dismay and indignation'. He said "...the Israeli decision went against international law and flew in the face of international opinion". "The International Committee of the Red Cross also condemned the Israeli action today and lodged a formal protest through the United Nations against Israel for what it called a 'grave violation' of International Law. It cited an Article of the Geneva Convention protecting civilians in occupied territories". However, the Israelis have only contempt for international law and opinion, especially when they have the support of the US.

Another Palestinian is killed by the Israeli army. Such killings, unless they contain some unusual aspect, are of decreasing interest to the western press.

The Globe and Mail of January 14/88, on reporting on the deportations, raises a little known fact. "Since capturing the territories Israel has deported more than 1,000 Palestinians, including 13 last year." "Israel insisted that the expulsions were permissible under laws inherited from the pre-1948 British Mandate over Palestine." This was the regime which the Israelis fought in a two year terrorist campaign to oust.

The Globe and Mail also reports that a Palestinian boy of 10 years from the Jabaliya refugee camp was killed after being struck in the shoulder by an Israeli bullet. Four Palestinian men were severely wounded by Israeli gunfire and ten women treated in hospitals for injuries sustained from being hit with 'rubber bullets' (which can to be lethal if they strike a vital area).

The Globe and Mail of January 15/88 reports that an additional 10 Palestinian personalities have been warned that they face the threat of deportation because they have allegedly been 'encouraging anti-Israeli activity.' They were questioned for up to eight hours and then released. Among them was Hanna Seniora, the editor in chief of the Palestinian daily Al-Fajr, and four other editors and journalists of other newspapers. The others so threatened were comprised of the head of the Palestinian Red Crescent Society (a regional variant of the Red Cross),
the head of the Palestinian doctors association, and a number of leading Palestinian lawyers. They were generally charged with 'suspicion of identifying with a hostile group' - the Palestine Liberation Organization - and 'organizing an unlawful assembly'. In a news conference convened later in the morning two other journalists were detained. They were released on the payment of substantial bail bonds.

However much it may seem like it, there is allegedly no attempt by the Israelis to decapitate and separate the intellectual leadership of the Palestinian people from their base.

The same issue of the *Globe and Mail* carries a report that the UN Security Council has voted 14-0 to urge Israel not to deport any more Palestinians. The United States abstained from that vote. The Israeli Ambassador to the UN, the ultra rightist American emigre Benjamin Netanyahu, said Israel will ignore the resolution "because Israel has sole authority over the occupied territories."

The *New York Times* of January 15/88 notes that there has been a massive withdrawal of Palestinian labour from Israeli enterprises over the last two weeks. Some 100,000 Palestinians normally travel to Israel daily, mainly to work in low-paid jobs which provide no social security protection whatsoever. Israeli employers are beginning to grumble and to press the Israeli government to begin recruiting cheap labor overseas to replace Palestinians.

Over the course of the following ten years, they will largely achieve this - recruiting cheap contract labor in places like the former East Bloc which have destroyed their own economies through corporate 'reform', sending their workers scrambling everywhere for jobs. Asian and African 'third world' countries will also come to supply some of the cheap labor on which Israel runs.

Initially it will be the Israeli construction industry, food handling and processing operations, restaurants, and municipal tasks such as street cleaning, which will be affected the most by the withdrawal of Palestinian labour. One disgruntled employer of cheap Palestinian day labor complains and yet at the same time boasts to the effect 'We should lock them all up in their villages and territories. We build everything here ourselves anyway.'

The *New York Times* of January 18/88 reports that Israeli curfews of Palestinians now include 250,000 people kept penned in their houses and camps. "The round the clock curfews, during which Palestinians are not allowed to leave their homes, are intended not only to keep stone-throwing demonstrators off the streets but also to exert what is being called 'environmental pressure' by keeping Palestinian workers away from their jobs."

"United Nations relief workers said shortages of food, particularly powdered milk, were developing in the Gaza strip. 'This is hunger, but not yet starvation', said a senior United Nations official in the area."

Defense Minister Yitzak Rabin has called on the army to impose strict, extensive and long term curfews on Palestinian settlements. Such collective punishments are intended to put pressure on the elders in that society who allegedly will then put pressure on their youth to cease demonstrating and throwing stones. He said "It should be noted that this policy is contrary to the policy that was generally followed in the past, to the effect that everything should be done so as not to disturb the lives of the general population, thereby preventing the circle of hostility from expanding."

However it is clear that 20 years of Israeli policy toward the Palestinians has led to a generation and more who feel hopeless, filled with millennial anger, and a
courage born of despair. For some reason, there still has been no resort to arms by Palestinians.

The Globe and Mail of January 18/88 notes that food supplies in the refugee camps in the Gaza strip have almost run out. At Nuseirat camp, home to 25,000 people, mothers have started to go without food in order to feed their children. People who try to venture outside of the camp to buy food are turned back by the Israeli military. The curfew of Nuseirat is entering the third week and Israeli jeeps and armored personnel carriers slowly patrol the deserted streets. A 25 year old metal worker tells a reporter how he was seized while outside of his house looking for his niece - he was forced to sit in a pool of rain water near the entrance of the camp and beaten by Israeli soldiers whenever he moved. He is covered with welts from this beating.

According to a recent Israeli poll some 81% of Israeli Jews supported the deportation of any Palestinian who supported the 'riots' and a large majority approved of the 'iron fist' policy being applied.

The same issue of the Globe and Mail carries a letter to the editor by one Miriam Kronby, of Toronto. She notes that an earlier issue of the Globe and Mail carried a picture of a woman embracing a boy. "The caption reads 'A weeping boy on the West Bank hugs his mother yesterday after she quickly pulled him away from an Israeli soldier'. The photograph is credited to Associated Press and accompanies a New York Times Service story citing the Palestinians' determination to continue their resistance."

"The photograph is neutral or, at most, ambiguous. It could for example, depict a joyful family reunion. Since there is nothing in the photograph that relates to the story and nothing in the story that is clarified by the photograph, the juxtaposition of the two appears calculated to inflame anti-Israel sentiment."

(Globe and Mail, January 19/88)

Maybe all the photos of Israelis shooting in the direction of Palestinian youths and photos of Israeli military clubbing them are also in themselves neutral and do not attribute any relationship between the actions of the Israelis and the consequences for the Palestinians. These too are also calculated to inflame anti-Semitic sentiments.

To repeat Israeli writer Amos Os' caricature of Sharon and his role in the Beirut massacres, 'They are like the man who puts a poisonous snake in a child's bed and when the snake bites the child says 'But I told the snake not to bite. I didn't know snakes were so dangerous'.

The Globe and Mail of January 19/88 reports that Israeli soldiers are seizing food collected by Palestinian women in Gaza's refugee camps and destroying it in front of them. This is allegedly because they broke curfew to obtain it. Reporters covering the events were ordered away because the areas had been declared a 'closed military zone'. The UN Relief Agency and the Red Crescent say there is a serious shortage of food in the eight Gaza camps which have been under curfew from one to two weeks.

A 52 year old Palestinian woman died today as a result of a clash which occurred previously.

The Globe and Mail of January 20/88 reports that Emergency police powers have been declared in East Jerusalem. "The move came as Defence Minister Yitzak Rabin banned food shipments from relief agencies or sympathizers to Palestinian refugee centers in the occupied Gaza strip or West Bank unless Palestinian shopkeepers ended a general commercial strike." Shortly after the food blockade
was imposed Israel troops halted five truck loads of food going into East Jerusalem.

The *New York Times* of the same day reports that Mr. Rabin has '...vowed that the protests would be quelled with force, power and blows'. He will later order his soldiers to 'break the bones' of all those caught rioting, regardless of how young. Such bone breaking then begins to take on a momentum of its own among the Israeli occupiers. In Gaza, Israeli soldiers have been trying to force the Palestinian shopkeepers to break the strike and open - those who refuse have their identity cards taken from them, an absolutely essential document in occupied Palestine.

A letter to the editor of the *Globe and Mail* of January 20/88 comes from Mordecai Breimberg of Vancouver. In part he says, "Although Dr. Mate [a Vancouver doctor] is a dissenter among Canadian Jews, his willingness to judge Israeli treatment of Palestinians by the same moral standards we judge any state's treatment of the Jews is part of a Jewish enlightenment tradition, one unfortunately sacrificed on the tribal altar of Israeli exceptionalism."

"We must proceed beyond framing this debate in terms of Israeli interests and concerns alone. As Professor Said so rightly affirms, the recent events in Gaza "cannot, indeed will not be reduced to the 'agony of the Israeli soul'. The Palestinian people have equal humanity, their own history, political organization and objectives." (Globe and Mail, January 20/88)

The same issue of the *Globe and Mail* carries the story of a Palestinian woman who, with her family, live in the apartment building in the old city of Arab East Jerusalem into which Ariel Sharon recently moved with much fanfare. She recounts how they have been systematically harassed by Israeli soldiers and Sharon's private bodyguards.

Fatima Khawasmeh tells of how all their visitors and kinsmen are thoroughly searched, made to wait long periods and sometimes refused entrance to her apartment house. Both she and her son were arrested after a recent scuffle with a civilian guard outside their own building. It was obviously part of a ploy to gradually drive all Palestinians out of Jerusalem. At other times, militant Yeshiva students have simply seized Arab houses in East Jerusalem, forced the inhabitants out, and proclaimed the house 'reclaimed Jewish property'. In such cases of straightforward seizure and theft, the Israeli police find there is nothing they can do about the matter.

On January 21/88 the *New York Times* reports that three Palestinian guerrillas have been killed while trying to penetrate the northern borders of Israel. This is the first guerilla attack against Israel since the suicide attack by a lone hang glider pilot during the previous November.

The same issue of the *New York Times* contains a fantasy-peddling letter to the editor by one Daniel Spicehandler. The most recent crimes of the Israelis are all swept under the rug in his rendition of the Exodus movie story - with millions of bloodthirsty Arab enemies descending upon little Israel in 1948, of a million Jews from other countries who join the survivors of the Holocaust in Israel to defeat their enemies. He advises Edward Said to remember the universal Arab rejection of peace with Israel and their threats to destroy it. "Is this what he calls Israel's refusal to share or divide Palestine?"

No, what Said means is the unprovoked Israeli invasion of the West Bank and Gaza in 1967, the imposition of a brutal occupation government, the seizure of almost 50% of the remaining Palestinian lands and waters and their transferal to new Jewish settlers, and the increasingly murderous oppression of Palestinians who now just want the Israelis to leave their homeland.
The Globe and Mail of January 21/88 carries a report entitled "52 Palestinians severely beaten, UN official says". In part it reads "Israeli troops severely beat more than 50 Palestinians at a refugee camp after Defense Minister Yitzak Rabin vowed to use such punishment to crush unrest, a United Nations official said yesterday. Angela Williams, acting head of the UN Relief and Works Agency in Gaza said a UN health center in the Jabaliya refugee camp in the Israeli-occupied Gaza strip treated 52 residents for severe beating Tuesday night". "Reporters watched club-wielding soldiers kick in doors, drag Palestinian youths out of homes and force them to clear the street of road blocks in the Kadurah refugee camp in Ramallah ...Mr. Rabin told the Knesset on Tuesday that it was better to have demonstrators to be beaten than to be shot'. An editorial in the then still liberal Jerusalem Post said that "Mr. Rabin's choice of words was 'chilling'. Befitting perhaps defence ministers in some other regimes and other cultures with no pretence to sensitivity about humane values."

In Canada, Mr. Joe Clark, the former Tory Prime Minister and now External Affairs minister in the Mulroney government, held that Israel's use of food blockades of Palestinian refugee camps was not an acceptable practice. However he did not formally transmit that statement to the Israeli government because he did not want to endanger 'sensitive talks which were going on with that government'. (Globe and Mail, January 21/88)

The New York Times of January 22/88 notes an intensified crackdown on Palestinians in the occupied territories as Israeli troops break into houses to club and beat whomever they find there. "Soldiers have been going from house to house beating people in the sealed off refugee districts of Rafa, Khan Yunis, Nussein and Jabaliya in the Gaza strip according to foreign relief workers and Palestinian residents. ...'People are really terrified', a western relief worker in Gaza said by telephone. 'This is the most effective thing they've done yet. They just beat everybody who is in their way.'"

"'The priority is to use force, might beatings', Defense Minister Yitzak Rabin said of the new policy. "Under the new crackdown the army has beaten hundreds of Palestinian men, women and children with clubs, fists and rifle butts over the last few days in a new, officially declared, policy of force intended to put a halt to more than a month an a half of unrest..."

A reporter of the Jerusalem Post said that anyone detained in prison, when released, may continue throwing stones. "But if troops break his hand he won't be able to throw stones for a month and a half. It is unclear how legal such actions are." "Some soldiers still don't have riot control equipment and are presumably expected to kick and hit them with bare fists and rifle butts" wrote a Post reporter.

Said one Israeli soldier about this case of 'purity of arms', "We handle the clubs as we do the ammunition... The Arabs don't understand other methods, you just got to come down on them with clubs - roughly - and that's it." (New York Times, January 22/88) I note this without comment.

The Globe and Mail of January 23/88 reports that the Secretary General of the UN, Javier Perez de Cuellar, has urged the Israelis to honor the Geneva Convention, which protects the safety and security of civilians in occupied territories. What extraordinary cheek!

In the same issue of the Globe and Mail there is a story about a partial curfew placed on Palestinians in Jerusalem. The previous weekend the Likud mayor of Tel Aviv, Shlomo Lahat, had called on the Knesset to withdraw Israeli troops and
settlers from the West Bank and Gaza. This shocked both his own Likud as well a Labor members.

The *Globe and Mail* of the same day runs a letter to the editor by one David Rotenberg, which is intended to be an answer to an earlier letter by Gabor Mate. Rotenberg presents us with a selection of Jewish propaganda which is quite amazing in its departure from observable fact and rationality. He tells us the Palestinians living in the West Bank and Gaza have all the freedoms of other Israelis, as distinct from Jews in the Soviet Union, who are staggering under anti-Semitic discrimination. Moreover, the Arabs have a thousand year history of oppressing Jews so that it difficult for them to recognize that other people have any rights. Until the Arab governments and the PLO stop telling Palestinians that Israel has no right to exist and until they stop inciting Palestinian youth to riot, Israel will take whatever measures it feels necessary to defend itself and its citizens. Finally, the Palestinians have one right which Soviet Jews do not - the right to leave their homeland.

If they don't like living under Israeli occupation they can join the 600,000+ Palestinians expelled from their homes earlier.

The *Globe and Mail* of January 25/88 reports that "Army will continue beatings to quell protests," Rabin says. Facing rising international criticism Rabin said that the Israeli army will continuing clubbing demonstrators on the streets or in their homes, a thing which all armies do, he says. In the last five days, medical officers say scores of Palestinians have been treated for fractured limbs, and foreign news reports have carried detailed interviews with people who said they had been injured severely in being clubbed by soldiers."

Jewish psychologists have been sent to Israeli units involved in the clubbings in order to buoy up the soldiers morale. "Abba Eban, chairman of the Knesset foreign and defence committee, said a policy of beating is morally bankrupt. 'To advocate beating rioters as a substitute to shooting them, is dangerous. It implies there was no necessity to use live ammunition and kill people in the first place.'"

The *Globe and Mail* of January 26/88 reports that the Israeli Coalition government has rejected out of hand an Egyptian peace plan which called for a halt to further Jewish settlement in the West Bank and Gaza. It also notes a report tabled in the Knesset by two leaders of the tiny Citizens Rights Party who say that the army beatings have resulted in more than 200 cases of broken bones treated in Palestinian hospitals in the last two weeks. "We visited hospitals and were enraged by the orders issued to the army by the political echelon that have given free reign to the worst human impulses." Many of those beaten had not even been protestors.

The *Globe and Mail* of January 27/88 reports that Israelis generally support the policy of brutal repression being engaged in by their army. Denouncing the two-faced 'anti-Semitism' of the world in regard to Israel, Yitzak Shamir said "We are not allowed to kill, we are not allowed to expel, we are not allowed to beat... You ask yourself what we are allowed to do. Only to be killed, only to be wounded, only to be defeated." This is a pretty blood thirsty character to be playing to the boobs of the borscht belt.

In another *Globe and Mail* article of the same day "A reporter who visited two of the largest hospitals in the Gaza strip said that officials reported treating about 600 people injured by beatings since January 8." Also, "General Ehud Barak also indicated that reserves will be called up to replace regular army units. That is 'so regular units can return to training for their missions' an army statement said."
The New York Times of January 28/88 conveys a little of the nature of Israeli patrols attempting to get Palestinian shopkeepers to open their stores in the West Bank. "Hetting their crowbars and their rifles in what is now a daily ritual, the Israeli soldiers moved from store to store this morning, ordering the owners to open up their steel shutters or, if the owners were not around, breaking the locks. 'Chermouia' one of the soldiers shouted in Arabic, using the word for 'whore' outside of the Abu Shawish insurance Agency. 'What, it's 10 o'clock and you're not open yet? Get over here.'

'Don't you call me chermouia', bristled Samir Abu Shawish, a plump 35 year old insurance man. The word is so insulting to an Arab's honor that, later, he refused to translate it literally for a foreigner.

'Give me your identification', the soldier shouted back, with several other troopers moving in close, gripping clubs. A few feet away, the patrol's radio man, a slight youth who seemed barely in his teens, a heavy field telephone strapped to his back, was stopping an elderly Arab, pushing his fingers in the man's face."

Later on Mr. Abu Shawish said "This is very bad, because they treat us as an animal, a slave." 'The Israelis, for their part, have issued a pamphlet of Arabic phrases to their soldiers, containing such phrases as 'hands up', 'liar', 'stand by the wall'. The Israel Army phrase book advised that when a suspect was released he should be told 'I'm warning you. I don't want to see you again tonight. Get out of here, quick."

The Globe and Mail of January 28/88 reports that the Israeli army is investigating reports that Israeli soldiers have engaged in excessive beatings of Palestinians, but as yet have found no cases to prosecute. Well, imagine that. Also, Israeli officials have said that "Israel must toughen its image to deter further violence."

Prime Minister Yitzak Shamir said that the hang glider attack of November 25, 1987 which killed six Israeli soldiers "...shattered the barrier of fear' that kept Palestinians from challenging the army. 'Our task now is to recreate that barrier and once again put the fear of death into the Arabs of the occupied areas so as to deter them from attacking us any more.'

The Globe and Mail of January 30/88 reports that 50 Palestinians have been injured in an Israeli raid on a refugee camp near East Jerusalem. They were injured when Israeli police swept through the camp in a 'disciplinary roundup', A commander of one Israeli battalion said "We...don't like to beat... When a soldier has to stand in front of an elderly woman who could be his mother, or a child that could be his brother, the difficulty is great." However Israeli troops are doing their duty and continue to beat women who could be their mothers, and children who could be their younger brothers.

Military prosecutors charged a West Bank Palestinian yesterday with hurling a gasoline bomb that burned an Israeli settler. "Martial law applied to Palestinian residents of the territory allows the death sentence on conviction for such offenses."

The Globe and Mail of February 1/88 reports that scores of Palestinians have been injured in street clashes with Israeli troops. Some 35 were treated in a Gaza hospital alone. On the West Bank, Israeli troops fired tear gas into a Christian church in Jerusalem, where about 200 Palestinian women were offering prayers for those fallen in the Intifada. A number of Palestinians throughout the West Bank were injured by Israeli gunfire.

On February 3/88 the Globe and Mail reports that some 100,000 Palestinian children in junior and secondary schools and those at four of the five universities
in the West Bank have been effected by Israel's closure of all those facilities. The following day Israel closes all schools in the West Bank and 250,000 Palestinian children are left without schools to go to.

Israel also reported killing two more Palestinians and wounding more than 20 others. Jewish settlers in the West Bank are threatening to take matters into their own hand if the army does not crush the Palestinian resistance.

This ends the more intensive survey of the initial two months of the Intifada. What follows will be more cursory. It should be noted that the protests do not wind down but indeed continue throughout the remainder of the year at approximately the same intensity, with natural fluctuations from week to week. The Israeli repression becomes increasingly severe, with more and more shootings and woundings. Killings by extremist settlers are not common during the initial year but the Israeli public and the world press in general come to take the Israeli repression as something almost natural.

On February 4/88 the New York Times reports nine more Palestinians wounded by gunfire, a 24 year old woman previously wounded by gunfire dies; some 100,000 Palestinians are confined to their homes under curfew, the demonstrations continue.

The New York Times February 5/88 reports that Yitzak Rabin, Israeli Minister of 'Defence', is sorely aggrieved at becoming the lightning rod for international criticism of Israeli policies. He claims that when he told his troops to 'beat' the Palestinians he only meant that they should 'hit them' with clubs.

The Globe and Mail of February 6/88 reports six more Palestinians wounded in protests. On February 8 the New York Times reports that five more 'Arabs' have been killed by Israeli troops in protests and dozens more wounded. They include a 10 year old from near Nablus and a fifteen year old boy from Gaza. He was allegedly the first to die from Israeli beatings. (Globe and Mail February /8/88) The following day the Israelis deny beating the 15 year old to death; they claim he died at the hands of unknown assailants.

The Globe and Mail of February 10/88 reports that two Palestinian teenagers have died after being beaten while in army custody. A Jewish settler was also charged with killing a Palestinian demonstrator. The Globe and Mail of February 12/88 notes that a minority of Israelis oppose their government's treatment of Palestinians. "We did not come to Israel to participate in the oppression of another people, said Sidar Ezrahi, a US-born member of 'Israelis by Choice'." In the same issue of the Globe and Mail is a report about a statement by a US organization of doctors called 'Physicians for Human Rights.' "'We collected evidence of an uncontrolled epidemic of violence by the army ... on a scale and severity that might not be clear to the public' Dr. Geiger said. 'If this were a war much of what we have seen would be regarded as atrocities.'" The Vancouver Sun of the same day reports two more 'Arabs' killed in Nablus by Israeli soldiers.

The New York Times of February 15 reports that three PLO aides have been killed by a car bomb in Cyprus. It is generally thought that this terrorist act was committed by the Israeli secret service. In the same issue of the Times is a report about Israeli Druze, formerly the most loyal of subjects, battling with Israeli police in the Golan heights.

The Globe and Mail of February 15/88 notes that the Israeli army is checking reports that some of their soldiers used a bulldozer to bury four Palestinian protestors alive. All four were unconscious when they were dug out by Palestinian villagers and one died. The following day, the Globe and Mail reports that the Israeli military has arrested two of the soldiers accused in the above case. "We
suspect this thing did happen’, Major Ofra Preuss said when asked about the February 5 incident at the West Bank village of Kfar Salim,”

The *Globe and Mail* of February 17/88 reports that Maj. General Ehud Barak has confirmed that Israeli soldiers had used a bulldozer to bury four Palestinians alive. "This pattern of behavior is totally unacceptable under the standards of the Israeli Defence Forces, and any civilized norms’, he said.

The *Globe and Mail* of February 22/88 reports that two more Palestinians have been killed by Israeli troops in the West Bank. "Psychologists who compiled a report for the army said brutal behavior among troops has become widespread and that some officers are issuing illegal commands ordering random beatings."

The *Globe and Mail* of February 24/88 and the *New York Times* of the same day report that two additional Palestinians have been killed in protests, including a 13-year old girl killed by Jewish settlers and a 14 year old boy. Yitzak Rabin admits that the situation was getting worse and that Israel was "engaged in a civil war." One in which only one side does all the killing.

The *New York Times* of February 27/88 reports that four more Palestinians have been shot and killed by the Israelis. The CBS news network is planning to show a film clip of Israeli soldiers beating a 14 year old stone thrower, his arms pinioned behind him as the Israelis pound his head with a rock. The same issue of the *Times* recounts the attitude of Jewish settlers in the West Bank. Those interviewed felt that the only practical solution was to deport all 'Arabs' to Arab countries. Others hold that what Israel wins in war should never be returned and that 'Arabs have no rights in Israel'. They urge the army to get tougher and kill more protestors.

The *Globe and Mail* of February 29/88 reports that two more Palestinians have been killed by gunfire in the West Bank. In this case the army arrested three West Bank settlers who are believed responsible for the killings.

The *Globe and Mail* of March 3/88 reports that Israeli leaders are calling for curbs on the Israeli press, which has too assiduously reported on what is going on in the occupied territories. A Likud cabinet member, one Haim Corfu, holds that "The fact that the media fans a constant conflagration means one thing - that the occupied territories should be closed off for three months and a crackdown imposed."

A controversy arose after a US television film showed four Israeli soldiers beating two Palestinians with rocks and rifle butts for 40 minutes. "The storm of international opprobrium that followed prompted many on the right to conclude that some things might be more important than freedom of the press."

The same issue of the *Globe and Mail* carries a report on how the Israeli army drove patients from a Palestinian hospital in Ramallah by firing a large number of tear gas canisters into it. Maybe that is the kind of report which Mr. Corfu wants to suppress.

On March 5/88 the *Globe and Mail* reports two more Palestinian deaths, one outside of Bethlehem. The Israeli army has banned reporters from entering the regions around Nablus, Hebron and Ramallah, the three largest Palestinian settlements in the West Bank.

On March 8/88 the *New York Times* notes that three Palestinian guerillas had hijacked a bus in Israel; they and three Israelis had died in the shoot out which followed after it was stormed by Israeli commandos.

A member of the 700,000 Palestinian community within Israel proper, Abdel Wahab Daroushe, formerly a Labour member of the Knesset, has resigned from that party and is trying to establish a distinct party speaking to Palestinian
concerns. He is one of those for whom Israel's actions in the West Bank and Gaza have become too much. The Globe and Mail of March 8/88 reports that at least 12 Palestinian have been wounded by Israeli gunfire that day.

The New York Times of March 9/88 reports that Morris B. Abram, the President of the Conference of Presidents of Major Jewish Organizations, had returned from a trip to Israel and hailed that nation for its 'restraint in trying to handle a difficult situation with care and circumspection" and decried 'Arab intransigence.'

On March 16/88 the Globe and Mail reports tougher restrictions have been placed upon Palestinians to quell the uprising. This follows in the wake of the resignation of more than 800 Palestinian police officers from their jobs. The punishments include an indefinite night time curfew over the entire Gaza strip, the closure of various food markets in the West Bank, a ban on sales of gasoline and a heightened campaign to collect taxes from Palestinians.

The New York Times of the same day reports an escalation of hatred between Palestinian and Jewish settlers in the West Bank. The Jews have taken to attacking the homes of Palestinians around Qalqilya. They are armed with army-issued M-16 assault rifles. According to one Jewish settler, "If they weren't frightened of us", he said as if explaining the obvious, "they'd kill us." Elsewhere in the West Bank, members of Gush Emunim are shepherding Jewish American visitors around, pointing out the highlights of Israel some 2,500 years earlier. Wonderful.

The Globe and Mail of March 17/88 reports four more Palestinians killed in the West Bank.

The Globe and Mail of March 18/88 reports that the two army privates charged with burying four Palestinians alive on February 5/88 have pleaded guilty on charges of 'shameful behavior' and received 2 months in jail. Two other soldiers involved received 10 and 21 days in jail for their roles in the burial. One of the Palestinians died before he could be unearthed by nearby villagers.

Elsewhere, Israelis fired tear gas and 'rubber bullets' at some 800 schoolgirls who were demonstrating against the Israeli occupation and throwing stones. Twenty-five girls were treated for injuries.

March 19/88 the Globe and Mail reports two more Palestinians were killed in Gaza and 25 wounded. UN officials in Cyprus reported that 400 Palestinian refugees had been wounded in Gaza during the previous week and the number of casualties in March so far reached 900. In Jerusalem the Israeli police arrest Mohammed Abu Shabash, the vice-president of the Gaza Bar Association, for protesting against Israeli policies in the occupied territories.

The New York Times of March 21/88 reports that Prime Minister Yitzak Shamir has denounced American Jews who have put pressure on the American government to reign in Israeli actions. Speaking at a meeting of the Conference of Presidents of Major Jewish Organizations, Shamir said that "Jewish personalities should not exert pressure on their Government and ask them to put pressure on Israel." He held that his views represented those of the majority of Israelis. He seemed to be saying 'Just send the cash and shut up.'

The Globe and Mail of March 21/88 reports release of a reserve captain of the Israeli army from 21 days imprisonment for refusing to serve in the occupied territories. He had previously spent six years in the Israeli army and is one of about 400 Israelis who have refused to serve in the repression of Palestinians. "I don't agree with what's going on in the territories...and I am not willing to kill or be killed for something I don't agree with. I am not willing to beat women and
children." There are apparently still some scattered voices of decency left in that country.

The Globe and Mail of March 22/88 reports that the first Israeli soldier has been shot and killed the previous day during 'rioting' in Bethlehem. This comes after the demonstrations and their suppression have been going on for about a year. Until now Palestinians have refrained from using firearms. A further 11 Palestinians were wounded and 1 killed in demonstrations throughout the West Bank and Gaza. Elsewhere, US Senator Albert Gore Jr., a spokesman of the American Jewish lobby, gave qualified support to Yitzak Shamir's rejection of peace proposals for the Israel-Palestine conflict being pushed by the Reagan administration. Gore will be the vice president in a following Democratic administration for eight years.

Just when you think that the Israelis have reached a new low in their behavior, they descend even further into bestiality. On March 23/88 Yitzak Shamir announces an new policy of permitting Jewish civilians to shoot any 'Arabs' they think may be involved in fire bombings. "In allowing the Israeli citizens to fire on those hurling gasoline bombs, he made an exception for demonstrations when others might be hurt." The choice will presumably be left up to members of the Gush Emunim, Meir Kahane's Jewish Defense League, and the similarly minded in the occupied territories. Normally this would be considered a war crime, but not for Israelis.

The New York Times of March 24/88 reports 500 Palestinians have been arrested in mass seizures throughout the occupied territories. They join some 3,000 Palestinians already detained who can now be held for six months without trial, whatever a trial is worth in Israel.

The killings, woundings and beatings of Palestinians by Israeli soldiers have now become a daily event. So too the arrests and prolonged curfews. Only some of these are recorded here.

The Globe and Mail of March 26/88 reports that two more Palestinians have been killed by Israelis and 26 others wounded.

On March 29/88 the Globe and Mail reports that Israel has placed a curfew on all 600,000 persons living in Gaza and have confined the entire Palestinian population in the West Bank to their towns and villages for the next three days in preparation for 'Land Day', which has become a Palestinian celebration of their homeland. Defense Minster Yitzak Rabin said, "The closing stems from our desire to tell the Arabs, 'You decided on Land Day, so let's have a confrontation. We'll see who wins... Remember, we have not exhausted every means at our disposal."

Journalists are to be kept out of the Palestinian areas which have become closed military zones. But there is concern that the uprising will yet spread to the 750,000 Palestinians living within Israel.

The New York Times of March 28/88 reports that four more Palestinians have been killed today and some 400 wounded in the previous week. Those wounded by the Israelis must now make up a considerable proportion of the Palestinian youth in the two regions. Three of the dead come from a tiny West Bank village, which had declared itself liberated territory and was flying the PLO flag. Also, some 2,000 Palestinians were arrested in an attempt to crush the Intifada and 'break up its underground leadership'. The so-called 'Christian Arabs' of Bethlehem and surrounding villages have now entered the struggle for liberation.

On March 30/88 the Globe and Mail reports that 4 Palestinians had been killed and 8 wounded while defying the curfew placed on all Palestinian settlements for Land Day. One of those killed was a 50 year old woman attempting to protect her
sons who had been arrested. Reuters News Service claims that about 60 Palestinians had been wounded that day. Land Day is in commemoration for 8 Palestinians who were killed 12 years previously while opposing the seizure of their land for Jewish settlements. As well it is a celebration of the Palestinian claim to all their lost lands. In Gaza, the Israeli army fires on any Palestinian found on the streets. In the West Bank, Israelis shut food markets by force. Villagers are forbidden to go into their fields and townspeople to their jobs and markets. Various attempts are made to smuggle food in to curfew-closed areas by secret routes.

As a reminder that Israel is still actively involved in the occupation of Lebanon, Israel invaded the Lebanese village of Kfar Roummane yesterday and killed 11 people during their celebration of Land Day. The Israelis also closed down the Palestine Press Service in East Jerusalem in order to prevent it from reporting news of 'disturbances' in the occupied territories. (Globe and Mail, March 30/88)

The New York Times of March 31/88 reports that Israeli 'Arabs' had joined in a symbolic strike for Land Day and had gathered in marches and rallies, one of them near the sea of Galilee. On the main road from Nazareth the Palestinian pilgrimage was met by members of Meir Kahane's supporters telling them to leave (Greater) Israel.

Elsewhere, the Jewish-American emigre, Benjamin Netanyahu, has left his appointment as ambassador to the UN in order to run for the leadership of Likud as a successor to Yitzak Shamir. This crazed ultra-rightist will actually be the Prime Minister of Israel for a brief while.

The Globe and Mail of April 2/88 reports that 2 Palestinians were killed and 13 wounded when Israeli soldiers and police stormed a West Bank mosque they said held rock throwers.

The New York Times of April 7/88 reports that a 15 year girl from a Jewish settlement near Beita, in the occupied West bank, was killed by rock throwing Palestinians. She and a number of others had gone out to hike in the surrounding countryside for Passover when they were attacked. Two of the Palestinians were killed by armed civilian guards. This is the first Jewish civilian killed in over a year of demonstrations. "I don't think it will be possible to stop any Jews from taking matters into his own hands" said an armed Jewish civilian in the settlement.

At some point the Palestinians seized the weapons of two Jewish guards and broke them but allowed the remaining 17 Jews to return to their settlement. "The Arabs are bloodthirsty' a settler shouted from his car to journalists who were turned away by armed settlers ... They show their cruelty, they're vicious. They're people who can't be trusted."

The Globe and Mail of April 8/88 reports that many settlers from the region surrounding Beita had attended the girl's funeral and vowed revenge for her death. One leader of the settlement where she had lived proclaimed that no area in Greater Israel should be unsafe for Jews to wander in. On the other hand, army investigation has documented that she had died by an Israeli bullet in her head, presumably inflicted by one of the trigger happy Israeli guards. Nevertheless, the army shot and killed another 14-year old Palestinian suspected of being involved in the stoning while he was fleeing the village. They also blew up five houses of those said to be involved in the stone throwing.

The New York Times of April 8/88 repeats the above account but adds that one of the guards accompanying the 18 youths was 26-year old Romam Alduli. He
was in hospital recovering from being wounded by thrown rocks. It turns out that he is a follower of Meir Kahane's Jewish Defence League.

The following day the New York Times reports that Israeli investigations have confirmed that it was bullet from the guns of one of her guards which killed the Israeli girl. At her funeral "Rabbi Chaim Duckman of the National Religious Party declared that the [Arab] village of Beita 'should be wiped off the face of the earth'". Very religious.

One of the guards was a well-know Jewish extremist who had been forbidden to enter Palestinian Nablus previously. He had killed the first Palestinian in the village and was then beaten on the head by the victim's mother. Two of the guards then turned and opened fire on the Palestinian villagers until their ammunition was gone. Romam Aldubi has previously had a number of run-ins with Palestinians in the area.

The New York Times of April 11/88 confirms that the Jewish girl killed near the village of Beita had been shot by their Israeli guard Romam Aldubi. However in a Knesset session Minister Ariel Sharon "suggested that the entire [Palestinian] village be evacuated and all its houses blown up, and that more settlements be built. The assorted Rabbis in the Knesset echo the call of the Minister of Religious Affairs, one Zevulum Hammer, when he says, '...cut off the arms of these wild men and smash the skull of the viper to death.'" The West Bank settlers are losing patience with the Israeli army for not smashing the heads of Palestinian demonstrators quickly enough. What is to be done with this nation of religious killers?

The New York Times of April 13/88 reports that 40 more Palestinians have been wounded in demonstrations against the deportation of 8 native-born Palestinians, with an additional 12 scheduled to be deported soon. According to the American Friends Service committee some 1,158 native-born Palestinians have been deported between 1967 and 1978. The deportations proceed under a law introduced by the British in the 1930s to help stem both Jewish and Palestinian terrorism in the region.

The Globe and Mail of April 14/88 notes that a doctor working for the UN has charged Israel with using potentially lethal chemical weapons against Palestinian protesters. "One kind of gas caused severe abdominal pains and another immobilized its victims by weakening the muscles when inhaled." If inhaled in a confined space this could and probably has resulted in death.

The New York Times of the same day reports that a 70 year old Palestinian woman in Gaza has died of a tear gas canister thrown into her home. On the same day two Palestinians were wounded by bullets and another 51 injured by 'rubber bullets'.

On April 15/88 Israel memorializes the Warsaw Ghetto uprising in a hundred locales in Israel. Various speeches around the theme of 'Never again' are lavished on the listeners. Yitzak Shamir calls the Palestinian demonstrators "evil-hearted and unfeeling people who shoot poison arrows at our youngsters", referring to the recent death of the Israeli girl shot by one of her own guards. (New York Times, April 15/88) The Warsaw Ghetto uprising has some eerie echoes in contemporary Israel.

The Globe and Mail of April 16/88 reports that dozens of heavily armed settlers accompanied by the Israeli army marched along the route taken by Tiza Porat, the girl killed by her Israeli guard when their group faced stone throwing Palestinians. "The purpose is to demonstrate that Jews can walk freely in the
Israeli-occupied West Bank." They were not keen in having the army accompany them, presumably because then they couldn't take vengeance.

The *New York Times* of April 19/88 reports that two Palestinians have again been killed by Israeli soldiers, including a 26 year-old woman in Gaza. Elsewhere, a senior PLO leader has been assassinated in Tunis by what is believed to be a raid by the Mossad from an offshore ship. Israeli newspapers speculate whether this action "was to restore the image of Israel as a powerful enemy in order to instill fear in Arab countries and among Palestinians."

The *Globe and Mail* of April 26/88 reported that Israeli police have arrested dozens of Palestinian merchants in the occupied West Bank. They claim that the merchants had been smuggling food to Palestinians imprisoned under the curfew. They could face up to two years in jail.

The *Vancouver Sun* of April 27/88 reports that a 14 year old Palestinian girl by the name of Arish Usmail Adik had been shot and killed by Israeli soldiers. She had been demonstrating in her home village of Kufr Dik. The number of people more or less seriously wounded that day is not given.

The May 2/88 issue of the *New York Times* carries a very long article by one Joel Brinkley telling us that the 100,000 'Arabs' working in Israel have mixed views about the Palestinian uprising. They and the 700,000 Israeli 'Arabs' are said to "have no time for the demonstrations and just wish they would end." Israeli tourist businesses are beginning to cater to American Christian fundamentalists, who have discovered Israel as a place to visit, with all its bible sites and its courageous army etc. etc.

On May 3/88 the *New York Times* reports that it is one of the few days it has been quiet in the Palestinian settlements in the last five months. Some see this as merely a lull while others hold that fatigue is setting in among the Palestinians with all the killings, woundings and arrests which have occurred. Israeli authorities said that they would start cutting off electricity to those who had not paid their bills as part of the protest.

"A few days ago, the [Israeli] Government announced that it would begin holding the parents of children under 12 years of age criminally liable for the children's participation in riots. These and other harsh measures are making life in the West Bank more and more difficult, but the large military presence remains the most effective pacification tool." (*New York Times*, May 3/88)

However, the struggle is by no means winding down.

On May 4/88 both the *Globe and Mail* and the *New York Times* report the re-invasion of Lebanon by a tank-led 1,000 member Israeli force. They have been sent in to eliminate anti-Israeli guerillas operating in south Lebanon. They push to near the Syrian border in a two day 'search and destroy' mission. On the following day they storm the hill top village of Meidoun, where three Israelis and at least 40 Lebanese militiamen were killed in fierce house to house battles. After taking the town the Israelis dynamited all the houses left standing. (*New York Times* May 5/88)

In Israel, two more Palestinians have been killed on the West Bank. Also, an 82 year old man who had been shot some days earlier has died in hospital.

The *New York Times* of May 6/88 reports that a Jewish settler in the occupied West Bank has shot and killed one Palestinian shepherd and severely wounded another in an attempt to drive them off the land. It later turns out that there was no cause for this other than his general antipathy toward Palestinians.

The *New York Times* of May 11/88 notes that the Israelis have deployed their latest weapon against the Palestinians: bureaucracy. For one they have decided to
issue new identify cards, which require endless waits and endless papers to prove people are who they say they are. They also are aggressively collecting back taxes from Palestinians and have imposed stiff fines on merchants who have imported goods into the occupied territories without the special licences required. Palestinians who need any documents, from birth certificates to marriage licences, must first clear up any back fines which have been imposed. Israeli army trucks equipped with loud speakers tour the Palestinian districts announcing the new regulations which must be adhered to. As the Israelis say, this is all part of a campaign to make clear who governs the occupied territories.

On May 12/88 the Globe and Mail reports that the Palestinian underground leadership have issued calls to prepare for at least another month of struggle and for Palestinians to stock at least a month's food supplies in their houses.

"Israeli Defence Minister Yitzak Rabin told a meeting of B'nai B'rith leaders from around the world that the uprising has "the same political goals ...that the Palestinian terrorist organizations try to achieve by terror and atrocities," Mr. Rabin defended the use of military force to put down the revolt. 'I know that you have seen television day and night, all the stories of confrontation between civilians and the military', he said. 'I will not deny it. This is what we have to do.' To support their rule over another people.

The Globe and Mail of May 13/88 reports a whirlwind tour of the Palestinian city of Hebron by Yitzak Shamir. None of the Palestinians want to talk to him but he is quizzed by about two dozen Israeli cadet officers. One of them asks "whether Mr. Shamir did not think the extreme right-wing Jewish settlers in the territories were helping incite the violence. At that Mr. Shamir bristled. 'What right-wing Jews? Arab terrorism started when no one even knew of the right-wing in Israel. Extreme Arabs. They are the inciters.'

On May 16/88, the fortieth anniversary of the official founding of the state of Israel, a general strike is proclaimed throughout the West Bank, Jerusalem and Gaza by the PLO. In an address to the Knesset, Yitzak Shamir vowed that "No force in the world will change Jerusalem's designation of all time as the eternal capital and the fortress of the Jewish people."

A Palestinian merchant remarked that the anniversary marked a day of catastrophe for the Palestinian people but that no demonstration was possible given the overwhelming Israeli police and military presence in the city. Elsewhere, an Israeli military court sentenced Master Sergeant Charlie Danino, who had participated in the burial alive of four Palestinian youths at Kafr Salem some months previously, to be demoted to private for his negligence and improper behaviour. Jewish justice at work.

The Globe and Mail of May 17/88 reports that two Palestinians were killed by Israeli troops during a 'day of mourning' for those who had fallen in the Intifada. Some 46 Palestinians reported to hospitals to be treated for injuries sustained in beatings. This brought the official Palestinian death toll to 190, with one Israeli soldier and one Israeli teenager also killed. What the real death toll has been is unknown.

Elsewhere in the same issue is an account of charges brought before the Knesset by a member of Mapam, dealing with Israeli students being encouraged to beat Palestinian prisoners in detention at Ramallah. Said one 16 year old Israeli, "We asked (a soldier) if we could hit them freely and he said, 'Sure, why not?'... 'After dinner...I saw the prisoner... I took off his blindfold and punched him in the face. He started begging for us not to hit him and then I got a truncheon and hit him in the face."
"Another prisoner started screaming. I went into a rage. I picked up a piece of metal and beat the hell out of him. He looked like mush - a lump of flesh and bones when I finished with him. I had an immense urge to beat him, I'm telling you. If I had a machine-gun at the time I would have killed him. Not that he did anything to me or said some bad word, but because of what those Arabs do in this country."

An army spokesman said that a soldier had been disciplined for allowing civilians to beat prisoners but that he suspected that the Israeli youth was just boasting. (Globe and Mail, May 17/88)

The New York Times of May 17/88 goes through a list of all those beaten and killed during the day. It includes a 71 year old Palestinian who died in the hospital in Hebron. "He had been beaten, and his son told the authorities that militant Israeli settlers living near Hebron had stopped his father's car, dragged him out and beat him almost to death." Col. Ranaan Gissin, an Israeli army spokesman claimed that virtually all deaths reported from Palestinian hospitals are today attributed to Israeli actions. They apparently are just making it all up.

The Globe and Mail of May 24/88 carries a long article by John Gray entitled "West Bank stone throwing more like a game than war." So too the killings and woundings, the beating and bone breaking by the Israelis. Gray recounts the protean character of the stone throwing, arising here and then quickly fading away to gather elsewhere. He remarks on some Palestinian youths who comment on other comrades being beaten by the Israelis. He measures out his concern about the humanity on both sides of the conflict. Gray used to be a liberal reporter before he went to Israel.

The Israelis have decided to allow the 1,200 schools in Gaza and the West Bank to reopen, after having been shut for over a month. About 470,000 Palestinian children are expected to return to school - maybe that will help keep them off the streets.

The Globe and Mail of May 25/88 reports that one Jad Ishaq, a Palestinian associate professor of biology in the town of Beit Sahour, had been arrested and interrogated recently. For the previous six years he had been selling seeds and providing information to Palestinians on how to grow food in their backyards, Victory gardens so to speak. This may interfere with Israeli plans to starve the population into submission. Speaking of his enterprise, "...the fact that it coincides so closely with the latest Palestinian thinking on self-sufficiency and civil disobedience has clearly made the authorities suspicious'... 'The army thinks I've been advocating this idea of going back to the land but the fact is everyone is doing it voluntarily" said Jad Ishaq. 'All they come to us for is seeds and advice. The army was looking for someone to put the blame on and they choose me". Clearly a case of terrorist gardening.

On May 29/88 the Globe and Mail reports that an Israeli settler had lost a hand when he picked up a booby-trapped Israeli flag on which the Swastika had been drawn. Another 16 Palestinians were wounded in clashes with Israeli soldiers while a Palestinian youth hospitalized earlier died of head wounds sustained in a beating. Tensions mounted between the army and settlers over their vigilante attacks. Another typical day in other words.

The New York Times of May 30/88 reports that the Israeli army is investigating charges that some of their soldiers buried Palestinians up to their chests ten days after they had been arrested. Others dug them out some hours later. The military police said they will investigate the case.
On the same day the Globe and Mail reports that about 60 Palestinians were treated for injuries from 'rubber bullets' and tear gas. Six others were seriously wounded. A "...militant Israeli settler said her car was stoned by about 150 schoolgirls near the West Bank town of Qalqilya and she had to fire in the air before the army rescued her. Daniella Weiss, a leading figure in the Gush Emunum (Bloc of the Faithful) settlement movement criticized the army for reopening the schools. "There is no justification for allowing them to go back to regular studies, because they are becoming a terrorist force', she told Israel radio." Demonstrations and stone throwing have broken out throughout the occupied territories again.

An item in the New York Times of June 1/2/88 is entitled 'US Says Special Arab Badge In Israeli village is offensive.' "The State Department said today that an Israeli settlement in the West Bank that had started to require Palestinian workers to wear special identification badges was acting in an 'offensive' manner. This unusually harsh statement came in reaction to reports that the settlement of Ariel had ordered Arab [i.e Palestinian] workers to wear white identification badges bearing the words 'Foreign Worker' in Hebrew. A second Israeli West Bank settlement, Beth El, adopted a similar measure today."

"US State Department spokesman Richard Boucher said that "In our view this one settlement's requirement of badges for Palestinian workers is incompatible with democratic values."

"Officials in Ariel, a town with 9,000 Jewish inhabitants 40 miles north of Jerusalem, said they adopted the system after a leaflet from the leadership of the Palestinian uprising urged activists to kill Jews in revenge for Arab deaths. Critics from both the right and left in Israel have compared the badges to the yellow Star of David that Jews were forced to wear by the Nazis." Asked to comment on the case, a spokesman of the Israeli Embassy in Washington said "We have nothing to do with it. We understand it is a decision of the local council. We find this practice unacceptable and it has met strong public reaction in Israel from all sides."(New York Times, June 1,2/88)

The Secretary of State under George Bush 1, one James Baker, had recently said that the Israeli occupation of the West Bank was unacceptable and that that state must give up its dreams of a Greater Israel.

A second Jewish settlement, Beth El, announced plans today to issued special badges for Arabs. Despite criticism from both the right and the left, members of the four member security council of Beth El, a settlement of 1,500 people half an hour's drive north of Jerusalem, rejected the criticism."

"Arieh Bachrach, who has been a member of the council for seven years, said the tags would allow the guards to insure that Arab workers pass through a security check. As in Ariel, the first settlement to adopt the tags, Arab workers will have to deposit their Israeli identity cards at the front gate and pick them up again at the end of the day's work." (New York Times, June 1/88)

It is to be noted that these so-called 'Arab' workers are all Palestinians, who have been in the area for at least 2,000 years while the Jewish settlers have usually all arrived about 20 years previously, after the Israeli military conquest of the West Bank. (New York Times, June 1/88)

The Globe and Mail of June 1/88 notes that a UN agency has accused Israel of using random brutality in the occupied territories. "William Lee, spokesman for the UN Relief and Works Agency, said there are random beatings. I believe it is pervasive, random and unprovoked, and is used for the purposes of
intimidation." This flows from the policy of Defence Minister Yitzak Rabin, who proclaimed a campaign of "might, power and beatings."

An Israeli representative of the Citizens Rights Movement, noted the some 5,130 Palestinians had been wounded so far. "An astonishing total when you bear in mind that we are talking about a war of stones in which not one of our people has been killed." He mentioned that the previous week the Israeli army had beaten people ranging from a 4 year old boy to a man of 60. An infant from the Jabaliya refugee camp had lost an eye after being struck by a 'rubber bullet.'

Mr. Rabin defended the army's use of rubber bullets and whatever other methods they employed. He believed that the uprising was only simmering and by no means over.

The Globe and Mail of the following day, June 2, noted a UN official stated that tear gas fired by Israeli soldiers into enclosed spaces had killed at least 11 Palestinians since it began to be used, including a young infant the previous day. UN figures say hospitals have treated 1,285 Palestinians for gas-related breathing problems since the uprising began.

While the Israelis deny that people are killed by tear gas the US company which manufactures and supplies it says that there are clear warning on all canisters saying that its use in confined spaces can be lethal. This company will later have the decency to refuse to sell its products to Israel.

In other news, the army admitted that one of its privates broke regulations when he allowed an Israeli school boy to beat a prisoner with a club. He was officially reprimanded.

The Globe and Mail of June 3/88 reports that four Israeli peace activists were convicted of meeting with PLO representatives in Rumania under a two-year old law which makes it illegal to 'meet with a terrorist organization.' Their defence attorney had tried to make the case that they were meeting to discuss conditions for a peace but the presiding judge ruled that the PLO and all its representatives were engaged in terrorist activities and that therefore those charged were guilty.

John Brinkley reporting for the New York Times on June 3/88 reports that more than 5,000 Palestinians remain in Israeli jails, 2,000 of them in a tent camp in the Negev desert. These are people who the Israelis believe are part of the PLO underground directing the uprising but many of them are unskilled laborers who were seized at night in their homes who do not know why they are here and have never been charged or tried for any offense. They are all being held under 'administration detention' orders introduced by the British in their struggle against the Zionist underground more than 40 years previously.

They are allowed no contact with the outside and may receive no newspapers nor have any radio. Inspectors from the International Red Cross have called the conditions appalling.

A poll of American attitudes toward Israel and the Palestinians recently done by the American Jewish Congress indicates that the great majority of Americans support the Israelis in whatever they do. As long as they don't do it to Americans.

The Globe and Mail of June 4/88 reports strikes and demonstration throughout the occupied territories. The Israeli army has killed its 200th official victim. In the occupied West Bank vigilante groups of Jewish settlers are becoming active and have killed and wounded a number of Palestinians when they protested their presence in Shuykh village.

The Globe and Mail of June 7/88 reports that "An Israeli officer, Lieutenant Glora Even-Tzur, was jailed for throwing rocks at three Palestinians placed
handcuffed into stone pits outside the West Bank village of Arura, the daily Yediot Ahronot reported.

The army also was investigating allegations against a brigade commander accused of shooting a Palestinian shepherd to death during a helicopter chase near the West Bank village of Bani Naim.

On June 7/88 the New York Times reports that Arab governments meeting at a three day Arab summit have rebuffed Mr. Arafat's claim to speak exclusively for the Palestinians in the occupied territories, or to control monies set aside for those Palestinians by the Arab countries. One Bassam Abu Sharif, a senior spokesman for the PLO, has recently written that 'Arab officialdom was guilty of dereliction of duty towards the Palestinian uprising in the occupied land'. He asserted that the Arab governments have 'not only withheld financial support to the Palestinians but also kept them under political siege.'

The same issue of the Times reports various shootings, killings and beatings of Palestinians demonstrators. Of special interest is the case of a young Palestinian who was beaten to death by Israeli soldiers wielding clubs.

The New York Times of June 10/88 again reports on Palestinian homes systematically bulldozed by the Israelis on suspicions that some of the inhabitants were engaged in the uprising. It also notes the case of a Palestinian youth who was purposefully shot through the head by an Israeli soldier clearing a road block. The report concludes that "Many Israelis seem to have become inured to the violence." That is to say, violence directed against the Palestinians.

The Globe and Mail of June 13/88 notes that an Israeli bus driver has shot and killed a Palestinian youth who was involved in stoning his bus. There is no charge or investigation. The New York Times of the same day reports that a number of forest fires are burning in Israeli 'national forests' (from which Palestinians are excluded). It is suspected that Palestinians had set those fires and two youths have 'confessed' after 'interrogation'.

The New York Times of June 14/88 reports that "The 'Defense' Ministry said today that Yitzak Rabin, the Defense Minister, told the Cabinet on Sunday that civilians in the occupied territories were free to shoot any Palestinians who are seen holding firebombs in their hands'." In short, Rabin has given the Israeli settlers the right to shoot whichever 'Arabs' they feel like. These settlers typically carry automatic rifles which have been supplied by the army. Ariel Sharon and Yitzak Shamir agreed totally.

Although the use of fire bombs has recently been increasing, no Israeli has yet been injured by them. Three more Palestinians were reported killed by Israeli troops on the West Bank. One was a deaf man of 43, one Dib Mohamoud Hussein, who was shot and killed after ignoring orders to halt.

The New York Times of June 16/88 reports that two Palestinians youths were shot and killed in a village near Bethlehem for attempting to throw molotov cocktails. The Israelis also killed another Palestinian for blocking a road and attempting to get others to stay home and obey a strike order. The Israelis also closed down all Palestinian schools in the West Bank.

The Globe and Mail of June 17 reports that the Israeli army has now been ordered to shoot anyone throwing firebombs and to demolish the homes of the families of the suspects. Jewish settlers, with prayer shawls and the usual religious impedimenta, blocked various roads in the West Bank to demand that the army crack down on suspected firethrowers. Elsewhere, the second Israeli army soldier died of an injury sustained from a thrown rock. The continuing absence of the use
of fire arms presumably is that if they were used the Israelis would respond with large scale massacres.

On June 18/88 the Globe and Mail reports that the Israeli army shot and killed one Palestinian and wounded 18 others who had gathered to block the blowing up of the family house in Nablus of someone suspected of throwing Molotov cocktails. The Israelis also arrested and carted away 20 Palestinians.

The New York Times of June 21/88 reports the death of an Israeli farmer inside Israel who was allegedly killed by 'Arab terrorists'. Yitzak Shamir naturally vows vengeance. If true he would be the third Israeli to die as a consequence of the Intifada so far. The Palestinian total stands at well over 200 dead and possibly 2,000 seriously wounded.

Israel has also closed down a number of 'Arab' charities said to be aiding the Intifada by counseling and abetting violence.

On June 22/88 the New York Times reports another two Palestinians killed in East Jerusalem, plus six wounded by live ammunition and others requiring hospitalization through being struck by 'rubber bullets'. "Since Sunday, eight Palestinians have died in protests or from wounds sustained in earlier clashes with soldiers".

The Globe and Mail of the same day reports that three Palestinians were shot, one of them by an Israeli civilian. Included was a 10 year old wounded in the leg. Yitzak Rabin bemoans the fact that the Israeli farmer killed recently did not have a machine rifle with him when attacked. "I believe the whole results would be entirely different. He would be alive today."

The New York Times of June 23/88 notes that more than twenty Palestinian homes have been demolished in the past few weeks due to suspicions that some of the inhabitants had been involved in fire bombings. One Israeli colonel said that Palestinians who had been imprisoned by mistake were having their cases heard by the appropriate authorities. When asked to explain the order that Palestinian fire bombers are to be shot by any Israeli he said, "Of course, there is a general principle of law that says every man may protect himself... Of course, if the shooting turns out not to be justified the person may have to stand trial." Right.

Also, Amnesty International has urged Israel to investigate whether the tear gas used by Israeli troops had caused the deaths of some 40 persons to date, especially among the old and the very young.

On June 27 and 28/88 the New York Times reports the continued bombing of refugee camps in Lebanon by Israel and the final defeat of the PLO guerillas in Beirut’s Shatila camp. In six years they have been attacked by Israelis, the Shiite Amal, and Syrian-backed forces. The resistance of the PLO in this unequal struggle was extraordinarily heroic.

The June 29/88 issue of the New York Times reports that one Adi Ophir, a 37 year old Israeli and a philosophy professor at the University of Tel Aviv, has refused to serve in the Israeli army in the occupied territories. Israeli men are subject to military call up until the are 55 years of age. Mr. Ophir is only the twenty-fifth Israeli to refuse to serve and was sentenced to three weeks in prison.

On July 4/88 the Globe and Mail reports Palestinian demonstrations in Jerusalem when it was revealed that the Israelis are engaged in archaeological digging around the base of Temple Mount, where both the wailing wall and the dome of the rock mosque are located. The mainly women demonstrators feared this was part of an Israeli attempt undermine that mosque. Surprisingly, no one was shot or even wounded.
On July 7/88 the *Globe and Mail* reports that Israeli authorities have ordered all Palestinian hospitals to stop treating people injured and wounded in the Intifada free of charge. Also, in Nablus Israeli soldiers have shot and wounded a nine-year old boy who had been throwing stones at them. A dangerous threat no doubt.

The *Globe and Mail* of July 11/88 reports "Rabin vows to meet violence with violence". That day is filled with examples of what he means, youths are shot and killed or severely wounded throughout the occupied territories, others are arrested, five Palestinian homes are demolished. Rabin told a meeting of 100 US rabbis in Jerusalem that until an acceptable political solution can be arrived at "...the solution is to meet violence with violence. Giving in to violence will create more violence, more terror, and increase the chances of a war." This creature is a leader of the Israeli Labour party who will later become Prime Minister. Following that he will be assassinated by an even more right-wing Israeli youth. Chickens coming home to roost.

The July 21/88 issue of the *Globe and Mail* reports the shootings of demonstraters throughout the West Bank and the deaths of three of them. The next day, the *Globe and Mail* reports the deaths of and additional three Palestinians when a crowd of 600 marched through the marketplace in Nablus chanting anti-Israel slogans. Also, a number of people are being treated for variously serious wounds inflicted by the Israelis, including three 13-year olds.

The July 25/88 issue of the *Globe and Mail* reports that two more Palestinians have been shot and killed by the Israeli army while in Gaza and some 25 were wounded in beatings and through the use of 'rubber bullets'. Violence flared across the occupied territories as Palestinians celebrated the Eid al Adha festival.

The *Globe and Mail* of July 26 notes that an organization called Council for Peace and Security, made up largely of military men including some 30 generals, 80 brigadiers and 150 colonels, has called for the withdrawal of Israeli forces from the West Bank and Gaza since these do not advance but rather detract from the army's ability to protect Israel. Others serving in Israel's army vehemently disagree.

The *Globe and Mail* of July 27/88 reports that a 13 year old Palestinian girl, one Sheir Fuad Afana, has been shot and killed in Gaza. On the same day Gaza hospital officials said that three other Palestinian youths, ranging in age from 11 to 15, had been badly wounded by Israeli soldiers.

On August 3/88 the *New York Times* reports that King Hussein of Jordan has announced that Jordan will soon cut all ties and claims to Palestine, leaving the PLO as the only representatives of the Palestinian people. This effects Israeli policies, which in the past have claimed to accept Jordan as having the residual authority over Palestinians. The PLO once again puts forward its 'two state proposals', claiming the existence of both Israel and a Palestinian states.

The *New York Times* of August 10/88 reports continued Palestinian demonstrations and stone throwing. A 14 year old boy was shot through the head in the town of Kalkilya, where four other people were wounded, including a woman hit in the head by a teargas canister. There were also four Palestinians struck by dum-dum bullets and severely injured near Jenin. Others were wounded by 'rubber bullets. In Gaza five Palestinians were also shot and wounded.

On August 13/88 the *New York Times* reports ongoing skirmishing between Israeli police and Palestinians over the archaeological dig at the bases of the wall around Temple Mount in Jerusalem. Israel wishes to utilize the excavations as a
tourist attraction, but the Palestinians fear that it is the beginning of an assault on the two mosques on the surface of Temple Mount.

The New York Times of August 1/88 notes that a total curfew on all 600,000+ residents of the Gaza strip was imposed today after a firebomb attack on a Jewish settlement within Gaza. Elsewhere, the family of one Atta Iyad of the Kalandiya refugee camps said that they were forced to bury his body by Israeli troops at night. They claim he was tortured to death while the Israelis claim he committed suicide.

The August 17/88 issue of the New York Times reports that two additional Palestinian prisoners were killed during a prison uprising in an Israeli internment camp in the middle of the Neghev desert. Most of the 2,500 men interned there have never been tried under any charges whatsoever. Other Palestinians were wounded in demonstrations throughout Gaza today, despite the fact that a round the clock curfew exists for everyone there.

In the West Bank, the PLO is considering establishing a provisional Palestinian government on the basis of a two state solution, accepting the existence of the state of Israel within its defined boundaries, more or less those existing before the 1967 war. Israel rejects such proposals out of hand.

An August 18/88 New York Times story is entitled "Israel Steps Up Use of Force to Undercut Uprising". It reports on the curfews, clubbings, shootings and the steps to deport a further 25 Palestinians from their homeland. Yitzak Rabin is very enthusiastic about all these measures.

On August 19/88 the New York Times reports that Israel has outlawed all local Palestinian panels which are said to be behind the Intifada. An unnamed western diplomat has held that a Palestinian provisional government which recognized Israel's right to exist would put the Israelis in a certain bind. However, he said "The Israelis will simply not accept an independent Palestine state... If the Palestinians are going to declare an independent state the Israelis are just going to say 'Bag it'."

The Vancouver Sun of August 20/88 reports that the Tax Department of the Israeli government has started collecting taxes unpaid by Palestinians and is seizing cars, electrical appliances and other portable goods from those Palestinians 'judged' to be in default. In Ramallah, some eighty percent of the merchants have failed to pay Israeli taxes. In defence of their policy of not paying taxes, Palestinians hold that in 20 years of occupation they have never gotten much back for what they pay. This is basically true, said Israeli researcher Miron Benvenisti. He noted that in 1987 Israel collected $96 million dollars from the West Bank and Gaza in taxes but returned only $36 million in payments and services, keeping the remainder for use in Israel.

On August 23/88 the New York Times reports that three 'Arab' suspects have been arrested in connection with a bomb blast which injured 25 people in downtown Haifa a few days previously. Such bomb attacks are extremely rare so far. "The Institute for Advanced Strategic and Political Studies, a Jerusalem polling company, surveyed 1,182 Israeli Jews between June 5 and July 7. The survey found that 73 percent of those interviewed said they thought the uprising was continuing because Israel was 'too soft' on the demonstrators." This sounds very much like the response of the white citizens' councils in Mississippi during the civil rights struggles of the early 1960s.

Elsewhere, two Palestinian teenagers were shot to death while throwing stones at soldiers while about a half dozen others were seriously wounded. The Globe
and Mail of the same day also reported 13 Palestinians shot during a strike aimed at the Israeli collection of back taxes.

On August 24/88 the New York Times reports that a 42 year old man died after inhaling tear gas dispersed during a protest at Jabaliya refugee camp in Gaza.

On August 26/88 the Globe and Mail reports that the right-wing Herut (Freedom) party and their partners in the Likud bloc have formally merged into the Likud party. Yitzak Shamir, their leader, commenting on the Labour party's carping about the repression of the Palestinians replied "I thought we had gotten rid of this cursed guilt complex a long time ago." Especially when they are guilty.

The New York Times of August 27/88 reports that Israel has closed down most of the 45 Palestinian labor unions as well as professional associations on the West Bank because it holds that they are supporting the Intifada and Palestinian nationalism. It is unclear who will direct licensing for doctors and pharmacists and who will represent them.

The Globe and Mail of August 29/88 notes the Israel has shut down another Palestinian charity group which issued funds to a host of social undertakings in Qalqilya. On the same day, an Israeli settler fired his machine rifle at a group of demonstrating Palestinians, wounding at least two. He said that he believed that they were about to throw fire bombs - so his act was legally justified.

The US Guardian newspaper of August 31/88 writes that the previous two weeks have been especially horrendous ones for the Palestinians. Five Palestinians had died in interrogation centers, three had been killed in a fire bomb attack by Jewish civilians, and more than a dozen had died in shootings by the Israeli military. Another Palestinian had been beaten to death by them. It also notes the rise of violent anti-Arab racism within Israel itself. "In the town of Or Yehuda, in the Tel Aviv area, three Gaza workers were burned to death in an arson attack on August 9 on their hut, which was next to the construction project where they worked. Two Israeli Jews were detained for interrogation about the arson. In two other Tel Aviv neighbourhoods, racist thugs beat up three Palestinian garbage collectors from Gaza. Their Jewish employers were beaten as well and warned not to employ Arab labor."

The Guardian article then goes through a long list of the shootings, beatings, gassings and humiliations imposed by the Israeli army during the previous two weeks. There is also a report on the condition existing among the 3,000 Palestinian prisoners interned at the Ansar 3 prison camp in the Negev desert. It notes the case of one Ata Ayyad, 21, whose body was delivered to his family in the Kalandia refugee camp near Jerusalem. Ayyad had been interrogated for some 50 days and had clearly been beaten to death.

The Globe and Mail of September 7/88 reports that hundreds of Israeli soldiers had sealed off Qalqilya refugee camp, a settlement of some 24,000 people, and had gone house to house arresting those who had been engaged in stone throwing. They were supplied with lists of suspects provided by spies within the community. Some 150 persons were arrested. They were temporarily housed in a nearby zoo, a touch of Israeli racist humor. This follows a new Israeli policy of cracking down on communities were unrest had been the strongest.

The Globe and Mail of September 10/88 notes that the Intifada has now officially entered its tenth month. Some 225 Palestinians in the Gaza strip were arrested and charged with being part of the PLO underground. The army claimed that this will break the back of Palestinian resistance. In Gaza, no one believes
that. They did the same, though on a smaller scale, in the West Bank village of Kfat Alik.

In Gaza, tensions and conflict broke out between the Islamic fundamentalist Hamas organization and Arafat’s more or less secular PLO as to who was directing the resistance struggle.

The New York Times of September 14/88 reports that Yasser Arafat has addressed the European Parliament and said the the PLO recognizes the right of Israel to live behind its 1967 borders. However, he demands that Palestinians also be given the right to exist in a separate state. The Palestine National Council, a body of some 500 representatives, now is the bona fide director of Palestinian actions, in Palestine and in the diaspora. Arafat also declared that the proposed Palestinian state would be led by a democratically elected body.

"His speech drew a largely approving response from an audience predisposed to receive him warmly, 'I think the majority of Europe is ready to accept a Palestinian state', said Barry Seal, leader of a bloc of 31 representatives from the British Labor Party. 'He was among friends here', Mr. Seal added."

The Globe and Mail of September 19/88 reports that a general strike among Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza has been solid, despite conflicts between the PLO and Hamas. The strike was called to commemorate all those Palestinians killed in Shatila and Sabra refugee camps some six years earlier.

The Israeli repression continues unchecked. About 30 Palestinians have been wounded since the beginning of the strike three days previously. Two Palestinians were shot and killed by Israeli soldiers maintaining 'peace' while some 200 Palestinians have been arrested in army raids of their villages. Some 400,000 Palestinians were living under curfew.

On September 23/88 the Globe and Mail reports that some 12 Palestinians were wounded by Israel gunfire today. Israel radio also reported that four Israeli soldiers had been charged with manslaughter in the beating death of an elderly Palestinian after they entered his home to search for suspected stone throwers. Yitzak Rabin said that Israel will never relinquish control over the occupied territories and saw no role whatsoever for UN administrators or negotiators there.

The Vancouver Sun of September 27/88 reports that two Palestinians have been killed by 'rubber bullets'. International protests about use of this kind of ammunition, which at nearer distances act almost like dum-dum bullets, grows. Yitzak Rabin, the Israeli Minister of Defence, said that "Those who participate in violent activities suffer more casualties in terms of wounded". He added "Our purpose is to increase the number of wounded among those who take part in violent activities but not to kill them." And "Whoever takes part must know that I am not worried by the increased number of casualties."

Bernard Mills, the director of operations for the UN Relief and Works Agency in the Gaza strip said "...plastic bullets are effectively live bullets... They penetrate the body. They actually go in. They can enter your vital organs and kill you." Or permanently cripple you.

New rules of engagement by Israeli soldiers allow them to open fire even if their lives are not in danger. Mr. Rabin hopes that the new bullets "can be used to pick off 'organizers and instigators' of the demonstration who stand behind them." He also said the bullets enable soldiers to 'take more initiatives - not to wait till the beginning of stone throwing." So, in effect, he is saying that Israeli soldiers can now shoot into any group of Palestinians who may be shouting anti-Israeli slogans.
The \textit{New York Times} of September 29/88 says that the US has lodged a protest with Israel for its use of plastic bullets. Deputy of State Phyllis Oakley said that "The policy of using plastic bullets has admittedly been designed to cause an increase in causalities. We believe that measures must be taken to reduce rather than to increase casualties among the Palestinian demonstrators." Yitzak Rabin replied that "The demonstrators will have to learn that more violence will bring more suffering to them." Of course no one considers cutting off the flow of arms and ammunition from America to Israel.

The \textit{Globe and Mail} of October 4/88 reports on the religious-secular split which divides the Palestinian people. It mentions the growing support for the Islamic Resistance Movement (Hamas). A Hamas spokesperson said, "You must not confuse between the struggle against Israel and support for the ideas of the PLO. For us, secularism is as repugnant as Zionism. We don't want to get rid of the Israeli occupation to get some kind of secular regime run by the PLO." The Palestinians clearly have their own reactionaries.

In other news, Israel has sent its troops into a dozen villages to root out stone throwers and their ideological supporters.

The \textit{New York Times} of October 8/88 reports that 4 more Palestinians have been killed by Israeli soldiers, most of them in the city of Nablus. "Late last month Defense Minister Yitzak Rabin said plastic bullets were nonlethal. But on August 26/88 three Palestinians were killed and three died the next day, most of them shot with plastic bullets... This week a left-wing Israeli legislator, Yossi Sarid, called on the army to stop using plastic bullets, adding 'They say the bullet isn't lethal, but I'm not sure the bullet knows it.'" Most of those killed today had been attending a funeral for a man killed by the Israelis a few days previously. Nablus residents said the soldiers had chased the demonstrators into a mosque and opened fire during an ongoing service.

The \textit{Globe and Mail} of October 10/88 reports that at least 2 more Palestinians have been killed when Israeli troops raided some 30 villages in the West Bank yesterday. A third Palestinian was killed in Gaza after he tried to stab an Israeli security guard. Israeli troops also wounded at least five Gazans and 18 Palestinians in the West Bank today. This brings the official death toll of Palestinians in the 11 month long Intifada to about 300.

The \textit{Globe and Mail} reports that Israeli troops have seized the body of a teen-aged Palestinian who was killed when hit in the head by a plastic bullet. On seizing the hearse with the body the Israelis were confronted with a body of Palestinians throwing stones. They said they will return the body to the family when they are assured that his burial will not cause a disturbance. Elsewhere, the bodies of Palestinians began to be buried in secret. In Gaza, Israeli troops shot and wounded an 11 year old boy engaged in throwing stones at them.

On October 19/88 the \textit{Globe and Mail} reports that two more Palestinian boys, aged 5 and 14, have been killed in the West Bank by plastic bullets. Five other people were also hospitalized by such bullets. The five year old had been playing in a school yard near his home when he was struck by two plastic bullets; the 14 year old was hit in the chest by one.

The \textit{Globe and Mail} of October 20/88 reports that conditions in the occupied territories have worsened significantly under the 21 year long Israeli occupation. Statistician Meron Benvenisti noted that everything from hospital beds per thousands of the population, the amount of paved roads, the amount of water available, everything has gotten worse for the Palestinians. "From land expropriations to the pitiful planning to the...dual system of infrastructure
available for Arabs versus Jewish settlers, here you can find the reasons for the Intifada.

Mr. Benvenisti also commented on the Labor party's plan to redivide the occupied territories, which would leave most of the more valuable land with the Israeli settlements and give the Palestinians the desert tracks. It holds that about one half of the West Bank would be retained exclusively for Jewish settlement.

The *Globe and Mail* of October 21 and 22/88 reports that Israel has promised to avenge the deaths of seven of its soldiers in a suicide attack in Lebanon. Waves of Israeli aircraft attack Palestinian and Hezbollah bases in Lebanon, killing 15 persons and injuring another 35. Most of those killed and wounded were civilians.

Five days later another wave of Israeli air attacks leaves 17 dead and some 40 injured in Lebanon. At the same times Israel's puppet South Lebanon Army launches attacks on Moslem villages outside of its area of control. (*New York Times*, October 27/88)

On October 26/88 the *Globe and Mail* reports that Israeli troops have killed a 14 year old girl who was part of a crowd throwing stones. Some 15 additional Palestinians were wounded in clashes throughout the West Bank. Another Palestinian wounded earlier died today. The Israeli driver of an oil tanker fired into a Palestinian crowd in Gaza, wounding three people, after someone threw a molotov cocktail at his truck. Another typical day.

The *New York Times* and the *Globe and Mail* of October 31/88 both report the firebombing of a civilian bus near the town of Jericho in the occupied West Bank in which 4 Israelis were killed and 11 injured. The four dead are all members of one family. This raises to nine the number of Israelis killed so far in the Intifada.

The *Globe and Mail* of November 1/88 reports that hundreds of Palestinians in the region around the bus attack have been arrested and that three men have 'confessed' to the crime. The houses where they lived have been demolished. Yitzak Rabin has gone to Jericho and taken 'personal command' of the investigation. He says he may call for the death penalty.

Rabin calls the attack a "calculated campaign by the Palestinian Liberation Organization to increase violence in the area in advance of the upcoming Israeli general election." The PLO responded by saying "The PLO announces its denunciation of attacks on civilians among the Palestinians and at the same time denounces attacks on Israeli civilians."

The *New York Times* of November 1/88 noted that the bus attack which left a woman and her three children dead had eclipsed talk about the general elections in Israel. It is expected that it will mobilize Israelis to vote for Likud and the other right-wing parties. In the election which follows Likud does increase its votes substantially and goes on to form the next Israeli government, in conjunction with other allied right-wing parties.

The *New York Times* of November 9/88 reports that Ariel Sharon is back on the warpath. He excoriates the Labor party, former government partners with Likud, for its 'terrible weakness' in dealing with the Palestinians. He wants his old job as Minister Defense back and says "I told Shamir my stance and the fact that only a man like me is now able to make order out of a situation which is getting worse... He listened to me and I hope he took my words into consideration."

The *New York Times* report notes that Sharon is beginning to develop as a charismatic figure among the Israeli right, which now greets him in the manner it did Menachem Begin. Sharon reminisces about his earlier days in the Israeli military, about how they established a group of Arabic-speaking commandos in Gaza who snuck in by sea as alleged gun runners. "It took three days', Mr. Sharon
said, "but finally a group of terrorists came in secret to welcome them. And when they came to the house, we killed them right there. We did dozens of things like that', Mr. Sharon said."

What would he do about the current Palestinian uprising? Well, he would of course kill all those throwing molotov cocktails and anyone injuring an Israeli. As for the children throwing stones, after they had been arrested he would go to their parents and threaten them with deportation. "In Gaza, he said, 'I instructed soldiers never to go into the schools. Instead his officers called their parents to meetings and explained that they were responsible for the behavior of their children.' If their children were again apprehended "well, we gave them a canteen full of water, a piece of bread, a Jordanian dinar and white flag. We took them to the Jordanian police station at the border and we marched them across'. After a couple of dozen parents were expelled 'instead of soldiers beating the students, fathers were beating their own sons and daughters. You could hear the screams all across Gaza. And the stoning stopped.'"

I wonder whether this murderer actually believes this hoakum or whether he believes others are so moronic as to swallow it. Prisoners of war, alleged terrorists and Palestinian children - all that Sharon can enthuse about is killing them. It would seem that the more crimes the Israelis commit the more enraged and contemptuous they become about their victims.

The New York Times of November 10/88, in a very small filler, notes that Israeli troops in Gaza had been stoned by two youths 12 and 13 years old. Beside them was a 3 year old. The Israelis had naturally fired live ammunition, which killed the three year old and wounded the two others.

A coalition of major American Jewish organizations is lobbying their government to deny a visa to allow Yasser Arafat to address the United Nations. Because Arafat was a terrorist. The Israelis and their supporters are not terrorists of course. The US government had already warned the UN Undersecretary that difficulties would ensue if Arafat were invited to address that body.

On November 15/88 the Palestine National Council of the Palestine Liberation Organization formally declared an independent Palestinian state in the occupied West Bank and Gaza.

The New York Times of November 17/88 contains excerpts from the Palestine Political Resolution being circulated in the UN today. It calls for the withdrawal of Israeli troops from the West Bank and Gaza, guarantees the territorial integrity of Israel, and calls on the UN to hold an international conference on the Palestine issue. Its first point holds "To call on free men all over the world to stand beside our people and our revolution and to oppose the Israeli occupier, his repressive measures and his fascist, militarily organized terrorism, which is carried out by forces of the occupation army and by armed, fanatic settlers, against our people, universities, schools, institutions and our scared places of worship, Christian as well as Moslem." That sounds about right.

The US State Department and the George Bush government reject all moves by the Palestinians. The Jewish lobby in the US is temporarily satisfied.

The Vancouver Sun of November 17/88 reports that Palestinians living in Toronto celebrated the declaration of an independent Palestinian state. At a banquet attended by some Jewish supporters was one Yossi Schwartz, an Israeli-born lawyer who was highly critical of Israeli Prime Minister Yitzak Shamir's rejection of the declaration. "Schwartz said Shamir doesn't want to negotiate with the Palestine Liberation Organization because Palestinians are a source of cheap labor for Israel and a captive market for Israeli-produced goods."
The *Globe and Mail* of November 19/88 reports that the Soviet Union has recognized an independent Palestine but as yet is withholding formal ties with it. This might be difficult, since all of the Palestinian territory is occupied by Israel, which calls it reclaimed 'Judea and Samaria'.

The same issue of the *Globe and Mail* reports that Israeli troops have opened fire on United Nations peacekeeping troops stationed in Lebanon. There were no casualties among the French peacekeepers but more than 150 UNIFIL soldiers have been killed and some 250 wounded in the region since the force was deployed in 1978.

The *Globe and Mail* of November 21/88 reports the death of one Palestinian man of 22 years, the wounding of a 16 year old, and the shooting of two boys of 12 years in refugee camps in the West Bank. A nine year old Palestinian boy was also wounded in the head in an army raid on a West Bank village. Doctors said they had treated five others for serious injuries sustained in beatings. The dead and wounded appear to be getting younger.

The *Globe and Mail* of November 22/88 reports that Egypt has joined about 35 other Arab and Moslem countries in recognizing the Palestinian state. Israeli cabinet ministers Shimon Perez and Yitzak Rabin claim that this is a violation of the Israeli-Egyptian peace pact of the late 1970s. "In Brussels, European Community foreign ministers stopped short of recognizing the state that the Palestine National Council, the PLO policy-making body, proclaimed in Algiers last week but said the PNC's decisions were helpful to a regional settlement." France and Italy both wanted to recognize the Palestinian state.

In Israel, the Knesset was deadlocked with the refusal of the Labor party to accept a junior position in an alliance with Likud. "Fifteen leftist members protested against being sworn in by presiding Speaker Yair Sprinzak, whose Moledet party calls for the expulsion of Palestinians from Israeli-occupied territories. "He however forced them to swear allegiance under threat of expulsion from the Knesset. A new speaker was only then elected."

The *New York Times* of November 22/88 notes that in Israel anti-fundamentalist Jews rallied outside the Parliament buildings, one with a sign with a bearded rabbi and a notation reading "See no evil". It also reported that Citizen's Rights Movement leader, Shulamit Aloni, read a protest from a piece of paper rather than uttering the oath required. Four 'Arab' members of the Knesset also vowed to fight against the transfer of Palestinians out of their native homeland and for equal rights and equality in all lands which Israel administers. They were shouted down by other members of the Knesset.

Elsewhere, Palestinian leaders said that the creation of the Palestinian state which they had recently proclaimed was still a long way off. They however felt that it was a justified psychological move and held that all the losses and sufferings of the Intifada were justified. They are hoping, however, that international supporters of a Palestinian state will be able to put pressure on the US to consider the existence of a Palestinian state as well.

The *Vancouver Sun* of November 24/88 reports that a delegation of North American Jews have flown home from Israel with no sign that religious parties there would halt their demands that only Orthodox Jews be considered as bone fide Jews for legal purposes in Israel.

The *Globe and Mail* of November 25/88 reports that the Israeli parliament has come to a standstill over demands by the Orthodox religious parties there for a more strict definition of who is a Jew. Essentially, they demand that only Orthodox Jews and others who have been sanctioned by their rabbis should have
such rights. In the last elections only 13 out of 120 seats were won by the Orthodox and ultra Orthodox parties, but the Likud, which won only 47 as compared to Labor's 49 seats, caters to the demands of the Orthodox to retain power.

"...the reaction of Jews around the world, most of whom belong to the Reform and Conservative wings of Judaism, has been swift and unequivocal: any change in the [Israeli] legislation would be interpreted as the de-legitimization of Diaspora Jewry and might well lead to a sharp decline in moral and financial support." Richard Cohen of the American Jewish Committee said "if the law is imposed on us, we will wonder if we are welcome in the state of Israel."

Israelis were surprised by the international reaction and were concerned that even a partial withdrawal of American Jewish support could endanger the special relationship between America and Israel. "The coalition [of American Jewish organizations] insists that its message is a warning, not a threat. But in Jerusalem little difference is seen between the two. Politicians speak candidly of their fears of a drop in financial contributions from US Jews, even of a decline in official US government support, should Israel's powerful lobby in Washington appear less than fully committed."

However, Yitzak Shamir does not appear ready to back off under pressure of American Jewry. "As Ehud Olmert, a leading Likud member put it, 'If you want to change Israel, you [Diaspora Jews] should come over here and fight."

The Globe and Mail also reports that nine Palestinians were wounded by Israeli gunfire and one Palestinian woman accidently shot and killed as she was shopping in a market place.

The New York Times of November 22/88 notes that 21 Israeli paratroopers have been sentenced to two weeks in jail for rampaging through a Palestinian refugee camp north of Jerusalem smashing cars and stoning windows. They were officer candidates bound for a special training course and therefore represented the elite of Israeli armed forces. Both the right and the left criticized their imprisonment, the left because it held that the paratroopers were simply carrying out what Israeli policy has become and the right because Israel was at war with the Palestinians and in war anything goes, regardless of any international conventions.

The Globe and Mail of November 30/88 reports that 20 Palestinians have been shot and wounded during a general strike in the occupied territories. In a covering picture the Israeli troops seem to be less that 75 feet away from their targets, rather than the 75 yards within which 'rubber' bullets are lethal. However, they may simply be using live ammunition. Surprisingly, no armed response has yet been recorded for 'Arab' demonstrators.

"More than 7,000 Palestinians have been wounded since an uprising against Israeli rule in the West Bank and Gaza began on December 9, 1987. At least 316 Palestinians and 11 Israelis have died."

A growing split between the PLO and Hamas, the Islamic fundamentalist organization, has developed, Hamas demanding a continuation of the general strike and the PLO calling for a return to normality. Hamas also rejects the acceptance of the 1948 borders with Israel which the Palestine National Council had accepted in its November 15/88 declaration of Palestinian independence.

Elsewhere, Yitzak Shamir has turned down any consideration of an international peace conference between Palestinians and Jews and has demanded that Arab governments accept the finality of the borders of Greater Israel as they now exist. "Mr. Shamir, who views such a conference as a Soviet-Arab plot to force
Israel to give up the West Bank and Gaza Strip, told the editors [of Israeli newspapers] that direct talks stand a better chance if Arab states know there is no longer an alternative."

The New York Times of December 5/88 reports that a Jewish settler, Yisrael Zeev, from the occupied West Bank has been sentenced to five years imprisonment for killing a Palestinian shepherd who was grazing his sheep on land near a Jewish settlement. Another Palestinian was severely wounded. This is the very first case in which a Jewish civilian has been convicted of killing a Palestinian, although there have been many previous cases.

Mr. Zeev was convicted on manslaughter charges. "But Judge Cohen rejected a prosecutor's request that Mr. Zeev be charged with murder, accepting the defense argument that he had not intended to hurt the shepherds." Whom he shot at close range

In regards the Zeev case, the Globe and Mail of December 1/88 reported that the incident began when a Jewish woman spotted the shepherds in a field between a Palestinian village and the Jewish settlement. She called for help and Mr. Zeev came and fired at the shepherds. "Witnesses said that the victim knew him and shouted 'Israel, don't shoot'." This is a settlement of about 20 'religiously observant' Jews established in 1981.

"On Wednesday, a prosecutor rejected a police recommendation that another West Bank settler, Rabbi Moshe Levinger of Hebron, be charged with the shooting death of an Arab shopkeeper there in October. He cited insufficient evidence." On December 1 the Israeli police released three Israelis suspected of setting a fire in which three Palestinian laborers were burned to death as they slept in a shack on a work site near Tel Aviv. It was again a case of 'insufficient evidence.'

Leaders of the settlement movement meanwhile called on the army to take harsher steps against Palestinian rioters and demonstrators (and Palestinians in general).

The Globe and Mail of December 7/88 reports that Israeli troops have shot and wounded 8 Palestinian youths, including a five year old boy from a refugee camp in Gaza. The Israeli army was also opening an investigation of an Israeli soldier who is alleged to have shot and killed a 12 year old Palestinian girl on her way home from school. Witnesses claim she was shot at close range when she attempted to flee.

The New York Times of the previous day reported on the above case. "Doctors at Shifa Hospital in Gaza City said the girl, Asmaa Abu Edaba, died after being shot in the back of the head. Her sister, Sahar 14, said the younger girl was shot at close range as the sisters made their way home from school in the Shati refugee district." She said Israeli soldiers were pursuing Palestinians teenagers when "'Suddenly I heard Asmaa screaming', Sahar said, 'I looked back and saw an officer, about 40 years old, with beard and a red beret, pointing a gun. Asmaa tried to run, but he shot her right away in the head."

Just another example of Israeli 'purity of arms'.

The New York Times of December 7/88 notes a report by an international commission of legal monitors saying that conditions in the Israeli Ketziot Detention Camp, in the middle of the Neghev desert, are inhumane and in violation of the Fourth Geneva Convention. The report was compiled by the Lawyers Committee for Human Rights, a New York-based group with representatives from numerous countries. How they ever gained access to the camp remains a mystery. The Israeli government replies that it is bound only by its own laws and not by any Geneva convention.
The lawyers held that the conditions were impossibly crowded with prisoners confined to their tents most of the day, with insufficient water and stifling heat. "The Lawyers Committee describes physical abuse including frequent beating and use of collective punishments, an 'irregular supply of water grossly inadequate for detainees needs in intense desert heat, unsanitary conditions, poor food and forced labour." Three Israeli judges who had previously visited the camp, which houses from 2,500-3,000 prisoners, many of them detained without trial, had also complained about those conditions.

The Vancouver Sun's report of December 9/88 reconfirms the fact that Israel is still at war with Lebanon. It had deployed air, sea and land forces to rescue a team of its commandos sent in to raid Palestinian guerrilla bases near the coastal town of Naameh. The raid did not go as anticipated and the Israelis were soon engaged in a fierce fire fight with guerrilla forces. Israel, however, was able to evacuate most of them.

The December 9/88 issue of the New York Times contains an evaluation of the now "year long" (actually much longer) Palestinian Intifada and Israeli responses. Reporter Joel Brinkley hopefully proposes that the Intifada is running out of steam, running on inertia, with no new ideas being put forward by the Palestinians. Presumably it has shot its bolt. Fewer people allegedly are participating. When members of the Palestinian National Council recently raised the Intifada with Yasser Arafat, they were surprised that he had no new ideas either. Not even a recourse to armed resistance.

Israelis have come to take the Intifada as a matter of course, if they are part of the great majority who do not live in the occupied territories. The increasing brutality of the Israeli army is also taken for granted. The cumulative toll of dead and wounded are beginning to effect the sentiments of Palestinians, who allegedly are beginning to tire, despite the rage they feel. Who would think that the conflict could continue years into the future.

The Globe and Mail of December 14/88 reports that a Palestinian snatched a gun from a Jewish settler yesterday and killed him and another Israeli. He in turn was killed by units of the Israeli army who arrived on the scene shortly afterwards. "Palestinian sources said the Palestinian was a 25-year old shepherd named Hamdan Najar. They said he had been grazing his flock near Berakha, a settlement of about 20 religiously observant Jewish families..."

Elsewhere, four Palestinians were wounded in confrontations with Israeli troops, including a 13 year old boy shot in the chest. A round-the-clock curfew was also placed on the entire population of Gaza, some 700,000 people.

On December 17/88 the Globe and Mail reports a three day general strike has been proclaimed in the West Bank and Gaza to protest the killing of five Arabs in clashes with Israeli soldiers. (They were protesting and the Israelis were killing.)

"Defence Minister Yitsak Rabin accused radical Palestinians of trying to undermine the US-PLO talks. Rabin and other officials refrained from direct comment Friday after US and PLO delegates held their first direct meeting in Tunisia, but they reiterated their opposition to Washington's decision to speak to an organization which Israel considers terrorist. "You abandoned an important principle in the general American policy of opposing terrorism and waging war against it", Rabin said on Israel television."

However, in this case Rabin and his associates were the leading terrorists in the Middle East.

On the last day of 1988 the Globe and Mail (December 31/88) reports that Egyptian president Hosni Mubarak has assailed Yitzak Shamir for his dismissal of
a UN sponsored peace conference between the Israelis and the Palestinians. He questioned the Camp David peace pact between Israel and Egypt and called the PLO the general representative of the Palestinian people and its most moderate voice.

At the same time, the various organizations within the PLO ruled out a truce in the anti-Israel uprising. "In Baghdad, a second PLO spokesman was quoted as saying the organization rejects a new 'peace initiative' of Israeli Prime Minister Yitzak Shamir, which he described as aiming at ensuring Israeli occupation of the territories. Shamir had gone so far as to suggest that he might allow representatives of the Palestinians to attend some future peace conference - when and if it was convened.

Israeli troops had killed three more Palestinians and wounded a further 10 that day when they fired on protestors issuing from prayer service in Gaza. "'After prayers they raised the Palestinian flag and threw stones', an army spokesmen said. Palestinian reporters said soldiers used clubs, rubber bullets and live ammunition to break up the protest."

And so ended the first or the second year of the Palestinian uprising - stones against the Israeli army's bullets, tear gas, clubs and 'rubber' bullets. An extraordinarily heroic campaign of resistance against a brutal and hated occupier. One can hardly understand the courage which was required by the Palestinians facing the Jewish forces - possibly a bone deep desperation mixed with some millennial hope. There was more brutal repression yet to come.

South End Press "Intifada. The Palestinian Uprising against the Israel occupation" (1989) provides an appendix which lists the names and ages of all those Palestinians killed during the first year of the Intifada, December 1987 to December 1988. The total figure killed is 390 Palestinian men, women and children. Some 287 of them were shot by Israelis; they range in age from 5 to 75 years of age, mainly being teenagers. In addition are the names and death dates of 37 Palestinians who were killed in Israeli beatings and a list of 66 Palestinian who were killed by 'tear gas.'

If one remembers that the Palestinian population then hovered at something over 2 million persons, the death rate would be proportionally three to four times the 58,000 Americans who died in the ten year war in Viet Nam. Nor do the above figures include those severely wounded or permanently crippled by Israeli gunfire and clubbings. In late November 1988 the Globe and Mail reported that figure to be more than 7,000. In many instances the shootings left the victims crippled for life.

**The On-going Repression, 1989 and On**

Despite newspaper hype and the Israeli propaganda that the Palestinians have 'shot their bolt', 'that the PLO had lost its gamble', and that 'the occupied territories were returning to a semblance of peace and quiet', the Intifada continued through 1989 and into the 1990s. Jewish soldiers began racking up even higher death tolls in their shootings and clubbings. Jewish terrorists in the West Bank became ever more active, the Likud-Labor regime became more intransigent. The Jewish lobby in America rolled out its propaganda campaign about terrorists assailing peaceful Jewish settlers at an ever higher pitch. The world apparently settled down to an acceptance of the weekly toll of dead and injured coming out of Greater Israel.

Possibly the worst of it was that the Jewish population of the occupied territories ('Judea and Samaria') rapidly grew from about 50,000 to hundreds of
thousands in the following fifteen years, making their removal a near impossibility. Such settlement was stimulated by Israel through programs of tax relief and subsidized housing which was funded by American contributions and tax dollars.

This witnessed the growth of venomous racist-religious Jews drawn from throughout the world. Meir Kahane's dream seemed to be coming true, although he had yet to deal with the Jewish secularists. The Palestinians were forced into ever more marginal positions as new Israeli-controlled highways were built throughout the West Bank to link new Jewish settlements with Israel. These new settlements stole increasing amounts of the already very limited Palestinians lands. As a consequence of the Intifada Israel shifted to the use of low-paid contract workers from third world countries to take up the jobs previously held by Palestinians.

The Attempts to Silence a PBS Film about the Palestinian Intifada

In 1988 one Jo Franklin-Trout, for many years a co-producer on a PBS news program, had finished a 90 minute TV film entitled 'Days of Rage', dealing with the Palestinian Intifada from a Palestinian view point. It had cost around $180,000 to make, largely her own money, and she was looking for an American television channel to show her documentary. PBS (the Public Broadcasting Service) had picked it up and promised to broadcast it but after almost a year it remained unscreened. That was because of an orchestrated opposition to it from American Jewish lobby organizations. They rolled out their usual slanders, defamations and outraged indignation about the film.

Franklin-Trout's film is entitled Days of Rage. The Young Palestinians and that is what the film focuses on. The rage generated by all the restrictions, degradation, exploitation, beatings and killings committed against the Palestinians by the Israelis. And how this had boiled over into an ongoing wave of riots, stone throwing, and general resistance to the Jewish occupation forces. It contains very little commentary by the filmmaker and bases itself largely on what the Palestinians themselves say. It was shocking, outrageous, and intolerable to portray Israelis as a brutal and racist occupying power. It should be banned from the airwaves unseen and sunk into the uttermost obscurity, many American Jewish spokespeople held. It was also charged with being biased, simplistic, and anti-Semitic; even if what it depicted was essentially true.

One Chloe Aaron, a vice president of WNYC television (a city-owned station) in New York, said that she would not broadcast the film "under any circumstances, asserting that it was biased." Another New York television channel, WNET, had agreed to screen the film but only later in the year and after it had put together a panel discussion which would follow the film. The filmmaker replied that PBS was yielding to pressure which was being put upon it, while PBS denied that there was any pressure to suppress the film. However, Ms. Aaron, a former programming executive with PBS, said she had previewed the film and "decided the station would neither sponsor the film for PBS nor show it when the 333 other PBS affiliates do in September. 'It's one-sided... It makes no mention of how the Jews got to Israel, no mention of the Holocaust, no mention of how the Palestinians treated the Jews, nor how Arabs treated the Palestinians. It's purely a propaganda piece that I'd compare to Leni Reifenstahl's 'Triumph of the Will.'" (New York Times, May 2/89) Sure, right.
In short, *Days of Rage* is not Zionist propaganda and is therefore unsuitable for screening in the US. This from a programing executive of a PBS station in New York.

Similar executives of other PBS stations agreed that the film was biased but held that it nevertheless provided some valuable information on the Arab-Israeli conflict. They all felt that it required introductory and following commentary from 'balanced sources' to put the film in the proper perspective.

On May 29 /89 the *New York Times* runs a long piece by Walter Goodman, one of its Israel boosters, outlining another 'documentary' about the Palestinians and Jews. *'Arab and Jew. Wounded Spirits in a Promised Land'*. It is a two hour 'balanced' documentary allegedly dealing with both Israel and Arab responses and was produced from a novel by David Shipler, a former bureau chief at the *New York Times*. This is the film 'one should really watch', says Goodman, regardless of whether *Days of Rage* is later broadcast or not.

"The history of the encounters between Arabs and Jews is told largely through the people who lived and fought and continue to fight them [i.e from Jews], from the early Zionist settlements to Israel's war of independence in 1948 and the wars that followed up to today's 'intifada', the uprising in the occupied territories." In short, it is another one of the endless Jewish propaganda pieces issuing from the American film industry.

Goodman tells us that "The probings of *'Arab and Jew'* are in contrast to the tendentiousness of *Days of Rage*. Although Mr. Shipler finds a human equivalence between Arabs and Israelis...he stops short of making any political equivalence. Strong and sensitive though the work is, it does not assume to judge the claims or perils of Palestinian nationalism or the desirability of a Palestinian state... Ms. Franklin-Trout shows no such restraint. She is an advocate for the Palestinians, who are given most of these 90 minutes... Mostly, Israelis are seen as armed soldiers pushing around defenseless villagers." Well, Mr. Goodman, that is the face which Israel showed to Palestinians and the world, isn't it?

Goodman notes that the packaging envisioned for *Days of Rage* is that it will be presented in a 'frame' of [probably dismissive] commentary which "presumably will indicate how the film differs from the American concept of fair journalism and with a panel discussion that will allow for contrary views," (New York Times, May 29/89) Right – fair journalism.

On July 20/89 the *New York Times* runs a piece entitled 'PBS to Show Film, on Intifada Despite Protests'. The packaging of the film will cost as much as it took to produce the original. Although *Days of Rage* had not yet been screened publicly, a Stella Giamassi, a spokesperson of WNET (a PBS affiliate) said the station had already received some 2,500 letters about it, 70% of them denouncing the decision to show the film.

"Abraham Foxman, the national director of the ['anti'] Defamation League of B'nai B'rith said this week after seeing the film that PBS was acting irresponsibly in presenting it. "*Days of Rage* is an inaccurate, biased documentary which lacks historical or present perspective." Mr. Foxman added that while the League did not sanction boycotts, individual cancellations by public television subscribers would be a 'matter of conscience'.

Ms. Franklin-Trout declined to become involved in the 'packaging' which was to enshroud her film, and refused to appear on a panel discussion to be aired after its presentation. (New York Times, July 20/89)

The attitude of the Jewish lobby organizations and their supporters was that there was no such thing as an 'Intifada' other than a handful of juvenile
delinquents, probably sponsored by Arab oil dollars, willfully stoning young Israeli soldiers who usually resisted shooting them down. The lobby also rejected any claim that Israel had invaded Lebanon and carried out massacres there. They also disputed that there was a 'West Bank, other than the God given lands of Judea and Samaria which had been legitimately reincorporated under Israeli possession. All the rest was simply an example of the new anti-semitism which pervaded the American mass media. Luckily, Israel now had a large stock of its own nuclear weapons with which it would defend itself against the new anti-Semites. Days of Rage was simply an extreme example of attempts to humanize the Palestinian 'beasts who walk on two legs', to borrow a quote.

A week before Days of Rage is to be shown on PBS, the 'New Republic(an)', a right-wing journal owned and published by a militant American Jew, 'discovers' that the film's producer was on the cultural board of the Arab-American Foundation and that she had previously accepted a $33,000 contract from it for the purchase of copies of the film. Oh horrors - it is fatally tainted and suspect. A wave of protest immediately flows from Jewish 'human rights' groups, such as the B'nai B'rith. They demand that the film be pulled from PBS screening because it contravened its policy of showing any program sponsored by any group (ho, ho). (New York Times, September 1/89)

Walter Goodman of the New York Times pipes up again to remind readers that the producer, Franklin-Trout, is a member of the board of the Arab-American Cultural Foundation. He repeats that Days of Rage is simply pro-Palestinian propaganda and that Franklin-Trout "does not seem to have tried to verify the tales of atrocities. Their very telling conveys the passions roiling through the occupied territories and the readiness of so many youths to risk their lives in the Palestinians cause. The Israeli side of the story is treated differently. Even as we are struck by the pictures of severely beaten Arab children, it is evident that the documentary maker is working on our emotions. It is a loaded program." How can one answer this kind of double-think baloney?

He also notes that two pro-Israel documentaries are to be used to frame the showing of Days of Rage - presumably because the Jewish viewpoint is so seldom heard in America. (New York Times, September 6/89)

On the same day (September 6/89) the New York Times runs two commentary pieces side by side, one by Jo Franklin-Trout and the other by one Steven Emerson. Franklin-Trout merely says that her film was held up for a year before being shown and has had to jump over hurdles which no other documentary of her knowledge ever has. "'Why', she asks. 'Do we have a different set of standards for different people, especially the Palestinians? Intellectually the answer is no. In reality, the answer is yes."

"As I was finishing this film, PBS asked me to send a preliminary version to the Israeli Embassy. I said 'no'; it ended up there anyway. I have been asked to make a number of changes - some to correct inaccuracies, each designed so that stories Palestinians told would not 'offend'. As a journalist, I had not previously known that 'not offending' was a criterion for the decision to go or not to go with a story."

She also notes the scurrilous charge that the film was funded by the Arab-American Cultural Foundation, a charge which is patently false and completely manufactured. "It all seems a final and rather tawdry attempt to discredit a film that pressure was not able to remove from the air." Yes, that's how it seems to me as well.
Steven Emerson then presents a tawdry 'Fact and Answer' list of charges that the film was aided by the Arab-American Foundation, although he says nothing about whether what the film portrays is essentially accurate or not. It is to be written off as Arab propaganda and it is a disgrace that it is actually being shown in America. He suggests that a political investigation be made over Federal funding to those PBS stations which show it. "The public has a right to know who is funding or shaping the news, especially if foreign interests are involved. Perhaps if PBS won't follow this journalistic ethic, it should heed the law: The Foreign Agents Registration Act requires disclosure of all foreign sponsors of political lobbying or media presentations." Surely, he says, this should apply to Days of Rage. (New York Times, September 6/89) The ten-thousand fold greater Jewish lobby however should be excepted from such restrictions.

I suspect that less than one in a hundred American television viewers watched Days of Rage, and possibly one in ten or twenty of them were influenced toward a Palestinian viewpoint - given all the 'packaging' that was ultimately involved. However, all the high level charges and denunciations which preceded the film probably gave it a wider audience than it may otherwise have gotten.

On September 14/89 the New York Times runs an article by one Jeremy Gerard, who has rounded up some safe academic opinion to denounce Days of Rage. He also raises the question whether federal guidelines concerning 'political' viewpoints being excluded in PBS programs were being followed or not. He notes that a similar charge against the PBS network had recently been laid in its presentation of a film about Nicaragua, then under American assault. However, one PBS executive tells him that almost no program on their network does not have one external funder or another.

We will end our commentary on Days of Rage with two clippings from the New York Times of December 1/89. The first is yet another piece by Walter Goodman, who reviews a pro-Israeli film presented on PBS called 'A Search for Solid Ground. The Intifada Through Israeli Eyes. This account, unsurprisingly, does not raise any discussion nor does it require any 'framework' of dismissive reviewers. Richard Plepler, the executive producer, and Peter Kunhardt, said they got the idea the previous June when Days of Rage was generating so much indignation. In short, it is a knee jerk counter to that earlier documentary. The $380,000 it cost to make the film was readily obtained from assorted Jewish businessman and philanthropists who had been directed to the filmmakers by the Israeli Consul-General in New York. No foreign involvement there, of course.

Richard Hutton, the director of public affairs programming at WNET, a New York PBS station, when asked about whether there was any question about the point of view of 'Solid Ground', "notes that 'Solid Ground' begins with an announcement that no Palestinians were interviewed and that mainstream Israeli views are being expressed. So, if Ms. Franklin-Trout had preceded her program with a similar sort of declaration - that widespread Palestinian views were being expressed and few Israelis heard from, would PBS have been relieved of the obligation to provide balance?"

"I can assure those who paid for it ['Solid Ground'] that they are getting their money's worth. The few Israelis portrayed on 'Days of Rage' - champions of the Palestinian cause on the one hand, Arab haters on the other - have been replaced by Jewish families desirous only of living in peace with their neighbors, yet justifiably fearful of Arab intentions. Ms. Franklin-Trout's faceless Israeli soldiers lift their visors to show themselves as thoughtful, soft-hearted, youngsters forced to do disagreeable duty. In 'Solid Ground' it is the Arab world that constitutes the
faceless threat to the pretty children of a beleaguered land." (New York Times, December 2/89) What else would one expect from such an effort.

In the same issue of the New York Times, Jeremy Gerard reports that 'Solid Ground' was financed with help from the Israeli Consul-general in New York. PBS said that the involvement of the Israeli Consul-general does not violate its guidelines which preclude underwriters who have an interest in a program's point of view. WNET's director of public affairs said that "as long as there had been no editorial interference, the film did not violate the conflict of interest guidelines. ... Mr. Hutton said 'There was no link at all with anything having to do with editorial integrity. The producers have terrific track records." 'Track records' at what he didn't say.

This is about all I wish to say about the treatment of one single documentary about how Palestinians were being clubbed, maimed and shot by young, sensitive, Israeli soldiers who the Arab delinquents are throwing rocks at, simply because of a quarter-century of their treatment as third class pariahs in a land which had previously been theirs.

Chapter 15. Clubs, Gas and Machine Guns

The Year 1989

For this year I will reproduce only about 10% of the clippings available to me from the New York Times and the Globe and Mail. Most of the actions and policies of the Israelis have already been outlined in the previous year. The following two years cover more of the same - except that Palestinian demonstrations while becoming somewhat smaller witness a proportionally higher toll of deaths and woundings. The involvement of Jewish religious extremists also deepens.

On January 14/89 the Globe and Mail reports armed patrols of Jewish settlers at Hebron, in the occupied territories. These may be Gush Enumim fanatics. At the time there were some 70,000 Palestinians living in Hebron and some 400 recent Jewish settlers, come to reclaim the ancient lands of Israel. On this day two Palestinians died from shootings and 17 were wounded by Israeli troops firing upon 'rioters'.

On February 3/89 the Globe and Mail reports that one Rabbi Moshe Levinger has told Israeli Foreign Minister Moshe Ahrens that 'The settlers will never leave the West Bank. 'If the army withdraws from the cities,' settler leader Moshe Levinger said, 'we expect the most horrible things, riots and demonstrations of thousands... They [the Palestinians] will go out from the cities and conduct pogroms'." However, so far it is only the Jews who have conducted pogroms.

Elsewhere the Israeli army killed one 15 year old and wounded half a dozen others in villages near Jenin. They also arrested 24 schoolchildren for throwing stones and were holding them until their parents paid stiff fines.

The Globe and Mail of February 18/89 notes that Israeli troops have killed one teenager and wounded 17 others in stones versus machine gun clashes in the Nablus area. An 11 year old girl was shot in the head with a plastic bullet and was in serious condition in a near by hospital.

On the same day the Globe and Mail reports that United Nations Human Rights Commission condemned Israel "for what it called the savage treatment, torture and killings of Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza." The Commission 'accused' Israel of the following: killing Palestinians, including children, crippling youths by breaking their bones, savagely beating and maltreating women, torturing detainees, throwing tear gas bombs into houses, mosques and hospitals,
thereby causing death by suffocation; and imposing curfews and military sieges intended to destroy towns and villages.

Israel dismisses these charges as purely contrived by the anti-semitic forces which allegedly dominate the UN.

On February 20/89 the Globe and Mail reports that 11 Palestinians have been shot and wounded by Israeli soldiers throughout the West Bank and Gaza. Those wounded included a 14 year old shot in the stomach and a 12 year old hit in the leg. "In Jerusalem, shrieks and scuffles disrupted the funeral of a 21 year old Jewish soldier stabbed to death as he walked unarmed near the walled old city." He is the 16th Israeli soldier killed so far. Far more than 400 Palestinians have been killed and more than 8,000 wounded by the Israelis.

The New York Times of February 21/89 runs a long article by John Brinkley on those Palestinians permanently crippled by Israeli gunfire and beatings. He notes that after initial medical care there is no effective follow-up for the hundreds or thousands who have been permanently incapacitated. He takes the case of 19 year old Zuhriyeh Naji who was paralyzed from her waist down when struck by an Israeli bullet and now has to return home with no future before her. She and 24 other Palestinians were severely wounded in one day of demonstrations. Numbers have lost either arms and legs or have lost the use of them. Down the hall of a hospital ward, which they will have to evacuate to make room for new victims, sits one Mohammed Nasser, a 20 year old whose spine was damaged when hit by gunfire four months previously. He has relearned walking to a limited extent but his previous employer will not rehire him. Naturally enough, he is utterly despondent.

Others maimed have attempted to make a return to ordinary life but most of the Palestinians crippled and wounded seem to appear in no one's calculus of the costs of that uprising.

The March 15/89 issue of the New York Times tells the story of the Palestinian village of Beit Sahur, near Bethlehem, whose population is more the 80% Christian, who have been driven to a hatred of Israel. Once a relatively prosperous town with many merchants and workshops they have been cast into penury. Much of their land has been taken by Israeli settlers while the Palestinian population lives through long periods of curfew. Israelis troops make regular night time searches of the houses, creating a constant fear. The population is also regularly dragged out of their homes at night to paint over resistance graffiti which has been scrawled on walls.

A host of Israeli-imposed restrictions, ranging from passes required to move about to the number of cows that can be kept, impose humiliations on the inhabitants. Schools and universities have been shut down for most of the previous year. Many people are forced to draw on their meagre savings in order to live. It seems to be a process aimed at driving the population out of their village. The result is a combination of despair and rage.

"The depths of the alienation between Arabs and Jews is felt more intensely in this town of merchants and entrepreneurs - perhaps because Israelis once thought that Beit Sahur was an unlikely candidate for anti-Israeli militancy in view of its middle class nature and the fact that nearly 9,000 of its 11,000 people are Greek Orthodox. The residents of Beit Sahur, it was thought, also had a lot to lose by supporting a Palestinian campaign - but experts in Israeli and Palestinian affairs say the army gave them no choice."

The New York Times of March 24/89 runs an article on the Palestinian Diaspora, some two to three million in total. It notes that they and their children
have not abandoned their dream of an independent Palestine. In some countries, Kuwait for instance, Palestinian immigrants make up a substantial minority of the population and comprise an educated middle class. Said one Sabri Jiryis, a PLO official based in Nicosia, Cyprus, "Many Arab nations don't like the democracy or liberal-mindedness of the Palestinians. The usual Palestinian is more revolutionary, liberalized and modernized', he said. In some societies they don't like that."

The *New York Times* of March 30/89 notes that the Israeli army and police have refined their techniques in tracking down those who have engaged in the Intifada. Every Palestinian settlement in the West Bank and Gaza has been mapped in detail on aerial photographs, each house is noted on them, and a "string of observation posts is normally established on the perimeter of the larger settlements. Israeli soldiers stationed in these look out posts are equipped with powerful binoculars and night vision equipment: they are in radio contact with military centers. When trouble develops they can pin point its source immediately and contact Israeli troops.

They have also developed jeeps which carry canisters of projectiles which can be shot at demonstrators. Others have devices which catapult a large number of stones at those caught throwing them at Israelis. An Israeli commander of the group to which the *New York Times* reporter was attached proudly noted that Palestinian youths were now afraid of being hit by 'rubber bullets' and scattered when they saw Israelis aiming at them.

On April 7/89 the *New York Times* runs an opinion piece by rabbi Meir Kahane. It is entitled "The Guilt of the Jews Threatens Israel". That threat is allegedly the hesitation of Jews world wide to back Israel 200% in its struggle with Palestinians and with the Israeli failure to undertake the deportation of the entire Palestine population in Israel and the occupied territories. He tells us that "No one, no people, has so sadly honed guilt to a fine art than we Jews. There are, invariably, those liberal Jews who instinctively feel guilty about everything - whether they had anything to do with what's wrong or not. It is a fascinating form of pathology, worthy of a dissertation in abnormal psychology and suggesting the need for some form of national couch."

Kahane asks "What causes Jewish liberals to take the Arab position on every issue?"... The terrible ghosts of Jewish guilt gnaw away at the tortured Jewish liberal soul with the thought that perhaps the Jews are indeed 'occupiers' and colonialists... He wallows in a corrosive guilt what rapidly becomes self hate." Kahane is very big on attributing 'self hatred' to any Jew who does not back his own brand of Orthodox Jewish fascism.

The *Globe and Mail* of April 28/89 reports on the activities of a shadowy group of Jewish ultra-rightists calling themselves the *Sicari*, after a band of Jewish assassins in Roman Judea who murdered Jewish collaborators or anyone who met with their disfavor for whatever reason. So far they have concentrated on killing Palestinians randomly and terrorizing Israeli leftists by setting fire to their homes or spraying graffiti on their walls. They had left a collection of live bullets in front of the house of a Jewish grandmother who works in an Arab health clinic. This week they claimed responsibility for torching the home of the publisher of two of Israel's leading newspapers, including *Ha Aretz*, which has been prominent in reporting the Palestinian uprising.

This group claims responsibility for the shooting of four Arabs who had been sitting on the grass near the Jaffa Gate in Jerusalem. A lone gunman dressed in an Israeli army uniform sprayed them with a submachine gun and then escaped. One
died and three others were seriously injured. The attacks of the Sicarim are increasingly directed against Israeli leftists.

"The group's members appear to be linked to the ultra-nationalists settlers movement, which seeks to annex the occupied West Bank and Gaza Strip. In one telephone call, a member claimed allegiance to the Kach political party of US-born Rabbi Meir Kahane, which which was outlawed as racist last year." However they have also attacked the right-wing Prime Minister as a 'traitor' who will return "Jewish land to Arab hands" in a peace treaty.

Most of the original Sicarim committed suicide in the mountain fortress of Masada some 2,000 years ago. Unfortunately, this does not appear to be the fate of their current emulators.

The Globe and Mail of April 29/89 reports Israeli Border Police criticized after a probe of village 'massacre'. An army inquiry found that a unit of Israel's brutal Border Police fired excessively but did not commit "...an intentional massacre in a West Bank village this month... Five Palestinians were shot dead and about 20 more wounded in the pre-dawn raid April 13 in the tiny village of Nahhaim." The dead ranged in age from 16 to 29 and the wounded from very young children to elderly men of 64 years. These murders were carried out by about 30 Border Police during the Moslem holy month of Ramadan. The commanding officer was reprimanded for use of excessive force.

The New York Times of May 1/89 reports that two Israeli cabinet ministers have demanded that Jewish settlers be allowed to shoot more freely if they perceive themselves "to be threatened by Arabs'. Said one Avner Shaki of the National Religious Party, a Minister without Portfolio, "A rock should be seen as a weapon, like a firebomb, a knife, a bullet or a bomb." The debate followed the arrest of a West Bank settler from Kiryat Arba who had shot and killed a 14 year old Palestinian boy near Hebron. Another settler had shot a 10 year old girl in the head because she was stoning his car, he said.

On May 3/89 the Globe and Mail reports that Israeli occupation troops in Ramallah had tied a Palestinian boy to the hood of their jeep to prevent anyone throwing stones at them. Elsewhere in the West Bank the Israelis shot a 7 year old girl in the head and a 90 year old man in the face along with wounding four others.

The Globe and Mail of May 5/89 reports that Jewish settler-vigilantes in the West Bank set fire to a packed mosque and fired at those escaping, wounding five. Also "Knesset member Yossi Sarid said Israeli troops in the occupied West Bank broke the arms and legs of bound Palestinian prisoners whom they left lying on the ground... Mr. Sarid quoted unidentified officers as saying they were ordered by a lieutenant colonel to arrest 12 wanted Palestinians in the village of Huwwara and break their arms and legs." This will become a common policy in the Israeli army.

The New York Times of May 27/89 reports that four Israeli soldiers were acquitted of the beating death of a 43 year old Palestinian, one Hani Shami, who had attempted to protect his son whom the soldiers were pursuing because "they suspected him of throwing stones at the soldiers. The father tried to stop them from entering his house." The soldiers then beat him unconscious with their rifle butts. He was then taken into Israeli custody, blindfolded and handcuffed." He died while in custody. The court ruling today said so many other soldiers beat or kicked the man after his detention that it was impossible to determine who killed him." This has become a recurrent ruse by Israeli judges. The four soldiers were absolved of manslaughter charges.
Three other Palestinians were killed that day and 17 wounded. "The soldier's defense lawyer, Uzi Atzmon, said today that the trial had 'proved that the orders given to the Givati [Brigade] soldiers were to use force and beat those disrupting order' rather than to subdue protestors before arrest." The soldiers face the possibly of three years in jail but will probably escape with a slap on the wrist. Some fifty similar cases have already been heard in courts martial.

Reporting on the same case, the Globe and Mail of May 26/89 noted that the trial had received considerable coverage in Israel because it was an exemplification of Defense Minister Yitzak Rabin's policy of applying "might, power and beatings" against the Palestinians. The four soldiers charged held that they had not been issued clubs therefore they used whatever came to hand to beat the father.

The head of the military tribunal called the beating death a "grave incident". "'Beating to death is a phenomenon that shocks any civilized nation' he said, calling the case, 'a shocking picture of degradation'."

"The courts also blamed a faulty internal military investigation for making it impossible now to determine which soldier's blows actually killed Mr. Shami." It was of course impossible to find them all guilty of murder. "In handing down its conviction on the charge of cruelty, the military court found that Gaza strip commanders exceeded the orders of the high command and handed down 'patently illegal' orders to beat Palestinians after their arrests."

Anyone who thought that this decision would curtail such acts by Israeli soldiers was sadly mistaken.

The Globe and Mail of May 27/89 reports that a vigilante group of West Bank settlers "shot up a [Palestinian] West Bank village yesterday in the second vigilante raid in two days, wounding at least three people and damaging houses and cars." Ariel Sharon immediately toured Jewish settlers communities in the West Bank to lend his support for their actions.

The 1,200 Palestinian residents of the village of Arura, some 30 kilometers north of Jerusalem, said they had been invaded by 20 to 40 heavily armed Jewish settlers yesterday who began shooting at houses and people in the streets. The village leader said Israeli soldiers arrived three hours after the attack began and clashed with the stone throwing villagers. "'On Thursday night, hundreds of settlers from Kiryat Arba in the West Bank fired into Arab homes on the outskirts of neighboring Hebron. ...Aharon Domb of the settler-run Hebron information Center said the raid was in response to fire-bomb attacks on two Israeli owned cars."

The Globe and Mail of May 27/89 reports that Jewish settlers on the West Bank are inflamed about the trial of their spiritual leader, the Rabbi Moshe Levinger, on charges of have having shot and killed a Palestinian shopkeeper a year earlier. He claims that he emptied his machine gun against Arab protestors and just happened to hit the shopkeeper. In any case, they are all simply Palestinians living on land God reserved for the Jews.

The reporter talks to a Mr. Yehiel Leiter, who arrived from the US five years earlier to move into a hill top settlement in the West Bank. He says that "We're dealing with a tribal society where you'll have blood flowing through the streets no matter what... But my blood is no less red than theirs and I have the right to protect it." He teaches 'Jewish philosophy' in Jerusalem,

Zeev Schiff, the prominent writer on Israeli military affairs, says that the army is on the verge of losing control of the West Bank with "settlers organizing by the hundreds to carry out acts of vengeance against Arab settlements and are willing..."
for the first time to physically harm army officers who try to prevent them from carrying out their illegal actions."

Jewish settlers from Hebron, with a population of 70,000 Palestinians and 400 Jews, have staged reprisal raids on the Palestinian population there and in surrounding villages in the past few days. Settlers from nearby Kiryat Arba "drove a bulldozer though a neighbourhood in Hebron, uprooting trees and fences and smashing a car with West Bank licence plates."

On May 30, the New York Times reports that Jewish West Bank vigilantes have shot and killed a 14 year old Palestinian girl who was demonstrating against them. Settlers have clashed with Israeli forces trying to restrain them, but so far there were no deaths on either of the Jewish sides. So far they just kill Palestinians.

The Globe and Mail of June 3/89 reports that "Jewish settlers yesterday attacked and beat Israeli peacemakers trying to deliver food and medicine to Palestinian children in Gaza Strip refugee camps... The developments followed a raid by Jewish settlers on a Palestinian refugee camp. A 13 year old girl was shot dead." On the same day an Israeli court Ordered five Jewish seminary students jailed because of a rampage in a Palestinian village they were involved in.

"The seminary's spiritual leader, Rabbi Yitzak Ginsburg, justified the slaying and said the blood of Jews and non-Jews cannot be equated. 'We have to recognize that Jewish blood and the blood of a goy are not the same thing,' he told Israel Radio. 'Every law that is based upon equating goys and Jews is completely unacceptable.'"

The Vancouver Sun of June 3/89 reports that 'Israeli settlers launch a counter intifada'. It reveals a host of other rabbis and leaders with the same outlook as the Rabbi Ginsburg mentioned above.

"A thirteen year old Palestinian girl, shot dead by a band of about 30 settlers during a reprisal raid Monday in the village of Kifl Harith, was the first fatality in a campaign of growing violence that has the tacit support of many settler leaders." Actually there were many previous cases.

Groups from settlements such as Kiriyat Arba, Maale Adumim and Ariel have also been involved in retaliatory raids against Palestinians, which the Israeli army cannot prevent, of course. Army leaders now fear the possibility of an armed clash between themselves and the Jewish settlers. One Rabbi Ginsburg had led a march of his Yeshiva students through a Palestinian village where they were pelted with stones. "A few hours later, about 20 students from the school, the tomb of Joseph Yeshiva, aided by a dozen heavily armed settlers rampaged through neighboring Kifl Harith, setting fire to houses and fields and smashing windows of houses and cars and firing at villagers who threw rocks and bottles at them. The rabbi justified this action saying "'It is important to show that the land of Israel belongs only to the people of Israel'. He said the religious law commanded that 'If someone rises up to kill you, you will kill him first'.""

The 400 Jewish settlers in Hebron, under similar rabbis, were also active in threatening the Palestinians with guns and bloodthirsty rhetoric.

On the same day, June 3/89, the New York Times reports on the growing racist militancy of the Jewish settlers. After the stoning of a settler's car by Palestinians in the village of Azariya, hundreds of armed Jews descended upon it and burned houses and cars while shouting 'Death of the Arabs'. North of the village of Kifl Harit about 30 Jewish youth stormed in, set fire to houses and fired at Palestinians found in the streets. Elsewhere, Jewish settlers are reported to have attacked a member of the Israeli 'Peace Now' movement. As well, three Israeli
journalists from Hebrew language newspapers were beaten by settlers from the town of Ariel.

An unspecified rabbi in the West Bank proclaimed that the biblical prohibition against spilling blood applied only to Jews killing other Jews and did not apply to non-Jews. Jewish settlers have decided to take matters into their own hands because they claim the army actions have not been harsh enough to crush the Palestinians, who they hold are mere interlopers in the land which God gave the Jews.

On June 6/89 the Globe and Mail reports that Israeli president Chaim Hertzog has reduced the jail terms of three settler-killers from life to ten years imprisonment. This means that they will probably serve something like 5 years in prison for a long string of murders committed against Palestinian civilians "[They]...were sentenced to life in 1985 for a 1984 attack on the Hebron Islamic College in which they shot dead four Palestinians and wounded more than 30 others. The three were members of a 'Jewish underground' group that maimed two West Bank Arab mayors in a 1980 bombing, planted bombs in 16 Arab buses, and tried to destroy Jerusalem's al-Aqsa mosque.

On June 16/89 the New York Times reports that four Israeli soldiers have been sentenced to prison from 6 to 9 months for beating to death a Palestinian prisoner "...the court found that so many other soldiers beat the man after his detention that it was impossible to determine who actually killed him." The soldiers were acquitted of manslaughter but found guilty of acting with brutality. "The court also ruled that the men had exceeded orders that were in any case unlawful."

The New York Times of June 20/89 reports that Prime Minister Shamir will use an 'Iron Fist' to crush the Palestinians after a settler from the town of Ariel was stabbed and killed yesterday. Settlers send a deputation and banners to Jerusalem to protest Shamir's 'lack of action' in suppressing the Palestinians. In a radio address Shamir vowed that 'Samaria will be ours' and that Palestinians must give up their dreams for a Palestinian state."

On the following day, June 21/89, the New York Times reports that hundreds of settlers attending the funeral of Freidrich Rosenfeld (a former American Marine), the settler who had been stabbed the day before, screamed 'Traitor' at Yitzak Shamir when he tried to address them. One man shouts "Rosenfeld. God will redeem your blood, as a man of Ariel who fell in the field at the hands of cruel murderers." As Shamir left the gathering he was surrounded by settlers shouting 'revenge' and 'traitor'. "After the funeral, a Jewish settler reportedly disguised as an Arab opened fire on several Palestinian laborers standing by the side of the road near Tel Aviv."

The next day, June 22/89, the New York Times reports that Shamir has warned the Knesset about the threat of Jew fighting Jew, "an insane phenomenon which must be prevented at all costs." Former Israeli army chief of staff, Rafael Eytan, leader of the small right-wing Tsomet party, berates Shamir for not cracking down on the Palestinians harder. That is the only response which the settlers can propose. Imagine.

The Globe and Mail of June 23/89 runs a long article by Dr. Gabor Mate on the kinds of wounds inflicted on the Palestinians by Israel gunfire and beatings. He notes that ward after ward of Palestinian hospitals are filled with the injured of the Intifada, some to recover but many others being crippled to some extent for life. Some of the injuries, especially those caused by 'rubber bullets', are quite gruesome. He also notes that partly because of the severe water shortages
imposed by settlers tapping off the water supplies, but also because of the miserable living conditions, parasites infest about one half of the children in Gaza. He notes that an honorable minority of Israeli doctors have volunteered to aid the victims of the Intifada.

On June 27/89 the Globe and Mail reports that "...Rabbi Yehuda Amital, head of a rabbinical college in the occupied West Bank, warned that a Jewish underground is forming. He told Israel Radio 'there are extremist fanatic groups that have lost all trust, not just in the government and army but also in the people.' Settlers have staged a growing number of armed raids on Arab villages to avenge stone throwing attacks."

The July 1 issue of the Globe and Mail contains an article by one Carol Rosenberg enthusing about a militarily protected hamlet of some 30 west Bank settlers living beside Palestinian villagers. She supervises hikers who are recent immigrants from Canada and the US. Most of the men are armed and one Miriam Leser, a 55 year old from Brooklyn, is packing a pistol. "This proves that the people who came here mean business," said Mrs Leser. "...She said Israel should get tougher with protesting Arabs and advocated the expulsion of troublemakers. 'It's not like we're putting them in no-man's land or in a crematorium. They have somewhere to go', she said, adding that many Palestinians have cousins in neighboring Arab countries." "Mrs. Leser, who [allegedly] survived the Bergen-Belsen concentration camp, said she recoiled from comparisons which Palestinians and others make between the Israelis and the Nazis." I bet she does.

The New York Times of July 4/89 runs an article saying that in the West Bank hiking is a political act, at least in the form that such hikes take. Settlers organized by the Gush Enumim (Bloc of the Faithful) have organized groups of armed Jewish youth to march through Arab fields and villages, past markets and mosques, singing Israeli songs. The past Friday some 48 such marches were staged throughout the West Bank. Among themselves they revile Yitzak Shamir and call for his resignation because of his lack of toughness toward Palestinian demonstrators.

A West Bank settler, one David Wilder, agreed that the hikes were a provocation but "We've been in Judea and Samaria since 1967...If a Jew walking through the land which has been his home for the last 20 years is still a provocation, then it's time that is stopped."

In the previous 18 months Palestinians have born 127 such invasions by settlers. The Israeli Center for Human Rights has documented some 20 cases of Jewish settlers murdering Palestinians. Only one Jewish settler has been convicted for such murders so far.

In an article taken from the Jerusalem Post the Globe and Mail of July 6/89 notes the increasing killings carried out by a Jewish underground. The number of slayings of Palestinians by Jewish gunmen, who then disappear without trace, has markedly increased in the previous weeks. Jewish settlers have also entered Palestinian villages firing indiscriminately at people and houses. What Jonathon Immanuel worries about, however, is the prospect of Jew killing Jew. There have already been as yet nonfatal attacks on peace activists and reporters by West Bank settlers. Those on the left in Israel now fear what assaults Jewish extremists may next carry out against them.

The New York Times of August 29/89 reports that "In East Jerusalem, Rabbi Moshe Levinger, a leader of the Jewish settlers, capitalized on the press coverage of the opening of his murder trial by demonstrating at the home of Faisal
Husseini, a Palestinian leader who spent 19 months in jail without charge before his release several months ago.

"Rabbi Levinger, a founder of the militantly rightist Gush Enumim movement lives in the Arab city of Hebron. He is being tried for the killing of a Hebron [Palestinian] merchant in September... Before going to municipal court in Jerusalem today Rabbi Levinger led journalists in a protest by 50 of his supporters to Mr. Husseini's East Jerusalem home. Carrying signs calling Mr. Husseini the No 1. man representing the Palestine Liberation Organization in the West Bank, the demonstrators shouted for Mr. Husseini to be tried in Rabbi Levinger's place."

"The protestors drew Mr. Husseini out of his home and into a shouting match with Rabbi Levinger. Television crews, photographers and reporters strained to record every word. Rabbi Levinger shouted 'Why are you here? To kill Jews! You are the biggest terrorist in Israel!'

'Was it me who killed someone with his pistol?' Mr Husseini snapped in return, to which Rabbi Levinger replied 'It was my duty, since every day you send Arabs to kill Jews.' Mr. Levinger is one of the growing number of machine gun rebs.

After the end of Levinger's trial, after being found guilty of murder, he is sentenced to a total of five months in prison. He returned to his flock as a hero.

The same issue of the Times also reports a growing exodus of both Palestinians and Jews from Israel and the occupied territories. For the Palestinians it is totally understandable, but for the Israelis it is a combination of a stagnant economy and a certain disgust with what Israel has become.

The September 7/89 issue of the New York Times carries an advertisement from a group called "Americans for a Safe Israel". It holds that Israel should extend from the Jordan river to the sea and that the homeland of the Palestinians is Jordan, to which they should return if they don't like living under Israeli rule. It also mentions that 100 US Generals and Admirals who have stated that a strong Israel is in America's best interest and that such strength demands that Israel retain all the lands west of the Jordan.

The Globe and Mail of October 4/89 reports that one Abbie Nathan, a leading peace activist in Israel, has been sentenced to six months in prison for meeting with Yasser Arafat and other PLO officials to discuss the question of a Palestinian-Israeli peace. Meeting with the PLO or any other organization classified by Israel as a 'terrorist organization' is illegal in Israel. It seems that discussing peace conditions with any Palestinian organization is also illegal. Mr. Nathan claims not to be down-hearted by his conviction and promises to go on pursuing peace talks when he leaves jail. "Peace", other than the peace of the conqueror over the conquered, would seem to be a form of anti-Semitism in Israel.

On October 11/89 the New York Times carries a report from the Palestinian town of Beit Sahur, in the occupied West Bank. It begins with the account of a 60 year old Palestinian wood carver whose carvings have all been confiscated, including assorted crosses for non-payment of Israel taxes. The carver is one of some 60 families in that town to have had possessions confiscated. They were withholding their taxes as symbolic protest against the Israeli occupation - and also the fact that most of the taxes collected from poor Palestinians are utilized in the interests of wealthy Israelis. Many Palestinians have had their homes stripped bare by the teams of Israeli tax collectors, protected by Israeli troops.

"Defense Minister Yitzak Rabin said Tuesday that Israel would teach a lesson to Palestinians who refused to pay taxes in Beit Sahur." The lesson, apparently is that
a ruthless occupying power can loot anything and everything from an indigenous people within the lands it occupies.

The Mayor of Beit Sahur notes that the small factories in his town have been dismantled and shipped off by the Israelis. "This is going to mean that all factories, all workshops, all shops are heading for a shutdown... It is beyond my imagination what will happen next." (*New York Times*, October 11/89)

On October 23/89 the *Vancouver Sun* runs a commentary by Lawrence Freedman which notes that the rights of Palestinians in Israel are far fewer than those of Blacks in apartheid South Africa under the de Klerk government. Freeman holds that Palestinians in Greater Israel make up a very substantial minority and that the restrictions under which they live are nearly all encompassing.

The *New York Times* of November 16/89 runs a story dealing with the endless curfews which are imposed on most Palestinian communities and how people are trying to cope with them. Not all do. "A teenager became the 600th Palestinian to die in the 23 month old uprising, according to an unofficial count. The youth, 17-year old Odeh Zayed, was shot by troops in the Kalandia refugee camp on Tuesday night when he violated a curfew to prepare for street celebrations, a neighbor said."

On December 1/89 the *Globe and Mail* reports that Israeli Foreign Ministry officials and senior government spokespersons are raising the question of whether Israel should again invade Lebanon in order to halt Syrian domination and help reinstate a friendly government there. This sounds too crazy even for Israel to get involved in.

The *New York Times* of December 22 notes that the Israeli Army today said it would begin sealing off the homes and making parents of youngsters caught throwing stones pay heavy fines. This will apply especially to children under 12 years of age, which the army cannot now jail. One army spokesperson estimated that some 60 percent of the stone throwing was committed by youths under 13 years of age. The Israeli army spokesman says that in lieu of fines the army will cart off an equivalent amount of possessions owned by the Palestinian family.

Also on December 22/89 the *Globe and Mail* reports the conviction of four Israeli soldiers, including a woman, for administering severe beatings to prisoners held in a detention camp in the Negev desert. "Witnesses told the Jaffa military court that beatings were the norm. ...The indictment against the four soldiers listed 22 beating incidents at Dhhririya detention camp in March. The defendants shared in a common desire to take vengeance on Arab prisoners suspected of hostile actions against the army... They did not choose their victims, but beat any prisoner that came along."

The *Globe and Mail* of December 23/89 notes that three Palestinian youths had been slain today while an Israeli patrol was searching a house for a suspected rock thrower. One was the sixteen year old sister of the suspect. Two other Palestinians had been shot the previous day under exactly the same conditions. A 12 year old girl died in hospital today after being severely wounded by an armed Jewish settler. She had been shot in the back of the head by a passing Israeli motorist.

The *New York Times* of December 26/89 reports a Palestinian prisoner died last year after extensive beating by the Shin Bet secret police. This revelation follows a similar death reported two days previously. Apparently the Shin Bet hasn't changed one iota in its treatment of Palestinian prisoners from the way it behaved in the 'bus hijacking' case of 1984.
"The Security officials said today that Mr. Ali had become ill during the investigation but denied using force against him. The six hour autopsy yesterday revealed that Mr. Ali died as a result of repeated blows and the resulting internal bleeding. He also suffered injuries to his back, legs and testicles."

The *New York Times* of December 30/89 notes that Israeli police broke up a rally by Arab and Jewish women calling for new peace efforts by the Israeli government. "The police fired tear gas, pulled demonstrators by their hair and struck them with night sticks to break up the peace march in Jerusalem by more that 3,000 Israeli, Palestinian and European women. The police did not give any reason as to why a peaceful march was broken up - unless demonstrating for peace is now illegal in Israel.

The killings go on among the Palestinians. The army apologized for the shooting of two 12 year olds who were standing near some masked men and were mistaken for terroristic stone throwers.

The *Globe and Mail* of December 30/89 carries a letter-to-the-editor by one Robert Liss who wonders why all the uproar about the Israeli treatment of the Palestinians. After all, if they throw stones they obviously have to be shot. As for the term 'occupied territory' he notes, "What part of the world could not be considered occupied territory? Canada? Certainly native people would argue that point. ...What about the occupied territories of Eastern Europe - or Siberia for that matter? ... The truth is that the resurgence of the Jewish people into a nation once again is not something easily digested by most people in the world - Moslem or Christian. A fact not easily faced until one searches one's soul."

If people will consult their souls they will recognize that the emergence of a thoroughly racist and brutal Jewish state is a marvel of resurrection. Fascism with a Jewish face.

*Once again I must note that the events surveyed above comprise only a very small portion of even those reported in the two major newspapers surveyed.*

**The Year 1990**

The first third of 1990 was dominated by newspaper reports about the mass migration of Jews from the former Soviet Union to Israel as well as the problems they face/create there. Of the circa 200,000 Soviet Jews who have chosen Israel during the last 20 years only about 1 to 2 percent have settled in the West Bank. There they rapidly develop a racist attitude toward the Palestinians and in no way add to whatever 'progressive' element there still exists in Israel.

By 1990 Soviet Jewish immigration to Israel was running at from 5-10,000 persons a month. Where they will live, how they will be integrated into the Israeli economy, is as yet uncertain. Israel has launched a massive campaign in America to obtain funds for housing and retraining these immigrants. It is expected that within a decade some 1 million Soviet Jews will become Israelis.

With Knesset members evenly balanced between Likud and Labor, minor parties are taking an increasing role in making demands for their support. This is especially true for the various orthodox religious parties, whose demands aim to establish a type of Jewish theocracy. They oppose any peace with the Palestinians and with transferring any land to them.

Accounts of the on-going Palestinian intifada have by now tapered off considerably in the western press. I will here present the merest handful of such references.

On January 4/90 the *Globe and Mail* reports that the government of Israel has vehemently denied accusations by Amnesty International that it has approved
and carried out assassinations of Palestinians in the occupied territories. These are normally 'suspects'. "Amnesty International said that these rules seem to allow 'the unjustifiable killing' of people who may not be doing anything violent.' They note a pattern of encouragement for such killings within the Israeli government. Some Israelis even boast about this program of assassination of Palestinian leaders.

The *Globe and Mail* of January 20/90 reports that Prime Minister Yitzak Shamir has addressed a congress of his Likud supporters on the need for Israeli to retain the occupied West Bank as a place to settle the Russian Jews streaming into the country. This policy was protested by American officials who allegedly were attempting to retain this region for something like a Palestinian state. Also, on January 30/90 the *New York Times* reports that the Rabbi Baruch Abu-Hatzer a, a leader of Israel's North African Jews, has called upon Israel not to negotiate with the PLO. He says that negotiations were correct in the past but it is now too late. He suggests that Israel hold on to the West Bank and cede Gaza to the Palestinians if need be. This has recently become the case.

On February 21 the *New York Times* runs an article entitled 'State Department Says Israel Still Violates Arab Rights'. "The United States said today that Israeli soldiers continued to violate the rights of Palestinians in the occupied territories, causing 'avoidable' deaths and injuries." The report noted that 434 Palestinians were killed the previous year by the Israelis and that there had been a substantial increase in the numbers of human rights violations. It pointed particularly to the fact that "...military authorities in the occupied territories regularly enter Arab houses without search warrants. Such forced entries result in 'beatings, destruction of property and arrests' the report said." It also noted the number of Palestinian houses which had been blown up or sealed off by the Israelis.

The *Vancouver Sun* of February 26/90 (still not a neo-Conservative rag) runs an article called 'The Israeli Vigilantes'. It reports 600 delegates at a 'Congress of the State of Judea' held at Kiryat Arba, a new Israeli town built on a strongly defended hill overlooking Hebron. Activists from Meir Kahane's Kach and similar groupings are represented. They fulminate about their 'betrayal' by the state of Israel and its army. "If they let us manage the area we'd solve the Intifada. It would be over in one day,' said Tiran Pollack, head of the movement's paramilitary arm... I can put 250 armed men into the field on patrol, linked by walkie-talkies' said Pollack. 'Everywhere the army doesn't go, we do.'" The movement's methods are not hedged about by legality as are those of the army. "'The IDF has been humiliated' said Pollack. 'The soldier can't react. When they see what we do, it helps their morale. We're not bound by [Defense Minister] Rabin's instructions.'"

One Michael Ben Horin says "'If you said tomorrow that the penalty for throwing a stone was death, there would be no more stone throwing'." In an interview alternating between abuse of the government and a messianic discourse delivered in an apocalyptic baritone, Mr. Ben Horin "...said he didn't want to kill a single Arab but that all Arabs should leave the West Bank. They're the occupiers', he claimed. 'They have to go - in agreed fashion - to countries where there is plenty of petrol, land and water.'"

The *Globe and Mail* of February 27/90 reports that the Israeli army in imposing a curfew in the Gaza strip had killed one and wounded some 20 Palestinians. Elsewhere in Gaza UN relief officials said the 38 other Palestinians had been wounded with 'rubber bullets' and some 100 treated for tear gas
inhalation in a refugee camp. The Intifada has now lasted 26 months since it officially started.

On March 8/90 the New York Times reports that 7 Palestinian women have been wounded in an Israeli attack using tear gas and 'rubber' bullets in Jerusalem. They were part of a demonstration of 200 Palestinian women celebrating International Women's Day and would not disperse when the Israeli police told them they could not march because they did not have a permit. Elsewhere in the West Bank, two Palestinian youths were shot with live ammunition, while in Ramallah a 17 year old Palestinian woman was shot in the head with a "rubber coated metal ball as marchers converged on a Red Cross office."

The New York Times of March 9/90 reports that Israeli officials were thrown into an uproar by US President George Bush's questioning whether East Jerusalem was part of Israel or occupied Palestinian territory. "The last time Jerusalem's relationship to the other occupied territories was raised in a contentious manner was in 1980 when the Carter administration voted in favor of a Security Council resolution condemning all Israeli settlement activity in the territories, "including Jerusalem.""

Bush also decried Israel's growing settlement in the West Bank and holds that Israel has in the past simply disregarded international opposition. Yitzak Shamir is immediately on the phone to the US President making Israel's position clear.

On March 12/90 the New York Times notes that in a meeting Israeli Labor party leaders have decided to break from their official participation in a coalition government with the Likud.

On March 17/90 the New York Times reports that American Jewish leaders have ended a two-year boycott of meetings with the Pope over charges of alleged anti-semitism in the Polish church. They immediately raise the question of the potential rise of anti-semitism in the newly emerged republics of the former Soviet block.

On March 20/90 the New York Times reports that former US president Jimmy Carter "criticized Israel today, accusing the military of abusing the rights of Palestinians by shooting demonstrators without cause, demolishing their houses and jailing Arabs without trial... "There is hardly a family that lives in the West Bank and Gaza that has not had one of its male members actually incarcerated by the military authorities," There was no Israeli response to his statement but another two 17 year old Palestinians were killed on that day.

On March 24/90 the Globe and Mail reports that the Palestinian Red Crescent Society (an analogue of the Red Cross) has issued a report which holds that $58.8 million are needed to improve the health of the more than 2 million Palestinians living in the occupied territories. It was based on a plan for an integrated health care and hospital construction program to be introduced over the next ten years. Even apart from the 10,000 wounded Palestinians, it said that infant morality had soared during the previous two years of the Intifada. It also noted that drastic curtailment of health care spending on Palestinians over the previous ten years and noted that it now constituted less than one third per capita of that of the Israeli health system.

On March 27/90 the New York Times reports a speech given by one Rabbi Sliezer Menachem Schach, a leader of the tiny Torah Flag party of ultra-orthodox Jews, who reviled Israel's Labour party for having cut ties with Jewish traditions and adopted 'secularism' instead. He called upon all 'religious Jews' to not support a Labor government. His two member party could deliver the Knesset into the hands of Yitzak Shamir's Likud since the Israeli election created an exact 60 to
60 member standing in the Knesset. The Times notes that "Some call the rabbi a visionary. Others see him as a Khomeinist."

Much of the news from February to April revolved around the mass emigration of Soviet Jews to Israel, with supportive mass demonstrations in America. One such demonstration in New York is replete with a sea of signs reading 'Let my people go' and speakers who expatiate on the new freedom they found on emigrating to Israel. (New York Times, April 2/90) How many will later emigrate to America is unknown.

On March 31/90 the New York Times reports that tens of thousands of Palestinians and Israeli Arabs held rallies and protest marches to mark the 14th anniversary of Land Day, when riots broke out to halt the confiscation of Arab land by the Israelis in 1976. The Israeli police intervened, as usual.

On April 3/90 the Globe and Mail cites a number of 'Washington think tank analysts' who hold that the Intifada is at the point of petering out and that the Israeli-Palestinian 'peace process' is about to make some real headway. Unfortunately this will prove to be sheer hoakum.

From April 13 to April 24/90 both the New York Times and the Globe and Mail note a developing conflict between the Israeli government and Christian churches in Jerusalem over the introduction of new Israeli settlers into the old Christian Quarter of that city. The Greek Orthodox church and its mainly Palestinian membership is particularly incensed by this move, which has previously witnessed fanatic Jewish Torah students and their teachers simply evicting Palestinians from their homes in the Muslim quarter and turning their houses into Jewish schools. The Greek Orthodox church holds that it owns a 72 room complex which it had leased to an Armenian who had no right to sell or sublet the property to Jewish residents. They were particularly indignant that this was done during Easter weekend. The complex had been renamed the Dwellings of David by the 150 ultra orthodox Jewish settlers who have occupied it. A crowd of many Greek Orthodox priests and some thousand supporters was dispersed by Israeli police using tear gas. The Jews said they had bought the building from a Christian owner.

Old Jerusalem is comprised of the Moslem, Christian, Armenian, and Jewish quarters. Something over 50% of the population then was Moslem. "Yossi Achimeir, spokesman for Prime Minister Yitzak Shamir, said Arab Christians were being unreasonable." (New York Times, Globe and Mail, April 13/90)

The New York Times of April 16/90 reports deepening protests about the new Jewish settlers in the Christian Quarter while a Jerusalem magistrate's court ruled that the so-called 'Dwelling of David' was owned by the Greek Orthodox church. The settlers are appealing this ruling to a higher Israeli court. The move of the Jews into these new quarters was accompanied with singing and dancing. Jerusalem mayor Teddy Kolleck "...urged Jews to consider 'how they would feel if singing and dancing Christians or Muslims moved in to the Jewish Quarter on Passover'."

On April 19/90 the New York Times notes that an Israeli higher court ordered the Israeli settlers to be evicted from the building they occupy. They make an appeal to a still higher court, holding that the building is now a hotel for pilgrims operated by a company registered in Panama.

On April 23.90 the New York Times reports that the Israeli government had admitted that it secretly helped finance the Jewish settlers takeover of the Orthodox Christian building in Jerusalem to the tune of $2 million. Another $4 million had come from unspecified Jewish sources in the US. This followed Israel's
early denials that it was in any way involved. It is feared that this may in some way interfere with the $400 million aid Israel has requested from the US to pay for housing for Jewish immigrants from the Soviet Union.

April 24/90 the New York Times notes that Christian clerics in Jerusalem and in the West Bank plan to close their shrines in protest to the Jewish seizure of Christian property in Jerusalem. It is as yet uncertain how long or how widespread these closures will be. Israel's greatest source of foreign currency comes from tourism, including the pilgrimages of Christians to holy sites. Jerusalem mayor Teddy Kolleck said he had openly deplored the settlers take over of the church property because he could see it would cause trouble. "False messianism has never brought the Jewish people anything other than trouble" he said.

The New York Times of April 25/90 reports that the leading Jewish lobby organization in the US, the America-Israel Public Affairs Committee, has warned the Israeli government about the consequences of backing expanded Jewish settlement in Jerusalem's old city. It said the American Jews would not back Israeli support of these new settlers. Various spokespersons of Jewish organizations in America announced their concern over Israeli actions there. One Robert Lipton, president of the American Jewish Congress, said that "Jews will give sacrificially to settle Soviet Jews in Israel but they will not do so if these funds are to be diverted surreptitiously to the provocative settlement of religious fanatics."

The George Bush I administration conveyed its anger over the developments and hinted that it may make the passage of expanded aid moneys to Israel more difficult. At present the US government conveys circa $3 billion annually to Israel, with an additional $400 million for the housing of Soviet Jewish immigrants. This is in addition to the private funds raised by Israelis in America.

In a sharply worded statement the Israeli Foreign Ministry declared "It is the right of Jews to live everywhere, and to purchase or rent property in all parts of the land of Israel, especially Jerusalem." The Israeli Minister of Housing, David Levy, said "The case at hand is one of an ordinary commercial real estate transaction... Presenting the leasing as an affront to the Greek Orthodox Church or an infringement of its rights contradicts the facts."

That evening Israeli troops surrounded the building complex and the neighboring Church of the Holy Sepulcher. Jonathan Blass, a spokesman for the settlers said "In the United States, would they remain quiet if Jews were not allowed to live someplace because it happened to be next to a church?" However, he also held the non-Jews should be barred from living in the Jewish Quarter of the old city, because of its "unique character. (New York Times, April 26/90)

On April 27/90 the New York Times reports that the Israeli Supreme Court ruled today that the Jewish occupation of the St. John's Hospice it had acquired in the old Christian Quarter was illegal and ordered that the settlers be removed and only enough people left in it to guard and maintain the building until their occupancy was ruled on by a lower court. "Dan Avi Issac, a lawyer for the settlers said the 'guards and maintenance employees who stay will be ideological Jews, with some idea of making a Jewish settlement in every part of Jerusalem'."

Also on April 27/90 the Globe and Mail reports that Israeli soldiers have fired into a Palestinian crowd throwing stones at an Israeli military base in Gaza, killing three and wounding some 120 people. Israeli jeeps with mounted machine guns, armored personnel carriers, and army helicopters came to the assistance of the Israeli troops. The Israelis placed various refugee camps and settlements in Gaza and the West Bank under curfew.
On April 28/90 the Globe and Mail reports that 10 churches and one mosque in the old city of Jerusalem have closed their doors as a protest to the continuing occupation of a Greek Orthodox hospice by ultra nationalist Jews. Described as 'a day of mourning', the Greek Orthodox, Latin, Anglican, Armenian, Coptic, Ethiopian, Greek Catholic, Lutheran and Syrian Orthodox churches and one mosque were closed but their bells tolled for three hours. "Archbishop Michael Sabbah, the Latin Patriarch of the Holy Land told reporters: 'The problem which we pose as Christian leaders is, after 10 years, 15 years, will we still find Christians around the holy places?'" Yitzak Shamir repeated the homily, "Every Jew has the right to live anywhere in Jerusalem." (And apparently to take over whatever Palestinian property they can.)

On May 4/90 the Globe and Mail reports that the Israeli military has imposed a curfew on most of the 120,000 Palestinians living in the city of Nablus so that a 100 Jewish settlers and politicians could hold a ceremony at the Tomb of Joseph, in the heart of that city. The ultra-nationalist Jewish settlers sang and danced their way to the site while most foreign newspapers were barred from sending reporters to cover the event. "Mr. Shamir's party and other right-wing parties say Jewish settlers serve as both a security buffer for Israel proper and a signal to the world that Israelis have no intentions of withdrawing from any of the territories, considered by religious Jews as part of the biblical Israel promised to the Jews by God." God had apparently changed his mind for two thousand years, but now the Jews have made up his mind for him.

The Globe and Mail of May 8/90 reports that an Israeli general has caused an uproar by suggesting that Prime Minister Shamir fire senior army commanders for failing to crush the Palestinian uprising by now. Major-general Moshe Ben Kochba was a member of the Irgun underground in British Palestine. "He went public after the army rejected his recommendations two months ago to use tanks and more live ammunition to quell riots in the West Bank and Gaza strip." Other Israeli commanders said that the use of tanks against civilian demonstrators was against the army's code of behavior and was 'immoral.'

On May 15/90 the New York Times reports that after a lengthy trial in which the Rabbi Moishe Levinger claimed he was merely defending himself against 'Arabs' when he sprayed a Hebron street with machine gun fire and killed a Palestinian shopkeeper (no apologies tendered). In the year since he was first charged with 'manslaughter' he has been out on bail and has been leading Gush Enumim thugs in attacks on Palestinian spokespersons and Jewish peace lobbyists. On first being charged he strode the steps of the Israeli courthouse brandishing a revolver which he claimed he needed to defend himself. The trial has been prolonged by Levinger's venomous speeches. On conviction, his supporters angrily denounce the anti-Semitism of the Israeli courts.

In one photo Levinger stands, a gaunt, smirking, middle-aged man, with bulging fanatic's eyes, wearing his yarmulke. He looks surprisingly like a portrait of the 15 century head of the Spanish Inquisition, Thomas de Torquemada. Levinger is given a five month sentence for murdering a totally inoffensive Palestinian shopkeeper. This story is presented to the world as an example of Jewish justice at work. Levinger was one of the founders of the Gush Enumim (Bloc of the Faithful) movement in the West Bank, whose aim is to drive all Palestinians out of Palestine.

On Sunday, May 20/90 a 21 year old Israeli ex-soldier by the name of Ami Popper lined up some 50 Palestinian laborers and opened fire on them, killing
seven. He has since been found to be "deranged and upset by an unhappy love affair." He will be sent to a psychiatric facility for counseling.

The New York Times of May 22/90 reports a broad swath of demonstrations and stone throwing by Palestinians enraged by the murders of Palestinians throughout the West Bank, Gaza and within Israeli itself. Seven more Palestinians were killed by the security forces and some 722 wounded by Israeli gunfire in the intervening two days.

"The burst of Palestinian and Israeli rage defied recent Israeli statements that the revolt is waning. "The intifada is like the ocean, said a Palestinian reporter... The waves go up and down but the sea continues". Israel's 650,000 'Arabs', normally placid, had joined in the enraged demonstrations. They coincided with the Shamir government's search for allies on the right and its announcement of the construction of new highways and new Jewish settlements in the occupied West Bank.

The Globe and Mail of May 23/90 reports at least five more Palestinians were killed in clashes with Israeli troops. Elsewhere, the Globe and Mail reports that Arab foreign ministers accused Israel of trying to drive the Palestinian people out of the occupied lands to make way for their new immigrants. Amnesty International accused Israel of encouraging the killing of unarmed Palestinians by security forces.

Amazing as it may seem, there has still been no armed Palestinian response to more than two years of Israeli killings.

The Vancouver Sun of May 24/90 notes that US Secretary of State James Baker is pondering whether to support a move to send UN observer teams into the West Bank and Gaza to see if they can check Israeli actions. "Earlier Wednesday Israel accused the United States of perpetrating trouble in the territories by linking the latest unrest to a lack of progress toward Middle East peace... Israeli Foreign Minister Moshe Arens, who is usually restrained, took issue with Bush on several radio and television programs. 'We have heard of a connection between the tragedy in Rishon LeZion [where a young Israeli murdered seven Palestinian workers] and the policies of the Israeli government... It is clear to any well-meaning person there is no such connection'."

Arens bitterly noted that any number of mass murders by deranged persons occur in the US without anyone connecting their acts with their government. As he spoke, one million Palestinians were locked in their homes living under a curfew. On the same day, in a Gaza village, Mustafa al Fajem, an eight year old Palestinian child was killed by shots fired from a passing police car. Israeli authorities said they would investigate.

On June 11/90 the Globe and Mail reports the following: "Israeli soldiers beat a blind 68-year old Palestinian to death in a Gaza Strip refugee camp when he tried to prevent them from hitting his nine year old grandson, his family said yesterday... The family said soldiers broke into their home on Saturday about 10 p.m. When they began hitting nine year old Naim with gun butts, Mr. Abu Zenada tried to guard him and was beaten until he died... The army said soldiers went to the house for a search and the old man collapsed and died of heart failure... The army would not comment on whether the boy was beaten. He said the soldiers wanted him to denounce activists."

Other Palestinians said about 40 soldiers raided homes in the neighbourhood at the time, delivering beatings and injuries which had to be treated in hospitals.

The Globe and Mail of June 15/90 reports that hundreds of rioting Jews rushed into a Palestinian neighbourhood today and hurled stones at houses after
an 'Arab' woman was accused of stabbing an Israeli boy. "After dark, angry Jewish residents blocked a major road in East Talpiot, the Jewish neighbourhood where the stabbing took place. They shouted 'Death to the Arabs' while others drove around in their cars honking the horns." They also attacked a neighboring 'Arab' village, pelted the houses with stones and set fire to the olive groves.

"Meanwhile, the Israeli army yesterday reduced the sentence of an officer who tear gassed a UN maternity clinic in the occupied Gaza Strip on Tuesday, injuring 66 'Arab' babies. The officer, jailed for 10 days following the incident, claimed that Palestinian activists inside the clinic had been throwing stones from windows. Yesterday, the army reduced his punishment to a 21-day suspended sentence."

The Globe and Mail of June 25/90 contains a letter-to-the-editor by one Ruth Rifka Abrams. She notes that the Globe and Mail, despite its new format, is still up to its old anti-Israel slander. In regards to Israeli troops tear gassing Palestinian babies, she says that the Israeli soldiers' ethical standards are the light of the world.

"Is this an attempt to equate Israeli moral standards with that of the Iraqis who used lethal gas poisoning against 5,000 of their own Kurdish citizens?" She also notes that western newspapers treat stone throwing as a 'trivial activity.' "The tear gassed children in Gaza will recover. That [Jewish] wounded baby will never be the same."

What about the nearly 1,000 Palestinians killed by Israelis and the 20,000 wounded? Will they ever be the same again?

There is a three month gap in my data from June 25 to October 8, 1990. However the demonstrations and killings and woundings go on as before.

On October 8/90, as Palestinians emerge from the Al Aqsa mosque on Temple Mount, Jerusalem, they begin to shout insults and throw stones at some Jews praying at the wailing wall below them. The Israeli police, which had been standing ready, begin to fire 'rubber bullets' but quickly shift to firing live ammunition into the crowd of Palestinians. As a result some 18 Palestinians are killed and 20 to 30 more wounded. This action triggered the most wide spread rioting which has occurred in the West Bank since it was occupied by Israel in 1967.

The following 10-14 days of demonstrations and rock throwing by Palestinians throughout the West Bank and Gaza are invariably met by Israeli gunfire. Within those two weeks something like an additional dozen Palestinians are killed by the Israelis and some 880 wounded by gunfire. Think of it - 880 people shot and wounded in a little over ten days, after the Intifada is said to have sputtered out. (New York Times and Globe and Mail, October 8/9/90)

A three man commission to investigate the event is established by Yitzak Shamir and reports its findings on October 27/90. The inquest noted that Palestinians had been fearful at rumors that ultra-nationalist Jews intended to lay a cornerstone for the rebuilding of the biblical Jewish temple on the place now occupied by the al Aqsa mosque. While it faults the Israeli police for being insufficiently prepared for the outbreak it holds the 18 killings of 'rioters' completely justified.

The inquiry also reports that while there was insufficient police action early on, their use of live ammunition to suppress the 'rioters' was justified. It blamed Palestinians for starting the clash and the police chief for failing to avert it. Its conclusions seem unlikely to silence international condemnation of Israel, which has refused to allow a United Nations investigation. Avi Panzner, a spokesman for Mr. Shamir, held that the commission's findings were 'a very adequate report'. 
"The whole tragic event and the tragic loss of life started as a result of a provocation by Arba extremists on the Temple Mount. All in all, I think the police did a good job." [emphasis added] (Globe and Mail. October 27/90)

Following the Temple Mount killings the Israeli government of Yitzak Shamir introduced a tightening of police presence in East Jerusalem. Some 30,000 Jewish civil guards, men who are not now in the military, are to be formed to protect civilians from Palestinian reprisals. Elsewhere, the followers of recently assassinated Meir Kahane "have made death threats to [Israeli] politicians and journalists they see as hostile to their cause. Several of the targets have been placed under armed police guard." (Vancouver Sun, November 12/90)

On November 1/90 the Globe and Mail reports that the US announced it is holding up additional aid to Israel to settle the influx of Jewish immigrants from the former Soviet Union until it is sure that such aid will not be used to displace Palestinians. This raises a great furor within the ranks of the Jewish right in Israel and America. David Levy, Shamir's Minister of Housing, replied that Israel would press ahead with the settlement of Jews in the West Bank regardless of what the US does. Presumably he feels that he can rely on the Jewish lobby in the US to continue the annual $3+ billion subsidy that nation provides to Israel.

The Globe and Mail of November 5/90 notes that almost 300 Palestinians have been wounded by Israeli gunfire over the weekend in the Gaza Strip following the alleged 'suicide' of a PLO activist in Israeli detention. On the same day, UN Secretary General Javier Perez forwarded a proposal signed by 164 signatories to the Geneva Accord on the Protection of Civilians in Time of War which discussed protecting Palestinians in the occupied territories. Israeli Health Minister Ehud Olmert replied that "The thought that we will be judged by the biggest murderers in the world seems to me on the face of it something we should not agree to." The 'biggest murderers in the world' in this case meant the overwhelming majority of members of the UN.

On November 6/90 Shamir's Attorney General Yosef Harish is barely defeated in a Knesset vote which had intended to strip Parliamentary immunity from a Palestinian member who had been involved in a plan to transfer about 100 Palestinians located in Cyprus back to Israel. The parallel with the 1946 voyage of a ship called the 'Exodus', carrying Jewish refugees from Europe to Palestine, was probably intended.

The Globe and Mail of November 10/90 reports that "Former Israeli Prime Minister Yitsak Rabin warned the international community yesterday [in Toronto] that 'chaos in the world would follow any concessions to Iraqi President Saddam Hussein' ... All the evil forces - Yasser Arafat, Yemen - have gathered together around Iraq. Extreme elements in other countries came out publicly in support of Saddam Hussein's policies. Once Saddam Hussein has proved to be a failure...the evil forces in the region will suffer a setback." This childish Sunday school moralizing is from a leader of the alleged 'Labor' party of Israel.

The Globe and Mail of November 13/90 reports that Israel has finally agreed to accept a UN emissary - but only one - empowered to investigate the Temple Mount/Al Aqsa killings. Israel had already rejected the UN Security Council's condemnation of the killings. David Levy, Israel's Foreign minister, said that he had discussed the situation with the US and that "The Americans will take steps to remove the subject from the Security Council agenda." Mr. Levy also said that Israel was not prepared to discuss the Temple Mount matter with any UN emissary.
The Globe and Mail of November 14/90 reports that Israel has jailed three more Palestinian leaders without trial. These include Radwah Abu Ayyash, the head of the Arab Journalists Association, one Ziad Abu Zayyad, an alleged leader of the PLO in Palestine, and a Dr. Ahmed Yasiji, a doctor who had worked in the Shifa Hospital in Gaza and who was alleged to be also connected with PLO.

On November 15/90 the Israeli Labor Minister said he was considering a policy in which Israel would cut the 120,000 Palestinians employed in their country to about a half and replace them by Jewish immigrants arriving from Russia. This was backed by statements from Economics minister David Ley a few days later.

On the same day a follower of the late rabbi Meir Kahane stabbed a Jewish butcher shop owner in Jerusalem along with his Arab employee, police said. The butcher had refused to fire his employee and they were both attacked and injured. Mr. Kahane’s supporters have sworn to avenge his killing last week in New York by an Egyptian-American."

The Globe and Mail of November 27/90 reports 'Israelis beginning to get a feeling of claustrophobia'. "A series of bloody border incidents has given Israelis a feeling their frontiers are closing in on them. In the latest attack, a gunman crossed the Egyptian border near the Red Sea port of Eilat and killed four Israelis on a desert road... On the Jordanian border, where an unofficial peace has reigned since 1971, guerrillas have killed two Israeli soldiers this month." The article goes on to provide accounts of the ongoing conflict with the bombing of Lebanon.

Nor is this sense of claustrophobia restricted to Israel’s borders since Palestinian counter attacks on Israelis are beginning to take place almost everywhere in Israel and the occupied territories. All of this has an increasing effect on Israelis, despite the voices of the ultra-nationalists who proclaim more of the same and call for an increase in the repression. (Globe and Mail of November 27/90)

An article in the Globe and Mail of November 30 by one Carol Siegel notes that the recent killings along Israel’s border have re-raised questions about Arab-Jewish coexistence. She reports the views of a number of Israeli men from West Jerusalem who had fought in and been wounded in conflicts with Arab nations and with Palestinians from 1948 to 1988. They generally feel that the conflict goes back to the original Jewish settlement of Palestine at the beginning of the century and hold that the only permanent solution is the expulsion of the entire Palestinian population from Israel and the occupied territories."

On December 4/90 the Globe and Mail reports the arrest of a number of Palestinians who set a bomb which killed a Jewish-Canadian tourist. Moreover, the leadership of Hamas in the Gaza Strip has called for the use of firearms instead of the stones and firebombs to oppose the Israelis. Sections of the PLO also seem to support this shift. It is remarkable that it has taken almost four years for them to reach this point.

The Globe and Mail of December 10/90 reports that the government of Israel launched a suit against a Canadian publisher over a book which exposes the Mossad, the Israeli foreign secret service. Israel is suing Stoddart Publishing $2 million for publishing Victor Ostrovshy’s By Way of Deception, an account of that intelligence service and its actions during the recent past. It apparently has sold 450,000 copies in the US. A similar suit by Israel was thrown out of court. Mr. Ostrovsky had been a Mossad agent for a number of years in the mid 1980s and had signed a contract never to reveal anything that he had learned there. A larger print run is expected for a forthcoming paperback issue.
The December 12/90 issue of the *Globe and Mail* reveals that the $400 million obtained by Israel earlier in the year to help settle emigre Jews from Russia (in addition to its yearly levy from US taxpayers) has been used up and that Yitzak Shamir is lobbying Washington politicos for additional 'special funds' for this project. Shamir said nothing about an alleged 'peace process' which was to involve Palestinians and Jews. After more than ten years of talks it would be discarded by Shamir's successors. President George Bush 1 had also apparently been subdued by the American Jewish lobby and raised no more questions about the Temple Mount killings.

The *Globe and Mail* of December 15/90 reports that some members of the Palestinian resistance have decided to resort to firearms in opposing the Israelis, even if this will mean their deaths. They plan to use small armed groups to attack the Israelis, as well as keeping the mass demonstrations going. This change seems to have followed the Temple Mount massacre of Palestinians. As of yet, armed resistance has not emerged but one unnamed Palestinian militant said "Israel only hears the language of violence." That is seemingly true.

The *Globe and Mail* of December 18/90 notes that the Orthodox Jewish religious parties in Israel have gained greater influence since Yitzak Shamir's majority depends upon them. A number of new laws were either passed or promised, increasing the application of ancient Jewish religious laws on both the 'observant' and the secular in Israel. The first was a law banning any sexually suggestive ads and signs from appearing in that nation. That certainly gets to the core of Israeli problems. Also, municipalities were given the right to ban any activities on the Sabbath and other Jewish holidays which they may deem to be impious. (For example, swimming or shopping on Friday.) Laws stipulating that only Orthodox rabbis can perform marriages and that any children born out of orthodox wedlock may be considered to be 'bastards' are also expected. "Opposition members of parliament argued that the new religious law would alter the 'status quo agreement' between the non-religious majority and the observant minority."

And so ends my account of the ongoing intifada. Israeli soldiers and police continue to shoot, club and tear gas Palestinian demonstrators. The Israeli jails and internment camps continue to be filled with Palestinians, tried and untried. The Israelis continue to apply long term curfews to Palestinian settlements, recurrently reducing the inhabitants to hunger. Palestinian hospitals continue to be full of those wounded or crippled in the conflict. The Israeli bombing raids on Lebanon also continue. The intifada will continue throughout 1991 and 1992 and gradually peter out after that, only to be briefly taken up again at the beginning of the next century.

By 1991 Israeli troops have long since become inured to shooting, clubbing and killing unarmed Palestinians - of all ages and both sexes. They routinely chase whomever they think has been throwing rocks into their own homes, breaking down doors if necessary, threatening everyone inside and dragging out anyone they feel like. Their victims are usually given a sustained beating. Occasionally they beat their prisoners to death.

Houses of those implicated in the resistance are now increasingly blown up; the inhabitants are given 15 minutes to evacuate them. Other houses are permanently sealed off. Beatings and unofficial murders in the Palestinian prison camps also continue. The rare Israeli soldier or policeman convicted of such acts of 'excess' faces only minimal consequences or none at all. The prison wardens
invariably expatiate about the good treatment given Palestinian prisoners and how a particular case is an aberrant exception.

The Palestinian demonstrations have apparently grown fewer and smaller, although at times break out with all the intensity they witnessed in the recent past. If the numbers of Palestinians involved have decreased, the numbers killed and wounded does not. The Israelis are simply killing and wounding more of those engaged in demonstrating and stone throwing.

By the end of the Intifada in the mid 1990s almost 60,000 Palestinians will have been arrested and jailed for varying lengths of time and subjected to various degrees of beatings and calculated humiliation. Some 1,600 Palestinians will have been killed by gunfire, clubbings and the use of tear gas. The numbers wounded by Israeli gunfire or otherwise seriously injured are untabulated but by late 1989 were said by the western press to stand at approximately 25,000. Many will remain severely injured or crippled for life. Virtually every Palestinian in the West Bank and Gaza must by now have been personally touched by the Israeli repression. If not themselves than to someone who is kin or a friend.

The Intifada Continues, 1991 - 1994

The following is merely the briefest outline of developments in Palestine during the next four years.

The Vancouver Sun of January 2/91 carries a report from Israel by one Michael Sheridan. The account begins with driving through the West Bank in a settlers' convoy, which is stoned and with the Jewish occupants returning machine gun fire. He shifts to a scene in a posh Jerusalem hotel. It is a public relations exercise mounted by West Bank settlers who distribute a leaflet bearing a photograph of a Palestinian man murdered by his neighbors for collaboration. It is graced with a caption reading "There is no one to talk to. There is nothing to talk about." This is the settlers' response to the alleged 'peace talks' going on between Palestinian representatives and the Israelis.

Starting with some 61,000 settlers in 1987, their population has grown many fold. They are housed in California-style dwellings in new settlements scattered around the West Bank. They have even established some small factories in the region. This housing is heavily subsidized by the Israeli government and ultimately paid for by US funds. "Israeli flags surmount a podium on which an 'International Relations Task Force' sits ready to expound on the virtues of the Jewish settlement in occupied territories".

The same issue of the Vancouver Sun notes that four more Palestinians have been killed by Israeli troops on the eve of a visit by the United Nations General Assembly president. "The UN Security Council ended 1990 with an urgent meeting on violence in the occupied areas, and Tuesday's clashes were bound to increase attention on the issue while Israel wants the world to focus on Iraq's invasion of Kuwait... [Yitzak] Shamir added, 'We are keeping a low profile, but our country and our people face a serious threat from the Iraqi dictator, whose staunchest ally is the PLO'."

On January 4/91 the Vancouver Sun reports that Israeli Defence Minister Moshe Arens had addressed a conclave of visiting Canadian Jews, saying that in regards to Canadian foreign policy "There is nowhere to go but up in that relationship." He also suggested that 'rich countries' like Canada should provide far greater financial assistance to Israel than has been the case. He also criticizes Canada for joining 14 other countries in the United Nations Security Council.
which had condemned Israel's handling of the Temple Mount killings in the previous October.

The Globe and Mail of January 5/91 reports that Israelis have killed at least eight Palestinian demonstrators during the previous week. The Israeli military leaders talk about launching a crack down. Meanwhile, "The [UN's] Security Council called upon Israel, 'the occupying power', to comply fully with the Fourth Geneva Convention of 1949, which defines the rights of civilians in military zones. Its statement referred to 'all the Palestinian territories' occupied by Israel since 1967, including East Jerusalem."

American and allied forces are now close to launching a war against Iraq, who some months earlier had invaded and added Kuwait to its territory. Kuwait had been taken from Iraq by British colonial forces in 1920. Israel has been placed on a war footing and has its own plans of devastating Iraq but the Globe and Mail of January 11/91 notes "that the intrusion of Israel in that war would quickly shift Arab opinion in the region and...could generate opposition by other Arab nations."

To return to Palestine, on January 30/91 the Globe and Mail carries an article about how the Palestinians in the occupied territories have been under a curfew since January 16, the beginning of the American war on Iraq. Their condition is now becoming desperate, as many families have now run out of food and are going hungry. The Middle East Watch organization was also concerned about those Palestinians who have broken the curfew and were treated with the 'rough justice' [i.e. brutalization] meted out by Israelis. All incomes from jobs have been curtailed as well as the small scale farming efforts which Palestinians had used to eke out an existence. Health clinics and hospital care are also also largely curtailed. "Israeli loudspeaker vans patrol the region announcing that anyone breaching the curfew were risking their lives... The Israeli ambassador to Canada, a Mr. Goldstein, held that the curfew was what 'any country would do it under these circumstances."

On January 31/91 the Globe and Mail contains a comment by one Stephen Vizinczey, an emigre from Red Poland and a Canadian writer now living in London. He too repeats all the atrocities which Saddam Hussein is alleged to have committed, as he clearly saw in television accounts. He urges America to make full use of the Israeli airforce and ground forces. In 1982 they alone bombed and destroyed Iraq's fledgling nuclear plants and shot down all Iraqi planes sent against them. Vizinczey holds that all Arab governments which do not respect human rights and western civilization must, if they threaten the peace, be dealt with summarily. Some "...are asking us to leave our enemies in their warlike mood with their faith in ultimate victory over the infidels unimpaired. Which is why peace in the Middle East can be created only on the same basis as the peace of Europe at the end of the Second world war, which was founded on the decisive, absolute and total defeat of Hitler's Germany." So speaks a Polish avatar.

The Globe and Mail of February 4/91 carries an article about the Roman Catholic patriarch of Iraq who said "...Israel must be made to understand that Middle East peace is impossible without a Palestinian homeland." Speaking about Iraq he said "It wasn't a war, it was genocide, a destruction of a civilization, of an entire nation... They (the allies) have killed more people than the population of Kuwait. How can the conscience of the world accept that?" The same issue also contains an article entitled 'Home a detention center for residents of Nablus,' attempting to give a picture of what it is like to be a Palestinian locked up in one's home for 19 days without any access to anything outside it.
On the same day the *Globe and Mail* reports that Yitsak Shamir had appointed an Israeli fascist to his cabinet. One Rehavam Zeevi is the leader of the Moledet (Homeland) party and was a strong supporter of Rabbi Meir Kahane. Zeevi had previously campaigned for the deportation of all Arabs living within Greater Israel and their economic replacement by incoming Soviet Jews.

On February 6/91 the *Globe and Mail* reports that Israeli planes have again struck alleged guerrilla bases in Lebanon, killing seven and wounding over a dozen people. This followed a rocket attack on the Israeli-occupied zone in the south of Lebanon. "Israeli Prime Minister Yitzak Shamir said in an interview published today that there was no doubt that the rocket attacks were the result of an agreement between Mr. Arafat and Iraq's Saddam Hussein." Sure, sure.

The March 2/91 issue of the *Globe and Mail* contains a tribute to American imperialism by one Paul Koring. He emphasizes Hussein's use of chemical weapons against his own people in March of 1987 and resurrects Iraqi 'history', as known to him, going back over 2,000 years of dictatorship. He does not note that Iraq was where all civilization began some 6,000 years ago.

Koring notes that what remains of Hussein's rule may soon be overthrown but that America has lined up with a covey of right-wing autocracies whose wealthy are very wealthy and whose poor are poor indeed.

Another article in the same issue of the *Globe and Mail* deals with the Israeli decision not to hold "elections" for representatives to a "Palestinian parliament" because it says that voters would be intimidated by the PLO. Benyamin Netanyahu says that he fears that the Palestinians will be coerced into voting for PLO candidates and that Israel refuses to talk to members of the PLO, who are 'terrorists.' "I think that what we have to recognize is the state of war which the Arab world still imposes upon Israel", said Mr. Netanyahu. Who was it who launched the majority of wars in which Israel has been engaged over the previous 40 years?

On March 7/91 the *Globe and Mail* reports that Israel is planning to build 23,000 new houses for an additional 88,000 Jewish settlers in the West Bank. This follows a US payment of some $400 million for new housing in Israel. That was in addition to the $3 billion a year it transfers to Israel as aid.

On March 8/91 the *Vancouver Sun* reports that Yitzak Shamir has been pressured by his allies in Parliament to reopen a debate about Palestinian self-rule, without any question of changes in Israel's current boundaries. Ariel Sharon and other hard liners have argued to completely scrap any such talks. "Israel should not only abandon this peace initiative, it should demand the demilitarization of the Middle East as a precondition for peace talks", said Sharon. He was supported by various far right and ultra-religious parties which have made this government possibly the most reactionary in Israel's history.

On March 9/91 the *Globe and Mail* publishes an account of a Palestinian reporter who had been sent to an Israeli internment camp. He had almost no sleep for eleven days and questioned while he was hooded. He was then transferred to a tent prison camp where he and other Palestinians were kicked and yelled at by their guards but which was better than what he had previously experienced in the Central prison. When he was released 2 months later he had lost 33 pounds in weight.

On March 18/91 the *Globe and Mail* reports that Ami Popper, the young Israeli who murdered seven Palestinians, was sentenced to life imprisonment for this deed. The judges "...called it 'an unprecedented, abominable deed..." And so it was. Who knows when he will be released from prison for good behavior.
The *Vancouver Sun* of March 26/91 reports that "The Israeli government is openly encouraging Israelis [civilians] to 'shoot to kill' any Palestinian who appears to threaten their lives or those of others. 'If any Israeli, whether a policeman or not, sees someone with a knife trying to kill, he should shoot', said Police Minister Romi Milo."

Defence Minister Moshe Arens also called for the institution of a nation-wide pass system, at least for the Palestinian population under Israeli control.

The *Vancouver Sun* of April 2/91 reports that one General Ehud Barak has been named as the armed forces chief of staff, the head military honcho of Israel. He had a reputation of being one of the toughest generals to face the Palestinian uprising, and had in the past masterminded an Israeli military raid on PLO headquarters in Tunis. Barak will later become a 'Labor' party prime minister. Israel also tightened its control over Palestinians through a series of new restrictions.

The *Globe and Mail* of April 24/91 reports that two unauthorized new settlements have been established in the West Bank, at least one of them by Gush Emunim. "Noam Arnon, spokesman for the Gush Emunim settlement movement defended the new community named Talmon B. [about 20 kilometers north of Jerusalem]. 'Whomever thinks that the existence of Jews anywhere in Israel is an obstacle to peace and order, such a person has Nazi opinions.'

I see, anyone who opposes Jewish reaction and reactionaries is a Nazi.

In the same issue of the *Globe and Mail* is a report of the demotion of one Colonel Yehuda Meir to the rank of private because of his orders to his men to smash the bones of those Palestinians they captured. "In what was dubbed the 'Intifada trial', Col. Meir was charged with ordering soldiers to break arms and legs of bound Palestinians in two West Bank villages. They were rounded up after being put on secret police lists." Colonel Meir's defence revolved around his claim that he was only following orders from those higher up.

The *Globe and Mail* of April 26/91 reports the death of a 33 year old Palestinian shop keeper who had struck and killed an Israeli soldier. Afterward the Israeli military forced his family to leave while they destroyed their house. It was only one of 336 houses destroyed and some 200 permanently sealed off by the Israelis during the 40 month-long intifada.

The *Globe and Mail* of May 14/91 notes that Israel has demanded its approval before any peace talks take place with Palestinians. This stance is aimed mainly at the US which had been pushing Middle Eastern peace talks for some years. "In a number of speeches during the weekend, Israeli Prime Minister Yitzak Shamir ruled out giving up any part of Israeli, annexed East Jerusalem or the occupied West Bank and Gaza Strip. Israel was in the process of filling the West Bank with Jewish settlers so as to make any future withdrawal impossible."

Strangely enough, newspaper accounts for 1991 generally no longer report the numbers of deaths and woundings inflicted upon Palestinians by Israeli forces, although such events continue throughout this and the following years..

The *Globe and Mail* of June 8/91 reports that one Atef Bseiso has been murdered at midnight in front of the Meridien-Montparnasse hotel in which he was staying while in Paris. Mr. Bseiso was Yasser Arafat's prime body guard. Two Jewish extremist groups claimed responsibility for the killing; the Kach movement founded by the late Meir Kahane, and the other a splinter of that organization. Newspaper accounts for most of the rest of June and all of July are given over to stories about Iraq and the search for nonexistent nuclear weapons or the facilities to produce them. President George Bush 1 threatens to restart the invasion of
Iraq if Saddam Hussein does not turn over his non-existent nuclear weapons to the weapons inspectors who soon flood into the country.

The *Globe and Mail* of August 6/91 reports that US Secretary of State James Baker is traveling in the Middle East and North Africa to round up support for peace negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians. A stumbling block is Israel, which refuses to talk to any member of the PLO. Since the PLO is the acknowledged spokesman for the Palestinians it is difficult to know who the Israelis are willing to talk to.

In a series of letters to the editor of the *Vancouver Sun* of August 11/91 one Rafel Bulays refers to an earlier column by one Frank Rutter who suggested that peace talks cannot proceed with people one doesn't trust - the Arab nations. Rutter has a long history of venom peddling, now directed against the Palestinians. Bulays notes that "Mr. Rutter says that the only democracy in the Middle East is Israel but Rabbi Moshe Sober talks of a different take on Israel in *Beyond the Jewish State*. He says that 'For Israeli Arabs Israel is not really a democracy at all. No Arab has ever been allowed to hold a cabinet post, and Arab political parties must pass a loyalty test before being allowed to field candidates in an election. For Palestinians in the occupied territories Israel is a brutal state in which they have no vote at all. In 1965 an independent Arab political party was formed but it was banned and its leading members were imprisoned or deported. Recently, Israel's High Court ruled that any political party advocating equal rights for Arabs is illegal."

One John Klassen writes in to question Mr. Rutter's view that democracy and freedom of thought and the fundamental equality of men and women are part of the Western European tradition. What of the fact that the 2 million+ Palestinians living under Israeli occupation have no vote? He notes that in 1919 a broad spectrum of representatives from Syria, TransJordan and Palestine met to create a non sectarian nation which would include equal rights for Muslims, Christians and Jews. Britain and France acted as if this movement had never existed and went on to rule these territories as their new colonies. Klassen holds that a great deal of the present problems of the region stem from that action.

On October 1/91 the *Vancouver Sun* notes that Yitzak Shamir has voiced his hostility towards the Arabs in a Knesset speech and questioned whether a peace conference could ever be arranged. "He said the fact that the peace process needs US and Soviet sponsorship 'indicates that the leaders of many Arab states have not yet whole heartedly accepted the existence of the state of Israel.' In fact, the sponsorship of the peace process by those two nations stems only from the resistance of Israelis to any peaceful solution to the Palestinian problem.

The same issue of the *Vancouver Sun* reports that three Palestinians in the occupied territories had been killed by Israeli troops in the preceding few days. This happened even though the Israelis had closed down Jerusalem on the first anniversary of the Temple Mount killings. Another Palestinian was killed in the village of Burkin when Israeli plain clothes security agents opened fire on a group of protesters.

The *Vancouver Sun* of December 15/91 runs an article by one Marion Qawas, a co-founder of Vancouver Coop Radio's 'Voice of Palestine'. She notes that Canadians are so used to hearing news about the Palestinians presented through Israeli eyes that the main thing they ask for is how a given decision or event effects the Israelis. The Palestinians are largely dehumanized in the process.

She holds that "They have suffered untold injustices, but still keep a spirit of hope that baffles me." Qawas visited the Palestinian refugee camps in Lebanon
during 1970, including Tel Al Zatar, which was later completely destroyed and many of its inhabitants murdered by the Lebanese Maronite forces. She wonders how a people can go on functioning after so many disasters and so much oppression. To be without a country in this era is to be without the fundamental rights which Canadians take for granted. "I have often felt it is one of the great ironies of history that a significant section of the Jewish people have been hoodwinked into oppressing the Palestinian people almost exactly the same way they themselves suffered."

Qawas says that the Palestinians are battling on two fronts, against the remnants of feudal backwardness and for progressive political responses. "If we've become cynical after 20 years of watching the world's apathy, and cannot understand how the Palestinians themselves have not become the same, I only know that Western bravado about democracy and fair play will sound sweeter to my ears once the Palestinian people have a just settlement to their painful story."

On March 8/92, the *Globe and Mail* says that Brian Mulroney, still the Conservative prime minister of Canada (and yet to experience the election defeat which will almost wipe his party off the electoral map) says that the PLO, because of its support of Saddam Hussein, has lost whatever support it may have had in Canada and that he in no way recognizes it. Foreign Minister Joe Clark, however, is more flexible in his outlook and calls the PLO the legitimate voice of Palestinians.

**Jewish West Bank Settlers Continue Murders**

An example of the murders committed by Jewish civilians on the West Bank was noted by the *New York Times* of March 24/92 in a report entitled "Israeli settler kills tied-up Arab suspect".

"An Israeli settler shot and killed an Arab man who had been bound hand and foot after a stabbing attack in the occupied West Bank, the Israeli army and settlers said. The slaying, near the settlement of Susia, south of Hebron, reflected a surge of rage that has seized many Israelis after a wave of Palestinian attacks that have killed 10 soldiers and civilians this month. The shooting on Monday sharpened a public debate about the distinction between self-defence and vigilante action in response to the rising Arab violence. In a speech Tuesday to civil defence commanders Yitzak Rabin [then 'Labor' prime minister] urged the public to take more responsibility for its own security to attacks on the streets."

"The army and settlers said the incident near Susia began when a Palestinian was spotted in an area where sheep belonging to the settlement had been stolen the previous night. After two settlers questioned the Arab and put him in their jeep, he reportedly pulled out a knife and stabbed the driver from behind, injuring him slightly in the shoulder."

"The army and settlers say that Yoram Shkolnik, a resident of the neighboring settlement of Maaleh Hever, arrived at the scene and after a few minutes, fatally shot the Arab. Shkolnik was later arrested." (*New York Times*, March 24/93)

I do not know what Shkolnik was charged with and whether he was ever convicted of any offense. Or if convicted how many months he served in prison for the murder of 'an Arab'. What right the two settlers had in arresting this 'Arab' (his name isn't given in the newspaper account) on lands which were formerly Palestinian is also unstated.

This occurred during the fifth year of the Palestinian resistance to the Israeli occupation. By this time Israel was well on its way to increasing the original
50,000 Jewish settlers in the West Bank into the hundreds of thousands who live there today.

**Some Past Israeli War Crimes Unearthed in 1995**

The list of documented and as yet undocumented Israeli war crimes is a long one and runs from the very foundation of that state to its most recent military/police actions against Palestinians. The following is only a skeleton outline of the killings of POWs and civilians which Israel had been engaged in. Their emergence into the light of day in the mid 1990s created a certain revulsion, although the prevailing feeling was that the facts would have better been left buried. In North America, however, the exposure of these war crimes raised barely a ruffle on Israel's self image.

The following account leaves out the extensive Jewish terrorism against Palestinian civilians during the 1930s and killings which accompanied the British suppression of the Palestinian Arab Revolt, 1936-1939. The Jewish massacres of Palestinian civilians which accompanied the War of Independence in 1948 are also undiscussed. The killings carried out by Israeli forces against civilian villages in the years 1951-1956, particularly in Jordan, are not mentioned here. Nor are the Israeli killings which occurred in two invasions of Lebanon.

The current revelations arose when a retired Israeli general, Arye Biro, admitted early in April 1995 to killing some 49 Egyptian POWs during the 1956 war with Egypt. He had ordered their execution and his troops had dutifully carried out his order. Also, during the 1967 war two army cooks had seized three Egyptian prisoners in the Sinai and stabbed them to death. "The affair involved some of Israeli's top politicians, including Prime Minister Yitzak Rabin. The allegations dominated news shows, shocking some Israelis who had long prized the notion that their army maintained highly ethical standards - known as 'purity of arms'."

Yitzak Rabin, who had been the Israeli army's chief of staff during the 1967 war, stalked away when a reporter tried to question him on the killings of Egyptian POWs. His office later responded by saying that the killings were simply "isolated incidents". "The debate began when war veteran and author, Michael Bar-Zohar, said he witnessed the stabbing deaths of three Egyptian POWs in the Sinai... Military historian Aryeh Yitzaki said Israeli troops carried out several massacres in 1967 in which about 1,000 Egyptian prisoners were killed in the Sinai... In one incident, on June 9-10, 1967, about 400 Egyptian and Palestinian prisoners were killed in the sand dunes of El Arish, Yitzaki said. He said it began when a few of the prisoners opened fire after surrendering and killed two Israeli soldiers." (Vancouver Sun, August 17/95) This sounds like the justifications given for the mass murder of German POWs by assorted guerrilla and national armed forces near the end of world war 2.

An Israeli journalist, Gabi Brun, also said recently that he had witnessed Israeli troops execute five Egyptian prisoners following the 1967 war, making one of them dig the grave in which they were all buried. The mass circulation newspaper Yediot Achronot called for a thoroughgoing investigation. (Vancouver Sun, August 18/95)

A furore was raised over the Israeli murder of prisoners of war in Egypt and there were calls to break off diplomatic relations with Israel until the matter is thoroughly investigated. The Egyptian government called upon Israel to investigate how many Egyptian POWs were killed during the course of their various wars.
The matter arose first with former general Arye Biro's admission that he had had 49 prisoners killed during the 1956 Israeli invasion of Egypt. However, "Other reports of summary executions of Egyptian POWs have since surfaced in Israel. Some Israeli historians have said that thousands may have been killed during the Mideast wars in what was an unofficial Israeli policy." (Vancouver Sun, August 19/95)

On August 22/95 the Vancouver Sun reported that Prime Minister Yitzak Rabin rejected calls for an investigation of the murder of Egyptian POWs since this had happened more than 20 years previously and was simply a matter of some 'aberrations'. "Rabin issued a statement last week saying that the Israeli defence forces were 'a humane army whose soldiers are blessed with special moral values.' He must mean the moral value of murdering Arabs.

"Israel is reeling from revelations that its soldiers killed prisoners and civilians in three Mideast wars. The disclosures have shaken the widely-held conviction among Israelis that their citizen-soldiers were morally superior to those in other armies."

Former General Arye Biro's earlier revelations led to other revelations of other killings and atrocities carried out by the Israeli army elsewhere. "Attorney General Michael Ben-Yair is checking the legal implications of the allegation. Israel has no war-crimes law and murder charges can only be filed within 20 years of the crime. Many questions remain unanswered, including the extent of the alleged crimes, why details were censored for so long, and the involvement of senior Israeli officials, including Rabin..." (Vancouver Sun, August 22/95)

On September 21/95 the Vancouver Sun reports that 'Mass graves of Egyptians killed by Israelis found'. The Egyptian government itself is not happy about resurrecting past Israeli war crimes since this will only stimulate calls for some action and the Egyptian government is quite powerless in the face of Israel with their circa 300 nuclear weapons. However, a team including archaeologists is dispatched by the leading Egyptian newspaper Al-Ahram to investigate certain sites in the Sinai desert. On the basis of information given by some survivors, two sites are investigated, one on the outskirts of el-Arish and the other about 27 kilometer away, where nomads said they had seen Egyptian prisoners being murdered in 1967.

The skeletons of an as yet undetermined number of victims were discovered in what had been mass graves at both sites. How many other such sites there are scattered around the periphery of Israel can only be guessed at. (Vancouver Sun, September 21/95)

The above cases are, like Mai Lai, simply the tip of the iceberg and full investigation of the historical acts of the Israel Defence Force would undoubtedly discover far more crimes.

As far as I am aware, Arab armies in the region did not murder their prisoners of war but rather returned them in later prisoner exchanges. However, these unearthed examples of Israeli war crimes barely made it on to the pages of a few newspapers and were soon forgotten. The myth of the Israeli 'purity of arms' remained firmly in tact.
The Period Leading Up to the Present

By the mid 1990s the thrust of the Intifada had finally died down, although occasional outbreaks and smaller scale resistance continued. It is roughly a period of ten years since the first Palestinian demonstrations against Israeli rule broke out during the 1982 invasion of Lebanon. Israel became involved in 'peace talks' with the PLO - which were dragged out, rescinded, restarted with nothing ever being accomplished. Some 15 years after they started they are still going on, with nothing achieved and little prospect that anything would come of them. 'Samaria and Judea' (i.e. the West Bank) remained in the hands of now hundreds of thousands of Jewish settlers who had taken over most of the agricultural land in that region and had reduced the closely watched Palestinian enclaves to under a half of the region.

In the early 1990's Yitzak Rabin had taken over the leadership of the 'Labor' party and had been elected as Prime Minister of Israel. He had been among the most ruthless oppressors of the Palestinian people, constantly calling for more beatings and more broken bones for the stone throwers. All this is forgotten in the western press where he is portrayed as a saviour come to rescue Israel from the excesses into which it had fallen.

Finally the Israeli government, responding to international pressure, permitted Yasser Arafat to return to Palestinian areas in the West Bank and establish a PLO administration there. He is met with the almost universal jubilation by the Palestinian population, who believe that their statehood is near at hand and that the Israeli occupation is drawing to and end. This will not happen.

The Jewish right throughout Israel are stunned by these developments and are soon crying 'treason' and charging Rabin as being a collaborator catering to foreign governments. Assorted appeals for violence to oust his regime make their rounds.

In an upcoming election which the 'Labor' party seems about to win, Yitzak Rabin is assassinated by a young Jewish extremist. Although the assassin has the support of a number of the vociferous reactionary groups he is reviled by the great majority of Israelis - who generally don't hold with killing one of their own by another Israeli.

Labor wins a clear majority in the upcoming election under another Israeli general, Ehud Barack. He does seem to permit some changes which Israeli regimes of the immediate past dismissed out of hand. He begins a more serious negotiation with the PLO on the question of withdrawal of at least some Jewish settlements from the West Bank and Gaza and toward the creation of a Palestinian state. As of yet all the tax monies raised in Palestinian regions are collected and dispersed by the Israelis, who have been returning only a small portion for Palestinian uses.

During the following years the Palestinian Intifada has come to a complete halt. The PLO begins to take over the administration of Palestinians in the occupied territories but is never given the money to carry out an amelioration of the prevailing economic and social conditions. Nor does this 'government' have any powers over any of the dozens of Jewish settlements which have spread throughout the West Bank and Gaza. These settlers and their armed militias and religious students wait in bitter anticipation for a chance to strike out at the Palestinians and against any Israelis who have 'betrayed God's promise of the lands west of the Jordan to the sea'. Generally, they all vow never to leave the homes they have built in the West Bank and proclaim they will defy the Israeli
army if it attempts to displace them. Any talk of trading "land for peace" is anathema to them. An armed truce prevails.

Meanwhile, the Israeli-Palestinian peace talks, which have been wending their way through various European negotiations for years, look as if some acceptable compromise might be made by both sides. However, the Barak government refuses to consider the transfer of East Jerusalem to Palestinian control. Similarly, he refuses to negotiate Palestinian replacement of any Jewish settlement in the West Bank. It is uncertain if Israelis would actually have honored the land transfers proposed but that 'compromise' is turned down by the PLO.

By the end of the 20th century Ehud Barak's government had more or less given up negotiating about an independent Palestinian entity in the West Bank. Israel is also proceeding through a period of economic distress. The 'Labor' government is defeated and replaced by Likud and allied right wing in circa 2,000. There follows the brief rule by that ultra-reactionary, the American emigre and aircraft designer, Benjamin Netanyahu. He might be described as a Meir Kahane without the goal of establishing a Jewish Orthodox dictatorship in Israel. Things are becoming even worse for the Palestinians.

By this time the western world had grown tired of accounts of the Israeli repression and killings of Palestinians, unless some unusually gross violation of human rights takes place. Netanyahu proved to be neither a politician nor a leader and soon alienated many of his own supporters. The Labor party had by then been rejected by the majority of Israelis, despite its shift even further to the right. Sometime later Netanyahu was replaced as the leader of the Likud block by General Ariel Sharon. That war criminal becomes the Prime Minister of Israel. He was committed to crushing any and all Palestinian dissidence by brute force. His supporters would soon be chanting 'Arik, Arik King of Israel'.

In the middle of the year 2000 the second Intifada broke out. I am afraid that my clipping file does not extend to cover it. The following therefore will be only the most cursory account

Groups of Palestinian stone throwers were met everywhere by the military, this time firing live ammunition and not bothering with 'rubber bullets' or clubs or tear gas. Also, the Israeli army deployed tanks and armored personnel carriers to assault Palestinian settlements, breaking down walls and firing machine guns and cannon shells into whichever houses they deemed to be suspicious. Such assaults were backed by military helicopters firing rockets into locales where alleged 'terrorists' were located. Invariably numbers of infants, children, women and old people unconnected with the Intifada were killed. By now Israeli peace protestors had dwindled to the barest handful and most Israelis cheered their troops on in the bloody repression they perpetrated.

Palestinians employed in Israel were barred from entering that country for weeks at a time and Israel attempted to replace them with other third world workers or with recent Jewish immigrants from Russia. Entire Palestinian towns and even regions are shut down by 24 hour a day curfews, for weeks at a time, reducing even those who had stocked food supplies to desperation. Hunger is wide spread. People suffered and died because they could not be brought to hospitals in their vicinity. The Palestinian settlements in the West Bank and Gaza truly became a series of prison camps watched over by Israeli soldiers.

Every month or few weeks Sharon's high command would focus their forces on a particular Palestinian refugee camp or region and launch full scale military operations against it. Street battles on the scale of true warfare broke out in some
locales, which were then pounded into submission by tank fire. Moslem or Christian districts, it didn't matter which. Bethlehem was shelled into ruin. So were a great many other Palestinian settlements. Despite all of this the great majority of the Palestinian population is still unarmed; hardly any shots were ever fired at the Israeli forces.

The Palestinian Authority administration was smashed, being unable to operate under military occupation. Schools and universities were generally closed by Israeli orders throughout this entire period. Everything from health care to garbage collection ground to a halt. The headquarters of the Palestinian government, where Yasser Arafat and his advisors were located, were bombed and shelled, reducing the complex to a few useable rooms in which Arafat was allowed to remain. There were public Israeli calls for his assassination but apparently the Israeli leadership wanted to demonstrate to the Palestinians that their hero was powerless to protect them from Israeli attack. Killing him would have made him a martyr.

This continuing repression, the mounting killings, woundings, jailings, curfews took a toll on the hope which the Palestinian people had had. Allegiance to Islamic fundamentalism grew in proportion to their despair. Israeli 'Arab specialists' congratulated themselves on advancing this political split within the Palestinian population. However, it is questionable whether the triumph of Islamic fundamentalism in place of a secular nationalist movement will be much of a victory for Israel.

By the end of 2002 the second Intifada has been drowned in blood and flickered out. Arafat from his shattered administration complex attempted to raise international support for the Palestinian people and to negotiate with the Israelis but Sharon and his cabinet will have nothing to do with him. Israeli patriots of all stripes are jubilant and enthusiastic about the beneficial role of force in solving problems. It is at this point that Palestinian suicide bombers begin to strike Israeli targets. 'Brutal', 'barbaric', 'bestial' but one can hardly blame the Palestinians after they had endured Israeli oppression for so long.

Buses, shopping centers, movie houses, night spots and other places where Israelis gather are all targeted in a crescendo of suicide bombings. All the Israeli tanks and helicopters, all the police and army forces deployed seem incapable of defusing this threat. The perpetrators are dead so there is no possibility of punishing them. The outrage of Israeli civilians is witnessed in various lynch mobs which form after many explosions, shouting 'Kill the Arabs' and beating passing Palestinians. Even some members of the PLO's Fatah wing begin turning to suicide bombings.

In the late fall of 2004 Yasser Arafat is killed, or at least he dies of a 'mysterious, untreatable, rapidly progressing illness' the cause of which no one can determine. His body is returned from France, where he underwent medical attempts to save his life, and is quickly buried on the grounds of the Palestinian administrative buildings. He is replaced by a nondescript Palestinian functionary who while acceptable to the Israelis gets absolutely nowhere in 'peace' talks. Nor does he garner much support from the Palestinian population. Alienation, depression, and withdrawal of support for the PLO by the Palestinians follows.

In early 2006 Ariel Sharon effectively kicks the bucket (he is laid low by a series of strokes) but Hamas, the Islamic fundamentalist organization which Israel had once pushed to undercut the PLO, wins a clear cut majority in the Palestinian election and goes on to form the Palestinian government. What will happen now is anyone's guess. Except that a continuing cycle of repression, killings and a
A downward spiral of mutual racist reaction seems assured. Progressive Palestinians are now faced by an assault from both sides, their position seems dreadful indeed.
SUMMARY

This long account has covered a number of disparate but related topics: the rise and spread of fascism in Europe during the inter-war period; case studies of fascism in relation to Jews in a variety of nations; the consequences of fascism for both the German and Jewish and other peoples. I have noted that fascism was neither unique to or even original to Germany; during the initial seven years of Nazism its oppression was not primarily directed toward Jews but mainly against the left in particular and the working class in general. All forms of fascism in Europe were the product primarily of various elements of the bourgeoisie which felt itself threatened by the loss of their class status. The number of deaths during world war 2 presented was only provisional, because no true compilation is possible.

Part two dealt with a very limited selection of the nations and institutions of the world which have been charged with anti-semitism by Jewish spokespersons. A full list of such charges would be virtually inclusive of virtually all nations on earth and are considerably more venomous than those presented here. One may legitimately wonder whether almost all non-Jews are anti-Semitic, as some Jews seem to hold. Such charges almost invariably come into play against anyone who is insufficiently supportive of Israel or the national Jewish lobby.

The following accounts deal with some journalists who are normally seen as somehow progressive in their own way. It was pointed out that one of them, William Shirer, was a typical Chicago reporter who in his autobiography tells us how he manufactured reports for his newspaper from whole cloth and how much of an American war patriot he had been during world war 1. After a number of years of reporting from various locales in Europe and Germany (before America entered the second world war) he produced an alleged account of his reportorial investigations of Nazi Germany which made him a prominent name in America during the coming war. A variety of internal reasons suggest that a great many of his reports and interviews involved were probably as fabricated as his earlier reports for Chicago newspapers.

The other account was of Isaac B. Singer, a gifted old-fashioned Polish-Jewish story teller. His writings make clear that he does not recognize nor have much sympathy with anyone in the world other than Jews; that he holds working people everywhere in contempt and indeed has a most chauvinistic view of almost everyone in the world, certainly in Europe. Polish landlords, peasants, working people virtually everywhere, communists and radicals of all stripes. all contaminate Jews: the Goyim at best are faithful Jewish servants or the ever present anti-Semites. Despite this outlook Singer does, within the confines of his world, provide compelling stories. He earned the Noble prize in literature which he finally recieved.

Part three dealt with the Holocaust revival and the developing Zionist witch hunts in North America and abroad, noting a few of the prominent persons involved. Possibly the most amazing of these charges were those leveled at and pursued against Kurt Waldheim, the former Secretary-General of the United Nations after he left office. Presumably the campaign mounted against him flowed from the fact that while Secretary-General he failed to stop the overwhelming majority of the member states from voting that Zionism was a form of racism. The campaign against Kurt Waldheim was led by Edgar Bronfman, the formerly Canadian billionaire booze baron who had gotten himself elected as the President
of the World Jewish Congress, a senescent outfit which quickly rose to a leading position among hate-mongering organizations.

The most amazing thing about this envenomed campaign was that every charge, every claim against Waldheim then proved to be unfounded and baseless, yet by endless repetition, denial of the facts presented, by multifaceted additional hate mongering whenever the original claims were disproved – but mainly by simple repetition - the public in general was led to believe in Waldheim's guilt and his alleged past anti-Semitism. All the hearings and investigative commissions which found him guiltless of the charges, all the revelations of simply fabricated evidence against him, all the assorted 'experts' coming out of the woodwork - all this proved baseless.

Despite the manufactured evidence against Waldheim produced by Bronfman and the Jewish organizations which got on the bandwagon, virtually all the charges remained just that, despite the general belief that something had been proved against him. Jewish outrage peaked after Waldheim ran for the ceremonial role of President of Austria in the following years. This outrage clearly passed over into openly racist attitudes, something fully and proudly supported by Bronfman and his many allies.

The Wallenberg caper can be briefly described as a completely fantastic anti-communist campaign led by Canada's Irwin Cotler, a professor of law in Montreal. This revolved around the alleged fate and status of one Raoul Wallenberg who had allegedly saved a hundred thousand Hungarian Jews during world war 2 simply by opposing their deportation. It was a story drawn from a childish Hollywood melodrama which, like the Waldheim campaign, lasted over a great many years and was based on endless repetition with ever changing claims. The various Soviet regimes had allegedly held Wallenberg in their secret prisons in the 40 plus years since the end of world war 2. The ridiculousness of Cotler's claims was matched only by the gullibility of the western parliaments which supported him and who made Wallenberg, the Jewish saviour, an honorable citizen.

The cursory account of the pursuit, denaturalization and deportation of one Ivan Demjanuk, the alleged concentration guard once known as Ivan the Terrible, despite the many claims that the original had been killed by the end of that war. The Demjanuk pursuit was largely the work of Neil Sher, a Jewish Holocaust specialist in charge of the American Department of Justice's Special Investigations unit. Demjanuk was tracked down, charged, and expeditiously deported to Israel where he underwent a classic Stalinist show trial. The Israeli public media ran nonstop Holocaust movies while the judges treated Demjanuk as guilty even before being tried. The prosecutors prepared the testimony of assorted Holocaust survivors, some of whom were so unsure of their facts that they didn't even know what country they were in or how they got there. In short Demjanuk was found guilty and sentenced to hang by the Israeli 'court' - except that in America a number of superior court judges found that Demjanuk had been railroaded by the American Justice Department's Special Investigation Unit. They demanded that Demjanuk be immediately released from prison and returned to America. The manufactured nature of Israel's charges were brought home by the fact that Israel complied with this demand. Sher resigned from his long term position with the Special Investigation Unit soon thereafter.

In the next section we considered a selection of those prominently charged with anti-Semitism during the 1980s and early 1990s. Three of them, Keegstra, Zundel and Ross, had a long string of charges, trials, ultimate convictions and higher court dismissals of sentences which we briefly summarized. Some of these
cases ranged over fifteen and more years before the targets were convicted. Here again, what was remarkable was the endless resources and endless efforts of private organizations intent on convicting targeted individuals. Admittedly these three were reactionary, fantasy-prone individuals but certainly no more right-wing and repressive than the organizations which pursued them. Those witch hunters naturally gained the support of all right thinking Canadians and ultimately were successful in changing the national laws to make any statement which could be claimed to be anti-Semitic illegal. Whatever differences one might have with those persecuted, the organizations and means used to make their thoughts illegal were powerful new oppressive forces.

These clearly were heresy trials and Canadian public agencies and alleged 'human rights' organizations became deeply involved in hunting down contemporary heretics. A sample of other evil thinkers pursued by the philoSemites ends this section.

Simon Wiesenthal and Eli Wiesel were fully certified modern saints, both Holocaust survivors and proponents of an ever lasting genuflection toward their sufferings. They both parlayed their experiences into international reputations and influence. Wiesenthal was a late nineteenth century fantasist and a great deal of his world and claims are pure fantasy. I am not certain that he carried his fantasies into the 'capture' of some 'three thousand Nazi' in the post war period. He along with Kurt Waldheim helped found the Austrian Peoples Party, the Austrian Conservatives, a role he retained throughout his life.

Without independent verification it is impossible to question Wiesenthal's experiences during World War 2; however, the number of times and the ways in which he was preserved from destruction at the last moment seem rather improbable. One of his later books, Sails of Hope, pictures the voyage of Columbus as a desperate search for a land to which Spain's persecuted Jews could emigrate to, is based on the most utter fantasy, none more fantastic than the 'evidence' proffered. If this is anything like the evidence he presented to track down Nazi war criminals we are in need of a serious reinvestigation of his past claims.

Eli Wiesel came from an ultra orthodox Rumanian-Jewish family and was one of the few of his family who survived Nazi concentration camps. He emigrated to France where he began his career as a professional Holocaust survivor. Over a forty year period he produced some 30 to 40 books and novels mainly about the Holocaust, all of them treating the Holocaust as the single most horrendous event to ever occur to any people. This and his systematic German-hating, plus his reactionary outlook and his unwavering support of Israel regardless of what it did, won him a growing audience among American Jews which ultimately resulted in his acquisition of the Noble prize. (This underlined the extent to which that honor had become a political football.)

After becoming an American, Wiesel spent more than thirty years touring the country giving well attended and highly lucrative talks reminding Jewish audiences of the horrors of the Holocaust and the necessity to support Israel in all ways possible. These well paid lectures were so typically accompanied by Wiesel's tears [on cue] that they became something of a joke for some. During the Reagan era Wiesel came to the peak of his influence in America, reviling all those nations and individuals who did not fully support that regime. Possibly the height of his influence came when, along with A.M. Ropsenthal and most of the leadership of the American Jewish lobby, he demanded that President Reagan not visit a small German cemetery as part of the fiftieth anniversary of the Normandy landings. This hectoring and anti-Semite sniffing finally overreached itself and the
Holocaust revivalists were briefly forced into a new tact. However Wiesel remained an avenging saint even when there was virtually no enemy left to combat. He remained a supporter of Israel no matter what it did and who it did it to.

For Meir Kahane there never was any question that one was dealing with a murderous fanatic, a Jewish ultra reactionary who had contempt for everyone on the face of the earth other than Orthodox Jews. Very early in his career he began calling for a priestly dictatorship to oversee the lives of Jews and the reduction of non-orthodox Jews into a permanent pariah status. Early in his career he organized a large gang of orthodox Jewish thugs in Brooklyn who threatened all others in their purview. His so-called Jewish Defense League soon got into bombing, assassinating and generally terrorizing those whom it considered to be anti-Semitic, including Soviet diplomats, cultural tours and even other Jews. After some years of this the FBI cracked down and Kahane and some of his followers emigrated to Israel, where they continued in the same vein but with far more followers and far more victims.

During the last twenty years of his life Kahane recurrently toured America successfully raising funds for his party in Israel. Until during the 1990s a quite apolitical Palestinian immigrant living in New York shot and killed him. Although all political figures in that city bemoaned this act it struck some as well deserved and long overdue.

Chapter 10 presented a long list of individuals, organizations and entire nations charged with anti-Semitism. They are a few of the evil forces alleged by the Holocaust revivalists, ranging from the Pope and the Catholic church, to Switzerland, Jesse Jackson and American Blacks, the people of Quebec and a host of other charged. This is a theme dealt with more fully in Part 2 but here the focus is on those making these charges. Edgar Bronfman, the World Jewish Congress, Abraham Foxman, Marvin Hier and a wide range of Jewish hate mongering organizations are presented. Their venom and hysteria are matched only by the relentlessness of their pursuits and the endless number of people they have at their disposal. As mentioned before, the magic in their method is the simple repetition of their charges from endless sources so that the media and even national governments come to believe them, or fear contradicting them.

The financial benefits of these projects is not to be discounted. Bronfman and the World Jewish Congress ultimately wound up extorting more than two billion dollars out of Swiss banks through the totally unproven charges that they had kept deposits of Holocaust victims and had made money trading with Nazi Germany. They did this ultimately by bringing the pressure of the US Federal and State goverments to bear on Swiss banks and investments. The bulk of these winnings were not distributed to Holocaust victims in general but rather were largely administered by front organizations established by the World Jewish Congress to fund assorted cultural programs and holocaust memorial studies.

Jesse Jackson would be assailed by Jewish reactionaries for many years, indeed throughout his remaining political career, for a passing remark he once made in private about New York being 'Hymietown'. The endless remarks that this comment indicated his anti-Semitism never considered the often far more racist remarks of Jews about Blacks and a great many other peoples.

Similarly Pope John Paul II spent the final years of his reign being maligned by major Jewish organizations for a virtually endless array of charges, including giving an official audience to Kurt Waldheim after he had been 'convicted' by Jewish organizations for permitting the UN to hold that Zionism is racism. Their claims that Poland and Poles were all anti-Semitic and co-responsible for the
Holocaust was supported by a long and varied list of American Jews and their spokespersons.

Allen Dershowitz, possibly the most the best known US lawyer of his time, boasted in print how he had gotten a number of Jewish Defense League murderers found innocent in court, along with a number of other cases by his legal legerdemain. He and the Irwin Cotlers, the David Matas, the Marvin Hiers and a large number of other professional Jewish activists are the centre of this chapter. Their venom, their demands, their congenital hysteria rapidly gained the support of the majority of the Canadian and American public. This was very dispiriting for those who believed that fundamental civil rights were assured and that a Jewish McCarthyism could not triumph here.

The remaining three parts of the manuscript dealt with Israeli arms production and involvement in international sales, its invasion of Lebanon and the massacres which ensued, as well as an overview of the Palestinian Intifada and its suppression.

It began with a consideration of the Vanunu revelation of Israeli nuclear arms production over the previous thirty years and his kidnapping and imprisonment by Israel. Israeli nuclear arms were quite legitimate for American fundamentalists who saw that nation as their own and a promise for the end of days. But the fact that a warlike and increasingly fanatic nation could now be a major nuclear power is extremely frightening - especially considering their contempt for virtually everyone. This fact may yet require some other nations to now reconsider whether they need their own nuclear defense.

The following two sections dealt with Israeli arms sales and military training world wide. It was suggested that whenever any dictatorship became so open in its murder of its own people that support from the US was no longer feasible, Israel was always ready to step in to arm the killers. This also applied to the training and support offered to the police forces and para-military forces bedeviling those nations. As an example we considered Israeli officers and companies arming and training private death squad armies in Colombia - the most despicable forces on earth which actually outdo nazi war criminals by comparison.

Most of Israeli arms production was developed and funded by US funding, now running into billions of dollars per year. In the case of Israel's multi-billion dollar Lavi fighter project, when US aircraft companies overcame the US Jewish lobby, America required that Israel instead purchase (highly subsidized) American war planes. Israeli public opinion was outraged while Jewish organizations in the US bent every effort to reestablish the funding for Israel, even raising the old ploy of questioning whether America was becoming anti-Semitic.

Israel's invasion, conquest and mass murders in Lebanon from 1982 to the early 1990s was the topic of Part Seven. It focused especially on Israel's involvement in the massacres committed at the Palestinian refugee camps of Sabra and Shatilla in the early fall of 1982. When the world learned of the systematic murder of more than 800 Palestinian men, women and children the veil about Israeli 'purity of arms' was briefly stripped away and even many Jews in America briefly had second thoughts about the state they had supported. This was answered immediately by the Begin government in a series of world wide newspaper ads screaming 'Blood Libel' and charging anyone who held Israel responsible the massacres in any way as anti-Semites. Surprisingly, this ploy did not work and Begin was ultimately forced to call a special commission to investigate the events. This immediately brought most Jewish questioners back
into the fold, with glorifications of Israel as the single nation with the moral purity to investigate its own acts.

When this investigation was under way few seemed to notice that no Palestinians or non-Israelis were allowed to provide evidence - it was mainly an Israeli military show. The long and short of the investigating commission was, as predictable, a general white wash of Israel's participation in the massacres. Of the major political and military figures involved, a half dozen were held to have been deficient in their foresight of what would happen if they placed armed Phalangist militia over Palestinian refugees unchecked for two nights and days. A secondary general was relieved of duty while Ariel Sharon was so deeply implicated that all believed that he would have to resign from his command of the Israeli armed forces. But he wouldn't and simply soldiered on despite the condemnation of many. Despite his political escape Begin was so wounded as to have to soon retire, only to be replaced as Prime Minister by the Stern gang killer Yitsak Shamir. This goes somewhat beyond events covered here.

The Israeli armed forces, secret police and police forces continued exactly as they had in the past - continuing their war against the Lebanese people and soon coming to kill demonstrating Palestinian youths.

The remainder of this section dealt with the growing guerrilla activity which spread against Israeli occupation forces in Lebanon and their Phalangist allies. The Phalangists ultimately drew back into their own areas and the Israelis retreated very slowly toward their own borders, holding parts of southern Lebanon for almost fifteen years but recurrently carrying out mass bombing raids on totally undefended Lebanese towns and refugee camps. Some of the Israeli campaign to bomb Lebanon back to the stone age is mentioned here, as is the bloody sectarian warfare between different groups in that country, almost all of them directed against the Palestinians as well as against each other. One can only admire the Palestinians' extraordinary steadfastness.

The final part of this manuscript dealt with the Palestinian Intifada and its suppression during the late 1980s and early 1990s. It began with the revelations surrounding an earlier multiple murder by members of the Israeli secret service, ultimately including the head of the Shin Bet himself. This emerged only gradually over a number of years, with ever spreading lies and cover-ups. Fundamentally, the great majority of the Israeli population did not want to know of the crimes committed by its police forces, and these investigations, along with the sundry dismissals which followed, were among the last such cleansing which occurred among the Israeli security forces. All the police officers involved escaped all criminal proceedings and in many cases turned up again shortly afterward as Israeli arms merchants or officials of private police organizations.

The following sections dealt with the deepening oppression against which Palestinian youths revolted and the spiralling cycles of demonstrations and rock throwing were met by Israeli gunfire, by mass clubbings and acts of sheer sadism by Israeli troops and settlers. There is a fairly long selection of newspaper reports of the varied and repetitive account of the locales and the means whereby the subjugation of the Palestinian people by Israelis occurred. The woundings, mass arrests, the bone breaking clubbings, the deaths of boys, girls, adults, elders and sometimes infants - the steadily growing toll. The mass imprisonment of tens of thousands of Palestinians as the Israelis decided to put entire villages and towns under round-the-clock curfews, driving them into poverty and near starvation. Hopefully this account will convey something of the mounting horror, the utter
Israeli disregard for common human decency, and the legitimate hatred this engendered among the Palestinian people.

What was possibly most amazing was that years of this kind of repression did not result in an armed response to the Israel forces. Until finally, after many years, the suicide bombings by the Palestinians began.

This section ends with a brief overview of a PBS documentary about the initial phase of the Intifada by a somewhat sympathetic film maker. The wide-ranging attempts of the Jewish lobby to block its showing and the almost hysterical charges brought to bear on PBS and the filmmaker are quite revealing. It demonstrated the reach of this lot, the power they have over the American mind, and the readiness which all and sundry have to retreat whenever charges of anti-Semitism are laid.

The account ends with the revelation of past Israeli war crimes and the murders carried out by Jewish West Bank settlers’ organizations. These crimes seem to be an appropriate place to end this overview of Israeli repression of the Palestinian people. The years which followed would witness an even more murderous Israeli response, with the general support of the Israeli people who finally elected the leading Jewish war criminal, Ariel Sharon, as their Prime Minister. This seems an appropriate place to end this account.