

THE REVISIONIST CLARION

OOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOO

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

Issue Nr. 3 - March 2004
OOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOO

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

We have set up a strong state, we have immense military power, but reality has not changed our consciousness. It has remained the consciousness of a helpless, suffering people, waiting for the Cossacks to set upon us at any minute. Uri Avnery, 1st of feb. 2004

"The wall denies basic human rights to the Palestinian people and further reduces the West Bank and Gaza Strip to the status of concentration camps," Mr. O'Brien said. (Liberal MP, Canadian Parliament)

CONTENTS

- Israel's Flag Is Not Mine, Alfred **Lilienthal** (1949)
 - Bible Belt missionaries set out on a 'war for souls' in Iraq
 - The Defamation of Christianity, by Bruce Walker
 - A Republican's Case Against George W. Bush, by Paul Findley
 - The Gold Teeth
 - Deactivating the Holocaust Hoax
 - Reflections of a Holocaust Revisionist and Liberal, by Joseph Heaney
 - Debating Israel's Early Years, by Efraim Karsh
 - Power, Propaganda and Conscience in The War On Terror, by John Pilger
- NUTS AND BOLTS

Israel's Flag Is Not Mine

(September 1949)

Alfred Lilienthal

Dear Mother:

I brought you my hurts and troubles when both they and I were little: in that same spirit I bring them to you today.

Only last year, a new white flag with single blue six-pointed star was hoisted to a mast many thousands of miles away on the east coast of the Mediterranean Sea. This flag of

Israel is the symbol of a new nationalist state, with its own government, army, foreign policy, language, national anthem and oath of allegiance.

And this new flag has brought every one of us five million American citizens of the ancient faith of Judah to a parting in the road.

Judaism, I have felt, was a religious faith which knew no national boundaries, to which a loyal citizen of any country could adhere.

By contrast, Zionism was and is a nationalist movement organized to reconstitute Jews as a nation with a separate homeland. Now that such a state exists, what am I? Am I still only an American who believes in Judaism? Or am I—as extreme Zionists and anti-Semites alike argue—a backsliding member of an Oriental tribe whose loyalty belongs to that group?

Let us start, Mother, with how I feel about this new State of Israel. I wish it well. I hope that several hundred thousand suffering displaced persons will find in it a happy home. I hope it will prosper as a center of democracy in the Middle East. But when its flag was first raised on May 14, 1948, I had no impulse to dance in the street with hysterical joy, as did so many in New York and London. For I was born and remain an American. I have no ties with, no longings for, and feel no responsibilities to Israel. And I believe that the future happiness of the Jews in America depends on their complete integration as citizens of this—our true—country.

I am sure that if we Jews as a group are persuaded to divide that love which people normally give to their native land, it can lead only to disaster.

The Irish? They are a nation and Judaism is a religion. Irishmen here have left Ireland only in recent generations. The Jews left Palestine in Roman times, and have come here from every European country.

My one and only homeland is America. I am proud of my belief in the age-old Judaic concept of one God in Heaven and one Humanity here below. But my faith does not pull me into a feeling of narrowly tribal kinship with all others who worship God in this way. Whenever I read of Americans singing the Hatikvah, Israel's national anthem, or see youth groups raising Israel's flag beside the Stars and Stripes. I am outraged. For Israel's flag and anthem are symbols of a foreign state; they are not mine.

The most powerful weapon which Zionism is using on Americans of Jewish faith is its outward cloak of humanitarianism. The argument runs that Israel was set up primarily as a haven for the persecuted, the homeless, so why should we be critical?

Mother, the truth is that Israel was not created primarily for displaced persons. Instead, Article 3 of its proposed constitution proclaims it to be "the national home of the Jewish people." Meaning, Mother, you and me! As early as 1917 Dr. Chaim Weizmann, Israel's first president, was proclaiming: "We have never based the Zionist Movement on Jewish suffering in Russia or any other land. These sufferings have never been the mainspring of Zionism."

Rabbi Abba H. Silver, a recent head of the American Zionists, declared: "We must stand foursquare on the proposition that Zionism is not an immigration or a refugee movement, but a movement to rebuild the Jewish State for the Jewish nation in the land of Israel."

And what is the attitude of Israel toward those who adhere to the faith of Judaism but are citizens of other countries? Our "nationality" they insist is Jewish, no matter under what flags we were born; and, since we are not in Israel, we live "in the Diaspora," which is to say in exile. And their plans for us?

"We must," explained Prime Minister Ben-Gurion, in his first speech after the Israeli elections, "save the remnants of Israel in the Diaspora. We must also save their possessions. Without these two things, we shall not build this country."

So the vast Zionist propaganda machine strives to cement national ties between Israel and all persons of Jewish faith. And sending money to Israel is only a small part of our supposed obligation. The deeper objectives are given by Dr. Margoshes, an executive of the American Section of the Jewish Agency, as being:

" - to Zionize world Jewry. . .to establish Zionist hegemony over the developing Jewish communities throughout the world."

Daniel Frisch, newly elected president of the American Zionists, feels that "the American Jewish community will soon arrive at the inevitable conclusion that the all-day school plus a chain of summer camps is the only solution to the problem," and that "we ought to be able to send to Israel American—bred young people who want to live as Jews

minus the hyphen under the smiling skies of the reborn Israel. Our task has not ended with the birth of the Jewish State. It has but begun."

Have these misguided zealots forgotten the indignation which was aroused in America in the '30's, when the Bundists tried to tell Americans of German ancestry that they owed loyalty to Germany, and set up in America youth camps dedicated to German culture?

Today we see Zionists boasting of "Jewish" political strength, Zionist picket lines around British consulates, Zionists demonstrating against Foreign Minister Ernest Bevin when he arrives here to sign the Atlantic Pact, New York stores plastered with posters screaming "Do Not Buy British. Made Goods."

Are these people acting as Americans? Europe's recovery through the Marshall Plan is the keystone of our bipartisan foreign policy, which the Communists are trying to sabotage. Any boycott of British goods, organized or unorganized, helps this destruction. Now I know these Zionists were not consciously trying to tear down American foreign policy, but their actions were the inevitable result of living under segregation is not solely the fault of the other guy. Part of the responsibility is on our shoulders. True, the Jew is sometimes segregated by Christians. But it is also true that the Jew sometimes sets himself apart from Christians.

We have moved out of the ghetto, but sometimes scars of the long imprisonment remain. This is why many Jews even today feel at home only with other Jews. Many carry their Jewishness on their sleeves and are extremely self-conscious and sensitive to their separateness.

ALL OF THIS I understand: most of it I forgive. After all, six million Jews were wiped out by Hitler and anti-Semitism does exist, even in America. Why should each of us not be at least a little sensitive? This I think most non-Jews understand. But when anyone criticizes, however mildly, either Zionism, the State of Israel or the hysterical behavior of some groups of Jews. we have no right to shout "anti-Semitism!"

In any religion one can find a small group of fanatics who hate those of other faiths. Such fanatics are not numerous or important. It is Semitism—the constant effort of some Jews to assert themselves as Jews—and not their religion of Judaism which feeds anti-Semitism.

'No one knows better than you, Mother, that I, too. suffered humiliation from being a Jew. I have felt the arrows of discrimination. In my deep hurt I have cried out. But the discipline of two nationalisms. Were Hitler alive today, how he would laugh!

The plain fact is that we Jews are not a race and we should not let the Zionists persuade us that we are. Proof to the contrary lies in Palestine, plain for all to see. You had my letter, Mother, from my Army furlough there. I was second to none in my enthusiasm for what my co-religionists had done—for a desert brought to bloom, for clean new cities rising out of age-old sand dunes. All of these wonders had come to pass while only a few fanatics talked of statehood. One evening I went to see a performance of an opera in Jerusalem. In that theater lobby you could distinguish almost at a glance the Yiddish-speaking Ashkenazic Jew from Poland, the Spanish-speaking Sephardic Jew from North Africa or Turkey, the German Jew, Jews from a score of countries all differing in dress, language, manners and mental attitudes. I had visual proof of the arguments of anthropologists. who laugh at the notion of a distinct Jewish race.

Anyone who tells me those foreign Jews are exclusively my people that I should be closer to them than to Bob McCormick, the kid on the block with whom I used to play ball: or to Nick Galbraith, who roomed next to me at Cornell; or Dave Du Vivier with whom I studied in law school—that man is talking dangerous nonsense. I have also learned, Mother, that when something goes wrong in my relations with non-Jews. I avoid the habit of thinking that it happened just because I am a Jew. Such self-pity is comforting, but it is usually wrong and therefore dangerous.

There is today a deep split among Americans of the Jewish faith. The Zionists are the more vocal; they have more organized political power. But they do not speak for all of us, and I hope not for most. On the other side there is, for instance, the American Council for Judaism, which insists that the nationalism of Israel must be confined to the boundaries of that state. There are also countless other Jews without any affiliation who revere Judaism as a religion and scorn to degrade it into a cheap racial nationalism which competes with their Americanism.

But when we protest the right of the Zionists to speak as "American Jewry" on the question of Palestine, we are told that Jews should not be disunited, must not fight among themselves on Palestine or any other issue. And if we still speak out against what we feel is

a dangerous trend, we find ourselves reviled and ostracized as traitors. Coercion, often economic, frequently silences the freethinker.

But why should Americans of Jewish faith be any more united on questions of American foreign policy than are Presbyterians, Baptists or Methodists?

Have we forgotten the words of Woodrow Wilson in 1915 when he warned all Americans: "You cannot become true Americans if you think of yourselves in groups. A man who thinks of himself as belonging to a particular national group in America has not yet become an American. And a man who goes among you to trade on your nationality is not worthy to live under the Stars and Stripes."

Politicians of both parties who in the last election played to "the Jewish vote" in connection with Israel will do well to reread those words.

The answer to bigotry and anti-Semitism does not lie in fanatical Jewish nationalism. Of course the blowing-up of the King David Hotel, the hanging of the two British sergeants, the assassination of Bernadotte, the massacre of Arab women and children at Dier Yasin were all acts of tiny groups. But they have weakened the moral and spiritual stature of the world's oldest religion. Israel's terrorist Begin and Hollywood's Ben Hecht, who encouraged such lawlessness by saying, "Every time you let go with your guns at the British betrayers of your homeland, the Jews of America make a little holiday in their hearts!" such people are doing the Jews more harm than any words which Goebbels spoke.

There was no holiday in my heart, nor in that of the late Rabbi J. L. Magnes, president of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, who said sadly following that Hecht statement: "We had always thought that Zionism would diminish anti-Semitism in the world. We are witness to the opposite."

All too many Christians have supported Zionism because they felt that Jews, having been persecuted, should now have what they want whether it is good or bad for them. Christian leaders can help us greatly. But Christian sympathy for Jews should be measured not in terms of support for Jewish nationalism in distant Israel but in accepting us as friends, neighbors and first-class citizens of this our country. That is true liberal Christianity. And also, Mother, good Judaism, that fine old faith which you taught me as a little child.

Reprinted from the September, 1949 issue of *The Reader's Digest*.

<<http://www.alfredlilienthal.com/israelsflag.htm>>

FANATICISM

Bible Belt missionaries set out on a 'war for souls' in Iraq

US Christian evangelists want to "save Muslim souls" in Iraq, writes David Rennie in Cleveland.

American Christian missionaries have declared a "war for souls" in Iraq, telling supporters that the formal end of the US-led occupation next June will close an historic "window of opportunity".

Organising in secrecy, and emphasising their humanitarian aid work, Christian groups are pouring into the country, which is 97 per cent Muslim, bearing Arabic Bibles, videos and religious tracts designed to "save" Muslims from their "false" religion.

The International Mission Board, the missionary arm of the Southern Baptists, is one of those leading the charge.

John Brady, the IMB's head for the Middle East and North Africa, this month appealed to the 16 million members of his church, the largest Protestant denomination in America.

"Southern Baptists have prayed for years that Iraq would somehow be opened to the gospel," his appeal began. That "open door" for Christians may soon close.

"Southern Baptists must understand that there is a war for souls under way in Iraq," his bulletin added, listing Islamic leaders and "pseudo-Christian" groups also flooding Iraq as his chief rivals.

The missionaries are mainly evangelicals who reject talk of Muslims and Christians worshipping the same God.

Jerry Vines, former head of the Southern Baptist Convention, has described the Prophet Mohammed as a "demon-obsessed paedophile". Franklin Graham, son of Billy Graham and the head of Samaritan's Purse, a big donor to Iraq, has described Islam as a "very evil and wicked religion".

The missionaries pose a dilemma for President George W Bush. He has reached out to Muslims since September 11, shrugging off criticism from evangelicals to describe Islam as "peaceful". But Christian conservatives are also a key Bush constituency: Franklin Graham delivered the invocation prayer at his presidential inauguration.

The US Agency for International Development has said that the government cannot rein in private charities. "Imagine what the US Congress would say to us," said a spokesman in April.

Jon Hanna, an evangelical from Ohio who has recently returned from Iraq, applied for a new passport to travel there, describing himself as a humanitarian worker. "I was worried the US authorities might try to stop us, might be worried we were going to start a riot with our Bibles."

In Baghdad last month Mr Hanna met two other American missionary teams. One, from Indiana, had shipped in 1.3 million Christian tracts. "A US passport is all you need to get in, until the new Iraqi government takes over. What we thought was a two-year window, originally, has narrowed down to a six month window," said Mr Hanna, an evangelical minister and editor of Connection Magazine, a Christian newspaper in Ohio.

He describes Islam as "false". He cited St John's Gospel, saying: "Who is the liar? It is the man who denies that Jesus is the Christ. Such a man is the antichrist."

Mr Hanna concluded: "The Muslim religion is an antichrist religion." Later Mr Hanna asked to retract that choice of words. "Without the reader hearing my voice and looking into my eyes as I made that statement, it would be easy for certain readers to feel personally attacked and be offended," Mr Hanna wrote by email. "That would be unfruitful."

He rejected the suggestion that aid work was a "cover" for missionary work, preferring to call it a "conduit for sharing the gospel of Jesus. Christians are commanded to minister to the hungry, but also to the hunger of the spirit. It can't be separated," he said.

In public, the largest groups put the emphasis on their delivery of food parcels and their medical work. However, their internal fund-raising materials emphasise mission work. One IMB bulletin reported aid workers handing out copies of the New Testament and praying with Muslim recipients. Another bulletin said Iraqis understood "who was bringing the food . . . it was the Christians from America."

Southern Baptists from North Carolina visited Iraq in October to help hand out 45,000 boxes of donated food. One of the team, Jim Walker, told IMB's Urgent News bulletin that he met village children "starved of attention and I could tell some of them have not eaten well. But their biggest need is to know the love of Christ."

Mr Hanna said he encountered friendly curiosity, with noisy crowds gathering to take his group's tracts. "Maybe 10 per cent were hostile." He was one of 21 on his mission including Jackie Cone, 72, a Pentecostalist grandmother from Ohio who said God had told her to join a second mission planned for next year. "I sensed Him telling me to come back in January," she said.

Mrs Cone is confident she made converts in Baghdad. In her hotel she met a Muslim woman on crutches with a leg operation due that day. Mrs Cone knelt on the lobby floor and prayed that surgery would not be required.

"I saw her that evening and she said God had healed her, and she hadn't needed the surgery. She didn't say Allah, she pointed to Heaven and gave God the glory," she said.

Mrs Cone led the Kurdish woman and her brother in prayer, asking Jesus into their hearts. "I'd given them a Bible and a Jesus video in Arabic. I think they think of themselves as Christians now," she said. "They have the Bible and I hope they will grow in grace."

Muslims are hard converts, American missionaries admit. The large organisations have experts trained in refuting Muslim teachings that Jesus is just another prophet.

Before going to Iraq, Mr Hanna studied Christian training manuals and attended a seminar for missionaries to the Arab world.

Mr Hanna concedes his new Iraqi friends were possibly drawn by the novelty of meeting Americans. "But you don't discount that, you use it as an opportunity to tell them about Jesus. Last time we only took 8,000 Arabic Bibles to Iraq. **In future missions the goal is one million.**"

(Filed: 27/12/2003)

<<http://www.portal.telegraph.co.uk/news/main.jhtml?xml=/news/2003/12/27/wirq27.xml&sSheet=/news/2003/12/27/ixhome.html>>

ANTICHRISTIANISM

The Defamation of Christianity

by Bruce Walker

We all know that Christian anti-Semitism caused the Holocaust, right? The story goes something like this: (1) Christians, from the earliest days, were anti-Semitic; (2) Christians engaged in unprovoked persecution of Jews in the ancient and medieval world; (3) Christians encouraged massacres against Jews that desensitized Christendom to the Holocaust; (4) Men raised as Christians committed the Holocaust; (5) Christians ignored the Holocaust while it happened and denied the Holocaust after it happened.

Baseball allows three strikes and "You're out!" Football gives teams four downs to keep their drive alive. But let us be generous and give this particularly noxious defamation of Christianity five chances to be right. It is still defamation.

Christians were anti-Semitic?

Christianity has never been "anti-Semitic." The first Christians were Jews. The next Christians were Semitic people, even if they were not Jews. The model of racial moral superiority adopted by the National Socialist German Workers Party resembled Judaism, not Christianity (although Nazi evil was as hostile and incompatible with the righteousness required by Judaism as with the tolerance required by Christianity.)

Racism was condemned as sin in human history first by Christians. Outside Christian theology, racism was the norm. Why, then, describe the conflicts between Christians and Jews in the ancient and medieval world as "anti-Semitic"? Simple: it creates the false impression that differences between Jews and Christians sowed the seeds of Nazi racial policies.

Christians engaged in unprovoked persecution Jews in the ancient and medieval world?

The first three centuries of Christianity was one long religious holocaust by pagan Rome against Christians. When pagan Rome was scattering the Jewish people in the Diaspora, this vile though grand empire was torturing Christians to death. Seldom noted is that Jews, ten percent of the population of the Empire, sometimes helped persecute Christians.

Constantine the Great may have been converted to Christianity on his deathbed, but he was profoundly influenced by Christianity years before, which led him to proclaim the Edict of Milan in 313 A.D. This edict granted religious toleration to Jews, Christians and all faiths within the Roman Empire.

The diverse peoples of the Roman Empire were not forced to become Christians. These cosmopolitan peoples were familiar with many other moral and metaphysical systems, including Judaism. The many people of the Roman Empire embraced Christianity as something far better than they had ever seen before.

This did not lead to perfect moral behavior, but Christian doctrine denies that we will ever be sinless. What naturally did occur, however, was an improvement in the moral conditions within the Roman Empire. Under the increasing influence of Christian morals, Rome did not inflict upon the Jewish people crimes like the Diaspora and the destruction of the Second Temple, the Babylonian Captivity and the destruction of the First Temple, the Assyrian extermination or disintegration of ten of the twelve tribes of Israel and Judah, or the Egyptian oppression of Hebrew slaves which led to the Exodus, Torah and the Promised Land itself.

Christophobes do not even pretend that Roman Christians were committing these sorts crimes, although these crimes were so common in the ancient world. Instead Christophobes fast forward to the Justinian codification of Roman law, which included discrimination against Jews. Legal discrimination, of course, was ubiquitous in the ancient world. Almost every people in the ancient world, including Jews against goyim.

The sort of murderous crimes which smell of religious holocaust, however, do not appear in a Christian Roman Empire which had large numbers of subject Jews. The first episode of religious genocide between these two great faiths took place in 614 A.D., when Jerusalem was captured by Persians and Jews, who together methodically tortured and exterminated more than 90,000 Christian men, women and children.

Christians engaged in massacres of Jews which desensitized Christendom to the Holocaust?

Aside from the Zoroastrian-Jewish extermination of Christians in 614, other religions did engage in mass exterminations of other peoples because of their faith. Overwhelmingly, the victimizers were conquering Moslems and the victims were Jews, Christians, Zoroastrians and Hindus who had the misfortune to be in the war of Islam militant.

Yet Moorish Spain is often presented as a model of tolerance, suggesting that Christian Spain, after the Christian majority had expelled the Moslem overlords, was somehow kind and gentle and Christian Spain vicious and coarse. Why? Bat Ye'or, the Jewish historian who came from Egypt and who is the greatest modern student of Islamic persecution of others, describes the ideal often presented in history books of a wonderful, idyllic Islamic Spain as a "pious lie" by Jews to make Christians, who never did anything nearly as bad as Moslems in Spain, look worse than Moslems.

The expulsion of Jews from Spain in 1492 is described as a comparable episode, but of course it was not. Isabella and Ferdinand were simply reimposing edicts made by prior Moslem rulers requiring that Jews become Moslems, convert or die. The greatest difference is that Christians did not engage in an organized, sanctioned slaughter of Spanish Jews.

The tragic massacres of hundreds of Jews in the Rhineland during the First Crusade are the next "example" of how dangerous Christianity is to Jews. The events are not disputed. Mobs of peasants traveled from town to town killing entire Jewish communities. Seldom noted is that these mobs were strongly opposed by the bishops and archbishops of the towns in which these several massacres took place.

Bishops and archbishops took in Jews, hid Jews, and tried in every way possible to prevent these murders. The mobs tried smashed the doors of bishoprics and tried to kill Christian clergy. The courage of bishops and archbishops against the wrath of wild mobs changed the course of these campaigns: mobs looking for Jews to kill avoided towns which had a strong Christian presence.

Saint Bernard warned crusaders that killing Jews for being Jews was like killing Christ. Popes excommunicated those who called for the murder of Jews. Hardly fodder for holocausts, is it?

Cossacks in the 17th Century engaged in some of the most unspeakable crimes against Jews in human history. This is also cited as "proof" that the differences between Christians and Jews led to mass murder of Jews. The Cossacks, however, were ruthless to virtually everyone, including other Cossacks. Jews were not the first nor the last peoples who suffered horribly at the hands of Cossacks. Moreover, Cossacks were notoriously irreligious.

Salient is the reaction to these crimes within Christendom. Europe in the 1600s was not yet "modern." Nevertheless, Christendom in the 1600s strongly and unequivocally condemned Cossack atrocities against Jews. There was no denial and no support for this holocaust against Jews by Christendom.

Men raised as Christians committed the Holocaust

Did men raised as Christian murder millions of Jews? Yes, but what is unstated matters immensely: men raised as Christians, and who emphatically and contemptuously reviled Christianity, murdered millions of Jews. The only people in Europe who opposed the Holocaust when they could have saved their lives by being quiet were Christians in Europe. The only people who spoke out against the Holocaust while it was happening were Christians.

No one in 1945 seriously believed that Christianity "caused" the Holocaust, but many people believed that the evil which Hitler represented was ended by Christians. There are dozens of examples of the deep gratitude which Jews felt toward serious Christians in this hellish part of human history, but perhaps one example sums it up best: Rome has the oldest synagogue, perhaps, on earth; after the war was won and Nazism was defeated, the Chief Rabbi of Rome converted to Christianity.

If Christians "caused" the Holocaust, then who caused the greater holocaust in the Soviet Union a dozen years earlier? This greater holocaust was not caused by serious Jews who seriously believed in the theology of Judaism, but it is worth noting that Judaism and Jewishness is no more perfect a vaccine against these sorts of crimes than Christianity.

Lazar Kaganovich, probably the greatest mass murderer in modern history, the Soviet Himmler, an atheist Marxist, considered himself Jewish; Kaganovich spoke Yiddish; he was raised as an observant Jew. Yagoda, the sadistic head of the Soviet secret police, was

Jewish. Men who reject the moral precepts of Christianity and of Judaism will commit unthinkable crimes against humanity. Kaganovich and Himmler had the same theology: man is god.

Christians want to deny the Holocaust?

The myth that somehow America and Britain "denied" or "concealed" the Holocaust is more than just odd. Consider what happened on December 17, 1942. The allied governments of every Christian nation in Europe and America denounced the mass murder of Jewish in occupied Europe "in the strongest possible terms."

This mass murder was described as a "bestial policy of cold-blooded extermination." Anthony Eden introduced the resolution in the House of Commons, and a Labour MP asked that all members "rise in their places and stand in silence in protest of this disgusting behavior" Lord Samuel, a Jewish peer and former Leader of the Labor Party said "These events are an outcome of quite deliberate, planned, conscious cruelty of human beings." Is Holocaust denial?

America and Britain (we tend to forget that Britain was not just a predominately Christian nation, it is a formally Christian nation: Christianity, specifically Anglicanism and Presbyterianism, are the government religions of England and Scotland respectively) deliberately decided that defeating Nazism in Europe was much more important than defeating Japanese Imperialism in Asia.

Japan had more ability to actually threaten the island democracies of Anglo-America, because the Japanese fleet and naval aviation were superb. Japan was exterminating in unthinkable ways millions of Chinese and other Asian peoples.

If the democracies of Anglo-America were indifferent to that enormous crime we call the Holocaust - by the way...what do we call the holocaust of Chinese by Japan? I seem to have forgotten - then these Christian nations certainly showed that indifference in inexplicable ways.

Christians as Christians have been condemning the murder of Jews for more two thousand years. This has often not reciprocated. The first religious and racial genocide in Europe during the 20th Century was not the murder of Jews but the murder of Christians within the Turkish empire.

Almost every horror later used by Lazar Kaganovich against innocent, overwhelmingly Christian, people, and even later used by Nazis against innocent, largely Jewish, people were used first against Christians in this forgotten holocaust.

Packing people into cattle cars, torturing innocents, liquidating children - all these things happened in Armenia before the Gulag, and in the Gulag before the Nazi death camps. As with the Holocaust, Christians who were not in harm's way risked their lives to save the innocent. Also, to his enormous credit, an American Jew, Henry Morgenthau, worked bravely and tirelessly to help these wretched victims.

But some people also denied this first experiment in racial and religious genocide. In 1918 Ben Gurion, the first president of the modern State of Israel, and Ben-Zvi published a book projecting an Eretz Yisrael in the Ottoman Empire. Future President Ben Gurion says in that book: "it must be said, to the credit of the Turks, that their rulers behaved toward the conquered with a degree of tolerance and generosity which is unparalleled in the history of Christian peoples of the period." Ben Gurion does not mention a single word about the Armenian genocide.

The extermination of the Christian Armenians had been preceded by decades of mass murders of Christians in the Turkish Empire. How did Theodor Herzl, the father of Zionism, feel the Fifth Zionist Congress in 1901 should react to these decades of torture and mass murder of Christians? Herzl urged the Congress to send a message to Abdul Hami II (know as the "Bloody Sultan" for his massacres of Armenians) which had an "expression of dedication and gratitude which all the Jews feel regarding the benevolence which his Highness the Sultan has always shown them."

The best and the worst moral attitude

Jews should want Christians to be deep and sincere Christians. Christians should want Jews to take Judaism seriously. Defaming Christianity does not lead to a safer, kinder world for Jews. It leads to monsters like Bormann and Eichman. The best protection against holocausts are men like pious Christians like George Washington and Pope John Paul II. The best protection is honest, decent Jews like Henry Morgenthau BatYe'or .

Monsters like Kaganovich, craven and cynical creeps like Ben Gurion are found in all races, all faiths and every age. Some are CINOs (Christians In Name Only) and some are JINOs (Jews In Name Only.) One of the best ways to seed and to nourish this sort of evil is

to defame Christianity - like pretending that the Holocaust is the logical consequence of serious Christianity.

February 11, 2004

<<http://mensnewsdaily.com/archive/w/walker/04/walker021104.htm>>

DUBYA

A Republican's Case Against George W. Bush

by Paul Findley

January 27, 2004

During my long life, America has surmounted many severe challenges. As a teenager, I experienced the great depression. In World War II, I saw war close-up as a Navy Seabee. As a country newspaper editor, I watched the Korean War from afar. As a Member of Congress, I agonized through the Vietnam War from start to finish. During these challenges I never for a moment worried about America's ultimate survival with its great principles and ideals still intact.

Today, for the first time, I worry deeply about America's future. We are in a deep hole. I believe President George W. Bush's decision to initiate war in Iraq will be the greatest and most costly blunder in American history. He has set America on the wrong course.

I must speak out. As best I can, I must bestir those who will listen to the grave damage already done to our nation and warn of still greater harm if Bush continues his present course during a second term in the White House.

When terrorists assaulted America on 9/11, killing nearly 3,000 innocent civilians, President Bush responded, not by focusing on bringing to justice the criminals who were responsible, but by initiating a war against impoverished, defenseless Afghanistan, a broad attack that killed at least 3,000 innocent people. Even before the dust settled in Afghanistan, the president initiated another war--this one in Iraq, a war planned long before 9/11.

In the name of national security, the president has brought about fundamental, revolutionary changes that threaten our nation's moorings.

At home and abroad, he has undercut time-honored principles of the rule of law.

Abroad, he has made war a ready instrument of presidential policy instead of reserving it as a last-resort should peril confront our nation.

In public documents, he claims the personal authority to make war any time and any place he alone chooses and the authority to use force to keep unfriendly nations from increasing their own military strength.

His power is unprecedented. He directs a military budget greater than all other nations combined. At his instant, personal command is more military power than any nation in all recorded history ever before possessed.

He proclaims America the global policeman and for that role he has already expanded a worldwide system of U.S. military bases. Four new ones are in place in Iraq and four others near the Caspian Sea.

He orders the development and production of a new generation of nuclear arms for U.S. use only, meanwhile threatening other nations, Iran and North Korea, for example, against acquiring any of its own.

Unleashing America's mighty sword, he brings about regime changes in Afghanistan and Iraq but mires our forces in quagmires from which escape seems unlikely for many years.

He isolates America from common undertakings with time-tested allies. He trivializes the United Nations and violates its charter.

The president offers wars without end, and the Congress shouts its approval. But his use of America's vast arsenal is so reckless that he is regarded widely as **the most dangerous man in the world**.

Here at home, in his frantic quest for terrorists, he stoops to bigoted measures based on race and national origin, tramples on civil liberties, and spreads fear and disbelief throughout the land. Those of Middle Eastern ancestry, and many others, buckle under government-inflicted humiliations and abuses with trepidation, sorrow and resentment.

Frustrated by Iraqi dissidents who protest the occupation by killing U.S. troops almost daily, the president reverts to war measures. He orders heavy aerial bombing in wide areas of the countryside.

Even as body bags pile high, the president seems oblivious to war's horror. The rockets and one-ton bombs may kill a few Iraqi guerrillas and cause others to pull back and pause, but they kill and maim innocent civilians, level homes, turn neighborhoods into rubble, and permanently blight many lives. They create deep-seated outrage, not cooperation.

The Iraqi carnage is piled alongside the simultaneous destruction and blighting of American lives. More than 500 U.S. military personnel have been killed and, according to one estimate, nearly 10,000 have been wounded. Ponder that fact. Ten thousand American families permanently blighted in a war the United States initiated. Mark Twain, writing of war, once asked, "Will we wring the hearts of the unoffending widows with unavailing grief?"

The president overreacts to 9/11 by leading America into a lengthy fiery trial that may last far into the future, – years of U.S.-initiated wars designed to punish regimes believed to harbor terrorists.

This is not the America my generation fought to preserve in World War II.

Starting wars will not bring a just peace. The president should ponder deeply why many people in many nations engage in anti-American protest.

The answer: People worldwide, especially in Iraq and Palestine, are livid over grievances against America. Almost all Iraqis are glad Saddam Hussein is out of power, but many of them, – the total may be a substantial majority, – see America as arrogant, biased, untrustworthy, and bent on world domination.

Here are some of the reasons:

In the 1980s – the height of Saddam's cruel treatment of Kurds and other Iraqi citizens, – the U.S. government served as the dictator's silent, uncomplaining partner, helping him battle Iran by providing intelligence, and critical military supplies, even some components of weapons of mass destruction.

At the end of the 1991 Gulf War, Iraqis had a bitter experience with the president's father. President George Bush, Sr. publicly urged the Iraqis to overthrow Saddam. His call prompted a strong uprising, but Bush refused U.S. support in any form. This bleak rejection prompted Saddam to use helicopter gun-ships to slaughter dissidents by the hundreds. He had retained use of these lethal aircraft in a provision of the U.S.-approved armistice.

Iraqis also remember bitterly that U.S. fighter planes enforced sanctions on the people of Iraq for a decade after the Gulf War. This embargo was so harsh it led to immense civilian suffering, including the death of at least a half-million Iraqi infants.

Today, Iraqis are wary of the President's motives and dependability. Many doubt that his true objectives are, as he now states, establishing freedom and democracy in their country, or, as he earlier stated, destroying Iraq's weapons of mass destruction.

Aware that he ignored offers of conciliation from Saddam's emissaries before the invasion, they believe he harbors dreams of an American empire and wanted the war in Iraq, come what may.

Their greatest and most deep-seated complaint is Bush's failure to make even the slightest move to halt America's anti-Arab bias. For example, the president has made no effort to distance America from Israel's colonialism.

He pays lip-service to statehood as a goal for the Palestinians, but he has done nothing to stop Israeli Prime Minister Sharon's brutality of Palestinians--assassinations, military forays that leave vast death and destruction, high fences that confine Palestinians like cattle, and the steady usurpation of more Palestinian land.

Bush seems unconcerned by the worldwide outrage at America's massive, unconditional, uncritical support of Israel, without which the Jewish state could never have carried out its humiliation and devastation of Palestinian society.

Bush is overwhelmed by the influence of religious zealots--both Zionist and fundamentalist Christian. He ignores America's own heavy guilt for the plight of Palestinians. He fails to recognize that more than a billion Muslims worldwide, along with many millions of non-Muslims, are deeply aggrieved at this complicity.

Bush offers an exquisite example of close-in hypocrisy. On one side of a Middle East border, he tries to convince Iraqi Arabs that he offers them democracy and freedom while, at the same time on the other side of the border, he supports Israel's violent denial of these identical rights for Palestinian Arabs.

Iraqis worry that U.S. occupation will become a new colonialism--indefinite U.S. control of Iraqi oil reserves, Israeli-style brutality, and a U.S.-forced treaty that will keep Iraq from helping the Palestinians.

President Bush is so befuddled by the awful carnage of 9/11 and rumors of more assaults to come that he does not see what is vivid to most of the world--the real ground zero of terrorism is in Palestine, not Manhattan. He ignores the real ground zero at great peril to America.

This issue surmounts all others in the presidential political campaign. It impels me to speak out against what George W. Bush is doing. I am a Republican, and I will remain in the Party of Lincoln. I feel no joy in making this case against the president. He may be sincere in his stewardship, but he is wrong, – dead wrong – in the direction he is taking our country.

What should be done? Must the president proceed with wars without end?

The president's best war decision is purely political one, and it is plain, peaceful, generous and just. He must make a clean break from Israel's scofflaw behavior.

If Bush has the will, he can easily free himself and America. If he acts, he will transform the grim scene in Iraq and elsewhere in the Middle East into bright promise. Any day he chooses, the president can instantly, – without firing a shot – quiet guerrilla warfare in Iraq and anti-American protests throughout the world.

All he needs to do is inform Sharon that all aid will be suspended until Israel vacates the Arab territory Israeli forces seized in June 1967. U.S. aid is literally Israel's lifeline, so the ultimatum would be electrifying evidence that the United States, at long last, will do what is right for Arabs and Muslims. If Bush acts, the Iraqi people will have reason to believe, for the first time, that the U.S. government truly opposes colonialism.

The ultimatum would prompt rejoicing worldwide, not just among Iraqis and Palestinians. Opinion polls show that a large majority of Israelis, weary of the long, bloody struggle to subjugate the Palestinians, would welcome co-existence with an independent, peaceful Palestine.

An impressive foundation for this presidential ultimatum already exists. All member-states of the Arab league unanimously offered peace-for-withdrawal four years ago. A similar plan called the Geneva Accords was recently announced jointly by former officials of Israel and Palestine. Almost simultaneously, four retired heads of Israeli intelligence even urged full, unilateral withdrawal from the West Bank and Gaza.

By standing resolutely for justice for Palestinians, who are mostly Muslim, Bush would virtually end anti-American protests and strengthen moderate forces worldwide.

Will Bush liberate America from endless wars and chart a constructive, peaceful new future for our nation? If he does so promptly, he will be a shoo-in for reelection. If he does not, I will join other Republicans, – there will be many of us – in urging his defeat.

1-27-04.

Paul Findley, Member of Congress 1961-83, author of: *They Dare to Speak Out: People and Institutions Confront Israel's Lobby*; *Deliberate Deceptions: Facing the Facts About the US-Israeli Relationship*; and *Silent No More: Confronting America's False Images of Islam*

FAIRY TALES

The Gold Teeth

From the book *Verheimlichte Dokumente*, Band 2, FZ-Verlag 1995. Page 127, here translated from German:

Beside "Soap from killed Jews", "Diminished Heads from KZ-Camps" and "Lamp shade from Human skin" the famous and terrifying story of the gold teeth that were stored in the German Reichsbank [State bank] in Francfort which the German had pulled out of dead Jews are among the best known propaganda tails that are told about the Germans from last war.

The Vienna news paper "Neue Front" was among the first papers to print the background of the swindle in their edition of August 1953.

In his authentic and startling narrative from the Nuremberg Trial Hans Fritsche tells, that the former Reichswirtschaftsminister Funk (Secretary of State for Trade and Industry),

the sick old man, was taken by surprise as Judge Dood, Executive Trial Counsel for USA, asked:

"Did you store gold teeth in your Reichsbank?"

"No", said former Reichswirtschaftsminister Funk.

To this answer Dodd said: "Then I will show you a film."

The light in court room switched off, the film projector started to whirl: US- soldiers force themselves into the strongroom of the Main branch of The Reichsbank in Frankfurt am Main. They open the very heavy, tons of kilos, steel door. Crammed full sacks with "Deutsche Reichsbank" written on them are carried out of the strongroom, they are opened and emptied on large tables. From them flows: rings, gold coins, jewels and gold teeth. - Frank is discompose and close to a collapse. This was his cooperation with the SS and the K-camps. In despair he stutters: "I did not know." Fritsche wrote: "We believed him!"

A year later Fritsche, writes in his memoirs, one of Frank's staff, Reichsbankdirektor Puhl (Director of the Reichsbank), is standing on trail in the so called Wilhelmstraße-Process, called witnesses that stated under oath that at the moment of the US-occupation the strongroom of the Frankfurter Bank of the Reichsbank was empty. Puhl said the strongroom was empty as he surrendered the bank to the US-army. Puhl was asked if he has no knowledge of the film Executive Trial Counsel for USA Dodd had shown as evidence at Military Trial at Nuernberg.

"Oh, yes," said Puhl, "I was presence as the film was made. It happened like this: One day after the occupation of Frankfurt an American truck stopped outside the Reichsbank. They asked me for sacks with the Reichsbank sign on. These sacks were filled with jewels, gold coins and gold teeth, which they had brought with them, by the Americans. Then they fetched a camera and moved the crammed full sacks into the strongroom and closed the steel door. Then they start to roll the film, ordered me to open the door, and carried out the sacks. That was the film that almost broke the neck of Funk."

<http://www.newsturmer.com/Historical%20News%20Letter/gold_teeth.htm>

OFF LIMITS

Without a doubt, the "hottest" spot in Iraq is the town of Fallujah, about one hundred kilometres from Baghdad.

For starters, no one warned us that the US forces have withdrawn from Fallujah. When journalists asked to be embedded with the 82nd Airborne there, the official response was that it was unsafe at the moment. The fact is that the resistance now completely controls Fallujah. **The Americans have literally put a lock on the front gate of their Forward Operating Base Volturno, and bugged out.** So we were driving around this city, noting the unfriendly faces as our driver-translator read out all the Arabic graffiti calling on the residents of Fallujah to "kill Americans" and "restore Saddam to power." Realizing that they probably wouldn't be able to discern between Americans and Canadians until it was too late, we got out quickly ourselves.

Canadian war reporter Scott Taylor interviewd by Christopher Deliso,
<<http://www.antivar.com/orig/deliso95.html>>

DEACTIVATING THE HOAX

Hello from Dublin, Ireland

I have an article for you which you might like to publish.

It has already appeared on a number of "indymedia" sites around the world. It has produced a mixture of puzzlement, consternation and approval. Often, naturally, it has been deleted.

Deactivating the Holocaust Hoax Reflections of a Holocaust Revisionist and Liberal

Joseph Heaney

Of all the points of view current in the world that of the holocaust revisionist is the most difficult to get a fair hearing for. Thus it is so very difficult to get across. The very second one makes the slightest revisionist utterance they are down on you like a ton of bricks. One is greeted with hysteria masquerading as argument. One's sanity is called into question. One is labelled a bigot and worse.

Most so called educated people believe that level headed intelligent individuals, who dispute the standard holocaust narrative of six million Jewish victims, gas chambers and other horrors, just do not exist. If one holds such views one is by definition morally and intellectually depraved.

It is my hope in writing this piece to set matters to rights. By this I mean to let people know that holocaust revisionists are not monsters in human form and they view their ideas as simply the result of submitting common belief regarding what is known as the holocaust to objective multi-disciplinary scrutiny. This is the essence of Holocaust Revisionism.

It is also my aim to probe the political and philosophical implications of holocaust revisionism. I do not seek here to prove the contentions of revisionists outright but simply to whet the reader's appetite for further exploration. With that I would like to help him or her to appreciate the profound and momentous importance of the revisionist message.

I must make clear that I have not always held such views. There was a time, some years ago, when if I had heard any challenge to the standard sacred text I would have immediately mounted my high horse and armed with fierce indignation rode over the guilty miscreant. I was a holocaustian, a soldier ready to do battle for the holocaust faith, only then I had not realised it was a faith, I, as almost everybody, thought it was established fact like where Australia was on the globe or how the Titanic had sunk. This is the initial psychological problem everyone who comes to revisionism for the first time faces. One has so taken for granted the story of the gas chambers, death camps etc. that it has entered the psyche and become part of one's mental furniture. Furthermore, many thinkers today see the holocaust as being the defining event of 20th. century history.

Surely, one says to oneself, intellectuals could not be so stupid, so gullible, so corrupt to ascribe profound meaning to events which either did not happen or happened in ways very different to how they are thought to have happened? The revisionist answer is simply that the standard political/historical world-view is indeed corrupt and distorted to the point of absurdity.

My interest in the troubled politics of the Middle East and a series of twists of fate led me in a direction where I reigned in my scepticism and contempt enough to read some revisionist articles. I believe myself to have a good nose for detecting flawed logic, rationalisation, doublethink, tendentiousness and such like. I could find none of these in what I read. This was a great surprise as that is what I had expected. In fact it was in the writings of conventional historians and in critics of revisionism that these qualities appeared to be marked. Naturally I was dumbfounded. Curiosity led to further investigation. Eventually I had to throw in the towel and admit to myself that the holocaust story while embodying some truth was essentially atrocity propaganda. My view of history and the world was thrown into disarray.

So what do the revisionists actually say? Firstly they do not dispute that the Nazis persecuted the Jews of Europe and placed a great number of them in ghettos and concentration camps. They do not dispute that Jews were massacred in Eastern Europe by various parties including indigenous communities of Ukrainians, Poles and Russians and other nationalities as well as by the SS and Axis forces. What they do dispute is the number of Jewish victims which at six millions they hold to be a wild exaggeration. They say that the genocidal gas chambers did not exist and that it was not the intention of the Nazis to exterminate the Jews but rather to expel them from their sphere of influence. There were no "death camps". There were camps used to hold people in transit before resettlement and camps where people were forced to work in the war industries such as Auschwitz. Deaths in the camps were mainly due to Typhus.

Is all this not redolent of a right wing ideology of hatred and intolerance? Firstly revisionists come from many ideological and cultural backgrounds. The first of the prolific challengers of the holocaust legend was a former French resistance activist Paul Rassinier who had been an inmate in Buchenwald and after the war for a time was a Socialist member of the National Assembly. He wrote a number of books based firstly on his

Buchenwald personal experiences and later on the Nazi concentration camp system in general. Due to the revelations contained in his books in the 1950s the Holocaust canon was substantially revised. In 1960 it was officially admitted by the Munich Institute for Contemporary History that no lethal gassings had occurred in Buchenwald or any camps on German soil. Thus dozens of witness statements and alleged confessions of perpetrators were rendered invalid. The scene of mass annihilation had been safely isolated in Poland behind the then existing iron-curtain where it was conveniently closed to forensic examination. Rassinier died in 1967.

The most important promoter of Revisionism in the United States at present is the libertarian Bradley Smith. For him the supreme value is freedom of expression and open debate. In his recently published biography "Break His Bones" he explains his motivation:

"The ruling discourse in America, and indeed the West, demands that the Holocaust story remain closed to authentic debate. The holocaust happened. Revisionists say it didn't. For that reason all worthy persons and particularly intellectuals-who are all worthy persons by definition-favor the suppression and even censorship of revisionist theory. Meanwhile, because over the last half century the story has been revised so much, it becomes increasingly difficult to say exactly what the holocaust was. That's where I saw my role. I fell into it like a blind man falling down a well. All I could see was the taboo that protected the story from real examination. How could anyone put his finger on what the thing itself had been if it was taboo to talk about it freely-really freely? I would be the one then, the blind man said, to help start the discussion going."

I recommend "Break His Bones", the website of that name and his main website CODOH.com for anyone who wants to sharpen their understanding of this subject.

Jews have also played a significant part in furthering the revisionist cause. Among them was the German Jew and anti-zionist the late Joseph Ginsberg who wrote in German such works as Schuld und Schicksal (Guilt and Fate) and Majdanek in aller Ewigkeit (Majdanek in all Eternity) under the name of JG Burg.

Contrary to what one is programmed into thinking the holder of revisionist opinions may not necessarily be some aggressive cropped headed youth but may be someone professional, unassuming, literate, middle-aged and well read. Usually, for social and career reasons, they keep their views to themselves. None are better aware of the hollow nature of western societies boast to be "free and open". Neither are they necessarily politically right wing.

Certainly the ultra right have been enthusiastic and vocal in their support for revisionism. This is to be expected as the legend undermines the credibility of their world view and consigns it, in general public estimation, to the realm of the psychopathic. More than for other shades of political opinion revisionist insights help to publicly validate their position.

This has afforded propagandists, such as Deborah Lipstat, in her book Denying the Holocaust the chance to claim revisionism to be a movement of the anti-Semitic far right. This is drivel. How could leftists and Jews have been among the pioneers of such a movement? Revisionism in it's essence is forensic rather than political in it's concerns. However, this is not to say it is without political and ideological implications. History is part of the bedrock upon which we build our subjective world of values and ideals. If it is radically revised then we may be challenged to correspondingly revise our world-view. How this revising takes place is important.

When one realises for the first time the holocaust story is false one has a sense of shock and disorientation. Some even develop psychosomatic symptoms. One has to take time to again find one's ideological, political and philosophical bearings.

How one integrates the new knowledge is as important as the knowledge itself. The sorry saga of the Second World War is normally narrated as a conflict between light and darkness, good and evil, between black and white. In essence the structure is that of that ancient story form; the fairy tale. There is little space for deep and subtle analysis, for varying shades of grey, for alternate modes of interpretation. It is presented as a simple conflict between good and evil. When one gains the knowledge that things were less simple than society had led one to believe there is a temptation to jump to the very opposite conclusion to the one which has been pushed so constantly and unremittingly. One jumps to the conclusion the wrong side won and one enthusiastically embraces the ideological baggage of the Nazis. In short one accepts a fairy tale equal and opposite to the fairy tale one had started out with, only now who the good and evil sides are reversed.

I prefer to see that awful conflagration in Europe as a struggle between a number of ruthless imperialistic power blocs. All the different political systems represented were predatory, elite driven and served societies soaked in propaganda.

While I consider myself to be a liberal I fully respect the entitlement of the ultra right to hold, express and promote their views. Freedom of opinion I see as more than a cliché. I see it as a necessity. Without this right to personal opinion and free expression we become more easily the victims of ideological and political tyrants and bullies. If we are not allowed the dignity of possessing our own minds and of expressing our insights to those we choose to express them to we live an impoverished life in the shadow of tyranny. Such a tyranny is not achieved without the all important tool of coercive fear. Yet, so called liberals all over the "democratic" world, play along with the suppression of revisionism on the grounds it is "nazi", "ultra rightist" etc. Yet the truth is, as explained above, revisionism is non-ideological and even if it were that is no grounds to justify denial of basic rights. The reality is that most "liberals" are only fair weather liberals and when confronted with something that threatens the established order they are ready to cannive at it's suppression. Devotion to the ideal of freedom of expression is a trendy lifestyle accessory for virtually everybody in the worlds of academia and journalism. It is a fashion accessory and nothing more.

Any ban on the expression of ideas can give fraudsters cover to hide behind. Full freedom of expression allows all ideas to face the challenge of open debate without the protection of a taboo against hate speech or hate crime or thought crime.

It is noteworthy that revisionists have always and everywhere sought free and open discussion. The establishment on the other hand has almost never consented to accept the challenge. Instead it has sought to shelter the public from revisionist publicity. When one side of an argument shuns the debate which the other side demands what does this indicate?

While revisionism is suppressed with legal penalties in most of western continental Europe in the English speaking world the taboo is enforced via an informal media ban (Internet so far excluded) and the use of gangs of naïve youth people to violently disrupt the dissemination of information such as by smashing the windows of bookstores which sell revisionist literature. Such youth organisations are often controlled by state intelligence operatives.

Academics and journalists who breach the taboo face dismissal. What has been uniquely bizarre is the way academic distinctions especially doctorates have been withdrawn from individuals who have committed the ultimate heresy. This happens even if the doctorate concerned a completely different subject! The public has to be protected from the the possibility of knowing that gifted individuals can hold revisionist opinions. To this end reality has to be modified in a similar way to how photographs were modified by Stalinist regimes to eliminate images of "unpersons" who were out of favour. The past does not fit. Thus it has to be changed.

Recently an attempt to withdraw an MA degree from an historian in New Zealand failed. The man, Dr Joel Hayward, had however been hounded out of his position at a University and his highly promising career and health ruined. Holocaust enforcers had even been considerate enough to contact him to make death threats regarding his children! His crime was, many years before, to have written a thesis for which he received first class honours in which the standard holocaust doctrines had been called into question and described as 'atrocious propaganda'.

Reality, one may note, has a certain robustness. It can be picked up and scrutinised and played with. It can be tossed about in the interplay of open debate without fear such rough and tumble will cause it to shatter.

What is it about the reality of the "Holocaust" that makes it different? Why does it have to be accompanied by a bodyguard of protective measures wherever it travels? Claims are heard "survivors" will be upset and feel emotionally afflicted by the mere possibility their testimonies may be put under the proverbial microscope and processed through the laboratory of critical analysis. Nobody can be insulted or demeaned by a challenge to the authenticity of a valid contention. The very nature of the world of fact is that it emerges "smelling of roses" and with credibility in yet greater glory thanks to the inquisitorial process undergone.

There is an argument particularly popular in Germany in recent years that scepticism regarding the six million and related assertions is expressed merely as a ploy to lure more recruits into the right-wing extremist "scene". The idea is that the sceptics do not believe themselves what they say but do so in the hope it will make an ideology look more innocuous and so more attractive to potential new supporters. One fault here is that this is

merely an ad hominum argument. That is it attacks the person of the opponent rather than what he says. Plainly put it goes for "the man instead of the ball". Such a line of attack can be deployed against any line of reasoning we are afraid to confront. We simply say: "You do not believe what you are saying so I am under no obligation to answer your arguments!" Of course to impute bad faith a priori, like this, to ones opponent in any disputation is to dismiss him before the discussion has begun. It denies him the minimal respect one decent human being ought accord to another. It is merely an excuse not to engage in discussion.

This ever so convenient line of reasoning can be marshalled for any case where we believe we are right and the opposition wrong, which one imagines would cover quite a few instances! Next time you have a difference of opinion with your spouse or partner why not try this line of reasoning?

"You are wrong. You know you are wrong and are dishonestly asserting your position for an ulterior motive. Thus I am not obliged to engage in any further discussion."

The results should be interesting!

People can better understand the reality of the "Holocaust" when they understand the context. Zionism engaged in an extraordinary colonialist enterprise immediately after WWII. This involved an aggressive war against the Arabs of Palestine including extensive ethnic cleansing. The extraordinary and lurid allegations helped justify this before world opinion. The world was made to feel it owed Israel, acting as proxy for the world Jewish community, something special in recognition of a terrible and evil betrayal. The new Jewish state required extensive financial and technical support to get on it's feet and integrate millions new immigrants. Much of this support came from Germany in the early years. Since the 1960s the United States has provided the lion's share of support for Israel. A great deal of money still to this day comes from Germany as "reparations". Israel has never in it's history been self supporting.

The holocaust story usefully served to distract attention, as it still does, from crimes committed by the Allies during WWII especially the atom bomb attacks which occurred at a time Japan was seeking to surrender honourably and the firebombing to death of civilians in their hundreds of thousands in Japanese and German cities.

Was "the Holocaust" intended, as most atrocity propaganda has been, to serve as an expedient which would eventually wither on the vine of human memory? Were it's inconsistencies and absurdities gradually to be allowed exposure as it's usefulness waned? One can only surmise.

However, Israel did not progress as had been hoped for. The new state experienced economic difficulties as the 1950s gave way to the 1960s. In the new decade outside financial and military support was increased. The alliance with the US was deepened and strengthened. Military conquest afforded further territorial expansion in the mid 1960s. The term "the Holocaust" was born around this time. Before this, titles such as "the Nazi genocide" had been used. The legend was utilised to morally underwrite the peculiar and not a little bizarre Israeli combination of financial dependence allied to multifaceted aggression. The failure of Israel up to now to achieve real economic viability partly explains the durability of the legend.

There are further explanations for it's durability. It has become part of the public self definition of the USA vis à vis it's enemies. Contemporary armed confrontations are almost inevitably described as being against "a new Hitler". The public is taught a mental paradigm whereby American arms inevitably confront consummate evil.

It has become a key origin myth of the present United States dominated world system. The story allows the US to present itself as having "saved" the world during WWII.

It serves the interests of the international Jewish business community.

The put down term "anti-Semite" can be thrown at anyone who refers to the utterly enormous influence of the Jewish community in the worlds of mass media and high finance. Absurd as it is when reflected upon, one can be accused of initiating "a new Holocaust" simply by pointing to such obvious facts!

The political left has found the legend useful as the alleged perpetrators were associated with the political right. Thus they are usually happy to promote it and use it as a major point of reference.

Similarly internationalists in politics and the business world of various hues who are opposed to traditional European forms of Nationalism and those who believe in unrestricted immigration into Europe use the legend assiduously in their publicity.

What is so very strange is that organised Christianity today plays along wholeheartedly with the extermination story. It turns a blind eye to the abuses of basic rights suffered by revisionists. Yet Christianity unlike zionism or the US military industrial complex or transnational corporate business or the political left gains nothing and loses credibility in the face of the hoax. The accusations of moral culpability undermine Christianity's claim to be a creed of compassion. Instead of confronting the accusations with objective analysis Christians prefer to wallow in a vague but real sense of guilt. One strongly suspects that the mindset one is dealing with here is one lacking the spark of real critical intellect. Could it be those with a habit of asking probing questions have already jumped ship? Could it be all that are left are mediocrities and "yes men" ready to be taken in by whatever counterfeit wares the holocaust hustlers have prepared to dupe them with?

People are bound to their rulers and authority figures by bonds of trust without which it would be hard for society to function. This trustingness makes it difficult for most people to question what institutions present as true and given, no matter how it is that what they are told may sound outrageous, extravagantly lurid, a challenge to their credulity. This natural human tendency protects the hoax from overmuch threatening prying examination.

Indeed this human tendency protects other hoaxes perpetrated by controlling elites in our times who want to hide their activities. This human tendency to trust protected the small number of Catholic clerics who up to recently got away with serial acts of abuse against children. Victims and those who doubted the whiter than white picture the clergy painted of itself kept quiet just as revisionists today are forced to tread cautiously. They had to hide from public view their maverick and tabooed view of the world. They kept quiet because they were beset by a powerful societal taboo which threatened real dire consequences and ostracism against all who challenged it.

Another factor which protects "the Holocaust" is it's own very monumental scale. People are well capable of telling small fibs themselves but would balk at the idea of promoting a monstrous untruth. A lie of such enormous scale most people can not envisage as such and so they tend to believe the story.

A continuous deluge of media propaganda repeats the essentials of the story ad nauseum. The process of repetition embeds it into the public consciousness thus rounding off the brainwashing process.

A lie believed distorts our perceptions. A monumental and epic lie does so to the point it acts as a gigantic act of sorcery putting it's subjects under a state of remote control whereby they do irrational things without realising it. They are subject to a kind of magic spell such as what we might call the Holocaust Hex.

In our hexed and benighted world we are reluctant to acknowledge the horrors the State of Israel has foisted upon the peoples of the Middle East. We do not ask is it strange that a nuclear power which has behaved ultra aggressively towards it's neighbours should be supported by a massive system of international financial largesse.

In our hexed and bewildered world normal and natural European nationalist sentiments and impulses are seen as pathological because nationalist ideology we are told ignited the most murderous and evil acts history has seen. Similarly, Christianity tainted as a carrier of 'anti-Semitism', that most frightful disease, is pathologised. The whole of Europe's heritage lies shamed and accused.

In our hexed and blinded world we dare not enquire if it makes sense that a small ethnic minority should monopolise the mass media, with all that extraordinary capacity for mass indoctrination, in much of the developed world.

We are hexed into false perceptions of our history and heritage, of politics and of society. Of course, also, we are hexed into a false notion of the legend itself.

Slowly but surely knowledge and awareness is growing. The eventual general exposure of the great imposture will free our perceptions. The ideological establishment will be discredited. Again able to see we will look about us in wonder at what surrounds us. We will see the academic world and the world of journalism and the Churches and realise how much they have been a sham. So called democratic politics, as it is practised, will then be revealed as the playground of powerful, ruthless and amoral elites. People will realise such gross and absurd untruths could not have survived and flourished for so long in a society that was truly free and open. A new era of questioning basic principles, a new enlightenment can be set in motion. People will seek to create a real truly liberal and open society to replace the current fake one. The free exchange of ideas, unhampered by taboos, will be set in motion. Spurious arguments, based on nothing better than an elaborate version of childish name calling, will no longer suffice. Saying "that is Nazi" or "that is anti-Semitic" or "that is Nationalism" will no longer carry weight. People will be forced

to support their positions with cogent argument. A new era of intellectual honesty and doubt and adventurousness can begin.

In short, the public exposure of the legend will cause the hex to work its magic spell in reverse! Instead of promoting confusion it will now promote understanding and enlightenment. It will be realised if we were so easily misled in one area we most likely were misled in a lot of other areas besides! Everywhere and overall perceptive skills will be sharpened. New light will illuminate many dark corners of deceit.

That revisionism has come this far is due to the activity of a relatively small number of gifted and courageous individuals. The work of examining and deconstructing the holocaust story is mostly at an end. The numbers accepting the revisionist analysis in western Europe and north America is still relatively small though it is constantly growing. What retards its faster spread is legal and extra legal intimidation added to the caution and defensiveness engendered by a major societal taboo.

This understandable caution however need not be all embracing. The truth needs to be sponsored. Sponsors of the truth can attend academic seminars and ask probing questions. They can engage in radio phone-ins. They can, circumstances permitting, ask questions as audience members in television discussion programmes. They can distribute leaflets. They can as students publicly confront academics. They can in private life be prepared to advocate and discuss. In short they can stand up and be counted.

The security of the legend rests on a taboo against open critical discussion. Various means of intimidation, as already mentioned, have been set up to protect and reinforce that taboo. Revisionists should refuse to be intimidated.

Activism, I believe, would be more effective in concentrating on the flimsy justifications for the existence of these mechanisms of intimidation rather than on the forensic details of the extermination allegations themselves. For it is in its need for recourse to intimidation of both the legal and extra-legal kind that the holocaust industry, most clearly and in an easily comprehended way, reveals there is something it desperately needs to hide. Always and everywhere the questions must be posed:

"Why are people not allowed to hear all sides of the discussion?"

"Why can we not have open public discussion on this topic?"

"Why has the public to be kept in the dark about technical research in this area?"

"Why do you challenge my right to express myself?"

"Why should there be any need for 'Holocaust Denial' laws?"

"Why do you answer my request for discussion with violence?"

"Why do you oppose a free market in ideas regarding this matter?"

"Why are revisionist titles not available in major bookstores?"

The denial of information to the public allied to intimidation amounts to how the official story is enforced.

Because it carries weight in the free market of ideas truth needs only to be asserted. Untruth however needs to be enforced.

This is the most immediately apprehensible flaw in the established holocaust story. Herein lies the tip of the iceberg of deceit. This enforcement embodies the denial of rights of free expression and denial of the public's right to information. As explained already it has legal and extra-legal aspects. Indeed, one may say that with their orchestration of this massive denial of rights the holocaust lobby themselves are the true 'deniers'.

Why do names such as Rassinier, Faurisson and other revisionists not trip off the tongues of academic students of history? If the "holocaust" is a matter of such fundamental importance, as we are told so often, is not a student of history entitled to be familiar with all shades of opinion on the matter? Why are students in academic institutions not encouraged to read revisionist writings in the original? They have to be kept ignorant of revisionist writing and research as part of the enforcement process.

That an established point of view is enforced does not definitively and absolutely prove the revisionist case but it does mean the treatment of and discourse surrounding the

matter are not rational nor natural nor healthy nor reasonable. An inquiring and alert mind will naturally seek out all those studies, scientific analyses and observations which have been so strangely barricaded away.

The truth, as always, will eventually everywhere become public knowledge. When that will be depends on many factors only the future will reveal. It can happen access to the internet may be denied to revisionism which will slow it's progress in gaining acceptance significantly. Still, a critical mass of awareness remains at present in place across the globe, which persecution can not eradicate. Scepticism regarding the legend is especially widespread in the Islamic world. So too has scepticism taken strong root in the former lands of the Soviet Union. Whatever happens, progress, most likely, will be counted in decades rather than years.

Some may suggest that as the truth will emerge victorious eventually, as it always does, there is no need to act by challenging the established orthodoxy. However, the longer it takes to happen the longer mankind lies under the bewildering and malign spell of the holocaust hex, and will pay a price, especially if Arab or Muslim, measured in blood and tears.

As a hoax the holocaust story is quite crude. In this the holocaust cult is vulnerable and weak. In that it is supported by enormously rich and powerfully resourced interests it is very strong. Still, the Emperor who is told his elegant set of clothes is a transparent sham, a fraud, a hopeless lie, is yet a very uncomfortable Emperor. Such an Emperor can only continue with the charade for so long if many small children one after another come forward chirping gleefully a revisionist message.

Notes/

A very good introduction to revisionism is available on internet at:
www.vho.org. See also codoh.com.

The Emperor relates to Hans Christian Anderson's fairytale of an Emperor who had a magic set of clothes made for him which was said to be invisible to those who were fools. As he paraded in his new finery everyone congratulated him and agreed on how well his new clothes looked. However a small boy pointed out the Emperor had no clothes at all and was actually naked. The result was shock, laughter and pandemonium.

The phrase thought crime comes from the novel 1984 by George Orwell. It means thinking thoughts which have been tabooed by the ruling political elite. To question the "Holocaust" is the ultimate thought crime in today's world.

Joseph Heaney
Dublin September 2003

THE ZIONIST (ATTEMPTED) WHITEWASH

Debating Israel's Early Years

by Efraim Karsh

One of the reasons I gave up political history was that it is very difficult not to direct it towards the future, towards your idea of what ought to happen. And that somehow distorts your view of what has happened.

Albert Hourani

As Israel edges toward peace with the Palestinians, old, highly controversial, and seemingly defunct issues are back on the table, such as the legal status of Jerusalem and the question of the Palestinian refugees. The refugees and their present rights inspire two very different approaches. The Israeli view, based on an assessment of the 1947-49 period that ascribes primary responsibility for the Palestinian tragedy to an extremist and short-sighted leadership, sees Palestinian wounds as primarily self-inflicted and so not in need of compensation. In contrast, Palestinian spokesmen justify their "right of return" to the territory that is now part of the State of Israel (or an alternative compensation) by presenting themselves as victims of Jewish aggression in the late 1940s.

Ironically, it is a group of Israelis who have given the Palestinian argument its intellectual firepower. Starting in 1987, an array of self-styled "new historians" has sought to debunk what it claims is a distorted "Zionist narrative." How valid is this sustained assault on the received version of Israel's early history? This question has real political importance, for the answer is bound to affect the course of Israeli-Palestinian efforts at making peace.

The new historians and their critics

Simha Flapan, the left-wing political activist and editor of *New Outlook* who inaugurated the assault on alleged "Zionist myths," made no bones about his political motivations in rewriting Israeli history, presenting his book as an attempt to "undermine the propaganda structures that have so long obstructed the growth of the peace forces in my country."¹ But soon after, a group of Israeli academics and journalists gave this approach a scholarly imprimatur, calling it the "new history."² Its foremost spokesmen include Avi Shlaim of Oxford University, Benny Morris of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, and Ilan Pappé of Haifa University. Other prominent adherents include Tom Segev of the *Ha'aretz* newspaper, Benjamin Beit Hallahmi of Haifa University, and researchers Uri Milstein and Yosi Amitai.

Above all, the new history signifies a set of beliefs: that Zionism was at best an aggressive and expansionist national movement and at worst an offshoot of European imperialism;³ and that it was responsible for the Palestinian tragedy, the continuing Arab-Israeli conflict, and even the Middle East's violent history.

In an attempt to prove that the Jewish State was born in sin, the new historians concentrate on the war of 1947-49 (in Israeli parlance, the War of Independence). Deriding alternative interpretations as "old" or "mobilized," they dismiss the notion of a hostile Arab world's seeking to destroy the Jewish state at birth as but a Zionist myth. They insist that when the Jewish Agency accepted the U.N. Resolution of November 1947 (partitioning Mandatory Palestine into Arab and Jewish states), it was less than sincere.

It is obviously a major service to all concerned to take a hard look at the past and, without political intent, to debunk old myths. Is that what the new historians have done? I shall argue that, quite the contrary, they fashion their research to suit contemporary political agendas; worse, they systematically distort the archival evidence to invent an Israeli history in an image of their own making. These are strong words; the following pages shall establish their accuracy.

A number of scholars have already done outstanding work showing the faults of the new history. Itamar Rabinovich (of Tel Aviv University, currently Israel's ambassador to the United States) has debunked the claim by Shlaim and Pappé that Israel's recalcitrance explains the failure to make peace at the end of the 1947-49 war.⁴ Avraham Sela (of the Hebrew University) has discredited Shlaim's allegation that Israel and Transjordan agreed in advance of that war to limit their war operations so as to avoid an all-out confrontation between their forces.⁵ Shabtai Tevet (David Ben-Gurion's foremost biographer) has challenged Morris's account of the birth of the Palestinian refugee problem.⁶ Robert Satloff (of the Washington Institute for Near East Policy) has shown, on the basis of his own research in the Jordanian national archives in Amman, the existence of hundreds of relevant government files readily available to foreign scholars,⁷ thereby demolishing the new historians' claim that "the archives of the Arab Governments are closed to researchers, and that historians interested in writing about the Israeli-Arab conflict perforce must rely mainly on Israeli and Western archives"⁸ -- and with it, the justification for their almost exclusive reliance on Israeli and Western sources.

This article addresses a different question. The previous critics have looked mostly at issues of politics or sources; we shall concentrate on the accuracy of documentation by these self-styled champions of truth and morality. By looking at three central theses of the new historians, our research reveals a completely different picture from the one that new historians themselves have painted. But first, let us examine whether the alleged newness of this self-styled group is justified.

New facts?

The new historians claim to provide factual revelations about the origins of the Israeli-Arab conflict. According to Shlaim, "the new historiography is written with access to the official Israeli and Western documents, whereas the earlier writers had no access, or only partial access, to the official documents."⁹

The earlier writers may not have had access to an abundance of newly declassified documents, which became available in the 1980s, but recent "old historians," such as Rabinovich and Sela, have made no less use of them than their "new" counterparts, and they came up with very different conclusions. Which leads to the self-evident realization that

it is not the availability of new documents that distinguishes the new historians from their opponents but the interpretation they give to this source material.

Further, much of the fresh information claimed by the new historians turns out to be old indeed. Consider Shlaim's major thesis about secret contacts between the Zionist movement and King `Abdallah of Transjordan. He claims that "it is striking to observe how great is the contrast between accounts of this period written without access to the official documents and an account such as this one, based on documentary evidence."¹⁰ Quite the contrary, it is striking to see how little our understanding has changed following the release of state documents. Shlaim himself concedes that the information "that there was traffic between these two parties has been widely known for some time and the two meetings between Golda Meir [acting head of the Jewish Agency's political department] and King `Abdullah in November 1947, and May 1948 have even been featured in popular films."¹¹ Indeed, not only was the general gist of the `Abdallah-Meir conversations common knowledge by 1960,¹² but most of the early writers had access to then-classified official documents. Dan Kurzman's 1970 account of that meeting is a near verbatim narration of the report prepared by the Jewish Agency's political department adviser on Arab affairs, Ezra Danin.¹³ Shlaim also relies on Danin's report, adding nothing new to Kurzman's revelations.

Much of the fresh information claimed by the new historians turns out to be old indeed. . . .

. . . As for new interpretations, some are indeed new, but only because they are flat wrong.

Similarly, Shlaim places great stress on a February 1948 meeting between the prime minister of Transjordan, Tawfiq Abu'l-Huda, and the foreign secretary of Great Britain, Ernest Bevin, claiming the latter at that time blessed an alleged Hashemite-Jewish agreement to divide Palestine. But this meeting was already known in 1957, when Sir John Bagot Glubb, the former commander of the Arab Legion, wrote his memoirs,¹⁴ and most early works on the Arab-Israeli conflict used this information.¹⁵

Morris's foremost self-laudatory "revelation" concerns the expulsion of Arabs from certain places by Israeli forces, at times through the use of violence. This was made known decades earlier in such works as Jon and David Kimche's *Both Sides of the Hill*; Rony Gabbay's *A Political Study of the Arab-Israeli Conflict*; and Nadav Safran's *From War to War*.¹⁶

Eager to debunk the perception of the 1947-49 war as a heroic struggle of the few against the many, the new historians have pointed to an approximate numerical parity on the battlefield.¹⁷ Yet this too was well known: school-children could find it in historical atlases, university students in academic books.¹⁸ Ben-Gurion's autobiographical account of Israel's history, published nearly two decades before the new historians made their debut on the public stage, contains illuminating data on the Arab-Israeli military balance; his edited war diaries, published by the Ministry of Defense Press in 1983, give a detailed breakdown of the Israeli order of battle: no attempt at a cover-up here.¹⁹

New interpretations?

As for new interpretations, some are indeed new, but only because they are flat wrong. Ilan Pappé has gone so far as to argue that the outcome of the 1947-49 war had been predetermined in the political and diplomatic corridors of power "long before even one shot had been fired."²⁰ To which, one can only say that the State of Israel paid a high price indeed to effect this predetermined outcome: the war's six thousand fatalities represented 1 percent of Israel's total Jewish population, a higher human toll than that suffered by Great Britain in World War II.²¹ Further, Israel's battlefield losses during the war were about the same as those of the Palestinians; and given that its population was roughly half the latter's size, Israel lost proportionately twice the percentage of the Palestinians.²²

Other interpretations ring truer, but only because they are old and familiar. Shlaim concedes that his charge of Jordanian-Israeli collusion is not a new one but was made decades before him.²³ In fact, this conspiracy theory has been quite pervasive. In Arab historiography of an anti-Hashemite caste, "the collusion myth became the crux of an historical indictment against the king for betraying the Arab national cause in Palestine."²⁴ On the Israeli side, both left- and right-wingers have levelled this same criticism at the government's conduct of the 1947-49 war. Shlaim has hardly broken new ground.

Shlaim's main claim to novelty lies in his challenging "the conventional view of the Arab-Israeli conflict as a simple bipolar affair in which a monolithic and implacably hostile Arab world is pitted against the Jews."²⁵ But this "conventional view" does not exist. Even

such passionately pro-Israel feature films on the 1947-49 war as *Exodus* and *Cast a Giant Shadow* do not portray "a monolithic and implacably hostile Arab world pitted against the Jews," but show divided Arab communities in which some leaders would rather not fight the Jews and others would cooperate with the Jews against their Arab "brothers." And what applies to popular movies applies all the more to scholarly writings. Not one of the studies by the "old historians" subscribes to the stereotypical approach attached to them by Shlaim.

The same applies to Morris. His claim that "what happened in Palestine/Israel over 1947-9 was so complex and varied . . . that a single-cause explanation of the exodus from most sites is untenable"²⁶ echoes not only Aharon Cohen's and Rony Gabbay's conclusions of thirty years earlier²⁷ but also the standard explanation of the Palestinian exodus by such "official Zionist" writers as Joseph Schechtman: "This mass flight of the Palestinian Arabs is a phenomenon for which no single explanation suffices. Behind it lies a complex of apparently contradictory factors."²⁸

Even the claim to novelty is not new! Aharon Klieman, the quintessential "old historian," wrote in his study of Hashemite-Zionist relations, published just two years before Shlaim's book, that "it has been a commonplace to present the Palestine or the Arab-Israeli conflict in all its historical stages as a simple bilateral conflict. . . . It is a mistake to present the Arab side to the equation as a monolithic bloc. The 'Arab camp' has always been divided and at war with itself."²⁹

At times, the new historians themselves realize they are recycling old ideas. For example, Shlaim acknowledged that their arguments were foreshadowed by such writers as Gabbay, Israel Baer, Gabriel Cohen, and Meir Pail.³⁰ In all, the new historians have neither ventured to territory unknown to earlier generations of scholars, nor made major factual discoveries, nor provided truly original interpretations, let alone developed novel historical methodologies or approaches. They have used precisely the same research methods and source-material as those whose work they disdain -- the only difference between these two groups being the interpretation given to their findings. Let us now turn to the accuracy of those interpretations.

I. Pushing out the Arabs

The new historians make three main claims about the Zionist movement in the late 1940s: it secretly intended to expel the Palestinians, it conspired with King `Abdallah to dispossess the Palestinians of their patrimony, and it won British support for this joint effort. Are these accusations accurate?

Morris writes that "from the mid-1930s most of the Yishuv's leaders, including Ben-Gurion, wanted to establish a Jewish state without an Arab minority, or with as small an Arab minority as possible, and supported a 'transfer solution' to this minority problem."³¹ He argues that the transfer idea "had a basis in mainstream Jewish thinking, if not actual planning, from the late 1930s and 1940s."³² But Morris, the new historian who has made the greatest effort to prove this thesis, devotes a mere five pages to this subject. He fails to prove his claim.

First, the lion's share of his "evidence" comes from a mere three meetings of the Jewish Agency Executive (JAE) during June 7-12, 1938. Five days in the life of a national movement can scarcely provide proof of longstanding trends or ideologies, especially since these meetings were called to respond to specific ad hoc issues. Moreover, Morris has painted a totally false picture of the actual proceedings of these meetings. Contrary to his claim that the meetings "debated at length various aspects of the transfer idea,"³³ the issue was discussed only in the last meeting, and even then as but one element in the overall balance of risks and opportunities attending Britain's suggested partition rather than as a concrete policy option. The other two meetings did not discuss the subject at all.³⁴

Secondly, Morris virtually ignores that the idea of transfer was forced on the Zionist agenda by the British (in the recommendations of the 1937 Peel Royal Commission on Palestine) rather than being self-generated.³⁵ He downplays the commission's recommendation of transfer, creates the false impression that the Zionists thrust this idea on a reluctant British Mandatory power (rather than vice versa), and misleadingly suggests that Zionist interest in transfer long outlived the Peel Commission.³⁶

Thirdly, and most important, Morris systematically falsifies evidence, to the point that there is scarcely a single document he relies on without twisting and misleading, either by a creative rewriting of the original text, by taking words out of context, or by truncating texts and thereby distorting their meaning. For example, Morris finds an alleged Zionist interest in the idea of transfer lasting up to the outbreak of the 1948 war. Yes, Morris concedes, Ben-Gurion in a July 1947 testimony to the United Nations Special Commission on Palestine (UNSCOP) "went out of his way to reject the 1945 British Labour Party platform

'International Post-war Settlement' which supported the encouragement of the movement of the Palestine Arabs to the neighboring countries to make room for Jews."37 But he insinuates that Ben-Gurion was insincere; in his heart of hearts, he subscribed to the transfer idea at the beginning of the 1947-49 war. Becoming a mind-reader, Morris discerns the transfer in a Ben-Gurion speech in December 1947:

There was no explicit mention of the collective transfer idea.

However, there was perhaps a hint of the idea in Ben-Gurion's speech to Mapai's supporters four days after the UN Partition resolution, just as Arab-Jewish hostilities were getting under way. Ben-Gurion starkly outlined the emergent Jewish State's main problem -- its prospective population of 520,000 Jews and 350,000 Arabs. Including Jerusalem, the state would have a population of about one million, 40% of which would be non-Jews. "This fact must be viewed in all its clarity and sharpness. With such a [population] composition, there cannot even be complete certainty that the government will be held by a Jewish majority. . . . There can be no stable and strong Jewish state so long as it has a Jewish majority of only 60%." The Yishuv's situation and fate, he went on, compelled the adoption of "a new approach . . . new habits of mind" to "suit our new future. We must think like a state."38

Morris creates the impression here that Ben-Gurion believed only transfer would resolve the problem of a substantial Arab minority in the Jewish State.

Is this mind-reading of Ben-Gurion correct? Was there really a hint of the transfer idea in his speech? Here is the text from which Morris draws his citation:

In the territory allotted to the Jewish State there are now above 520,000 Jews (apart from the Jerusalem Jews who will also be citizens of the state) and about 350,000 non-Jews, almost all of whom are Arabs. Including the Jerusalem Jews, the state would have at birth a population of about one million, nearly 40 per cent of which would be non-Jews. This [population] composition does not constitute a solid basis for a Jewish State; and this fact must be viewed in all its clarity and sharpness. With such a composition, there cannot even be complete certainty that the government will be held by a Jewish majority. . . . There can be no stable and strong Jewish state so long as it has a Jewish majority of only 60 per cent, and so long as this majority consists of only 600,000 Jews. . . .

We have been confronted with a new destiny -- we are about to become masters of our own fate. This requires a new approach to all our questions of life. We must reexamine all our habits of mind, all our systems of operation to see to what extent they suit our new future. We must think in terms of a state, in terms of independence, in terms of full responsibility for ourselves -- and for others.39

This original text suggests that Morris has distorted the evidence in three ways.

First, Morris omits Ben-Gurion's statement that there can be no stable and strong Jewish state so long as the Jewish majority "consists of only 600,000 Jews." He distorts Ben-Gurion's intention by narrowing the picture to a preoccupation with the 60-40 percent ratio, when its real scope was a concern about the absolute size of the Jewish population.

Secondly, Morris creates the impression that Ben-Gurion's call for a "new approach . . . new habits of mind" applied to the Arab minority problem, implicitly referring to transfer. In fact, it applied to the challenges attending the transition from a community under colonial domination to national self-determination.

Thirdly, he omits Ben-Gurion's statement on the need to take "full responsibility for ourselves -- and for others." Who are these others but the non-Jewish minority of the Jewish State?

Worse, Morris chooses to rely on a secondary source rather than consult the primary document; and for good reason, for an examination of the original would easily dispel the cloud of innuendo with which Morris surrounded Ben-Gurion's speech:

. . . There can be no stable and strong Jewish state so long as it has a Jewish majority of only 60 percent, and so long as this majority consists of only 600,000 Jews.

From here stems the first and principal conclusion. The creation of the state is not the formal implementation process discussed by the UN General Assembly. . . . To ensure not only the establishment of the Jewish State but its existence and destiny as well -- we must bring a million-and-a-half Jews to the country and root them there. It is only when there will be at least two millions Jews in the country -- that the state will be truly established.40

This speech contains not a hint of the transfer idea. Ben-Gurion's long-term solution to the 60-40 percent ratio between the Jewish majority and non-Jewish minority is clear and unequivocal: mass Jewish immigration.

As for the position of the Arabs in the Jewish State, Ben-Gurion could not be clearer:

We must think in terms of a state, in terms of independence, in terms of full responsibility for ourselves -- and for others. In our state there will be non-Jews as well --

and all of them will be equal citizens; equal in everything without any exception; that is: the state will be their state as well.⁴¹

Ben-Gurion envisaged Jewish-Arab relations in the prospective Jewish State not based on the transfer of the Arab population but as a true partnership among equal citizens; not "fortress Israel," a besieged European island in an ocean of Arab hostility, but a Jewish-Arab alliance.

These passages make it clear that Benny Morris has truncated, twisted, and distorted Ben-Gurion's vision of Jewish-Arab relations and the Zionist position on the question of transfer. All this is especially strange given that Morris contends that the historian "must remain honour-bound to gather and present his facts accurately."⁴²

II. Collusion across the Jordan

Shlaim traces Israel's and Transjordan's alleged collusion to a secret meeting on November 17, 1947, in which King Abdallah and Golda Meir agreed supposedly to frustrate the impending U.N. Resolution on Palestine and instead divide Palestine between themselves. He writes that

In 1947 an explicit agreement was reached between the Hashemites and the Zionists on the carving up of Palestine following the termination of the British mandate . . . it was consciously and deliberately intended to frustrate the will of the international community, as expressed through the United Nations General Assembly, in favour of creating an independent Arab state in part of Palestine.⁴³

Is there any evidence for this alleged conspiracy? No, none at all. First, a careful examination of the two documents used to substantiate the claim of collusion -- reports by Ezra Danin and Eliyahu Sasson, two Zionist officials -- proves that Meir implacably opposed any agreement that would violate the U.N. partition resolution passed twelve days later. In no way did she consent to the Transjordan annexation of Arab areas of Palestine. Rather, Meir made it eminently clear that:

* Any Zionist-Hashemite arrangement would have to be compatible with the U.N. resolution. In Danin's words: "We explained that our matter was being discussed at the UN, that we hoped that it would be decided there to establish two states, one Jewish and one Arab, and that we wished to speak now about an agreement with him [i.e., `Abdallah] based on these resolutions."⁴⁴ In Sasson's words: "Replied we prepared [to] give every assistance within [the] frame [of the] UN Charter."⁴⁵

* The sole purpose of Transjordan's intervention in post-Mandatory Palestine would be, in Meir's words, "to maintain law and order and to preserve peace until the UN could establish a government in that area,"⁴⁶ namely, a short-lived law-enforcement operation aimed at facilitating the establishment of a legitimate Palestinian government. Indeed, even `Abdallah did not expect the meeting to produce any concrete agreement. In Danin's words: "At the end he reiterated that concrete matters could be discussed only after the UN had passed its resolution, and said that we must meet again immediately afterwards."⁴⁷

Secondly, Meir's account of her conversation with `Abdallah -- strangely omitted in this context by Shlaim (though he cites it elsewhere in his study) -- further confirms that Mandatory Palestine was not divided on November 17, 1947.

For our part we told him then that we could not promise to help his incursion into the country [i.e., Mandatory Palestine], since we would be obliged to observe the UN Resolution which, as we already reckoned at the time, would provide for the establishment of two states in Palestine. Hence, we could not -- so we said -- give active support to the violation of this resolution.⁴⁸

Thirdly, Shlaim's thesis is predicated on the idea of a single diplomatic encounter's profoundly affecting the course of history. He naïvely subscribes to the notion that a critical decision about the making of war and peace or the division of foreign lands is made in the course of a single conversation, without consultations or extended bargaining. This account reflects a complete lack of understanding about the nature of foreign policymaking in general and of the Zionist decision-making process in particular.

Fourthly, as mere acting head of the Jewish Agency's political department, Meir was in no position to commit her movement to a binding deal with King `Abdallah, especially since that deal would run counter to the Jewish Agency's simultaneous efforts to win a U.N.

resolution on partition. All she could do was try to convince `Abdallah not to oppose the impending U.N. partition resolution violently and give him the gist of Zionist thinking.

Fifthly, Meir's conversation with `Abdallah was never discussed by the Jewish Agency Executive, the Yishuv's effective government. The Yishuv's military operations during the 1947-49 war show not a trace of the alleged deal in either their planning or their execution. Quite the contrary, the Zionist leadership remained deeply suspicious of `Abdallah's expansionist ambitions up to May 1948.

Lastly, while the Jewish Agency unquestionably preferred `Abdallah to his Palestinian rival, the Jerusalem mufti Hajj Amin al-Husayni, this preference did not lead the agency to preclude the possibility of a Palestinian state. As late as December 1948 (or more than a year after `Abdallah and Meir had allegedly divided Palestine), Ben-Gurion stated his preference for an independent Palestinian state to Transjordan's annexing the Arab parts of Mandatory Palestine. "An Arab State in Western Palestine is less dangerous than a state that is tied to Transjordan, and tomorrow -- probably to Iraq," he told his advisers. "Why should we vainly antagonize the Russians? Why should we do this [i.e., agree to Transjordan's annexation of Western Palestine] against the [wishes of the] rest of the Arab states?"⁴⁹

In short, not only did the Zionist movement not collude with King `Abdallah to divide Mandatory Palestine between themselves but it was reconciled to the advent of a Palestinian state. `Abdallah was the one who was violently opposed to such an eventuality and who caused it to fail by seizing the bulk of the territory the United Nations had allocated to the Palestinians.

III. Collusion with Great Britain

Shlaim writes that "Britain knew and approved of this secret Hashemite-Zionist agreement to divide up Palestine between themselves, not along the lines of the U.N. partition plan."⁵⁰ This alleged British blessing was given in the above-noted conversation between Bevin and Abu'l-Huda, in which the foreign secretary gave the Transjordanian prime minister

The green light to send the Arab Legion into Palestine immediately following the departure of the British forces. But Bevin also warned [Trans]Jordan not to invade the area allocated by the U.N. to the Jews. An attack on Jewish state territory, he said, would compel Britain to withdraw her subsidy and officers from the Arab Legion.⁵¹

This thesis is fundamentally flawed. True, the British were resigned to Transjordan's military foray into post-Mandatory Palestine, but this was not out of a wish to protect Jewish interests. Rather, it was directed against those interests: Israel was intended to be the victim of the Transjordanian intervention -- not its beneficiary.

* Contrary to Shlaim's claim, the British government did not know of a Hashemite-Zionist agreement to divide up Palestine, both because this agreement did not exist and because `Abdallah kept London in the dark about his contacts with the Jewish Agency. The influential British ambassador to Amman, Sir Alec Kirkbride, was not aware of the secret Meir-`Abdallah meeting until well after the event.⁵² How then could the British bless a Hashemite-Zionist deal?

* Glubb's memoirs alone indicate that Bevin gave Abu'l-Huda a green light to invade while warning him, "do not go and invade the areas allotted to the Jews."⁵³ In contrast, declassified British documents unequivocally show that Bevin neither encouraged Abu'l-Huda to invade the Arab parts of Palestine as "the obvious thing to do," as claimed by Glubb, nor warned him off invading the Jewish areas. Bevin said only that he "would study the statements which his Excellency had made."⁵⁴ Shlaim's choosing an old and partisan account over a newly released official document suggests a desperate attempt to prove the existence of such a warning.

* The British archives are bursting with evidence that the foreign secretary and his advisers cared not at all whether `Abdallah transgressed Jewish territory; they only wanted to be sure he did not implicate Britain in an embarrassing international situation. Shortly after the Bevin-Abu'l-Huda meeting, Bernard Burrows, head of the Eastern department, wrote (with Bevin's approval) that

It is tempting to think that Transjordan might transgress the boundaries of the United Nations Jewish State to the extent of establishing a corridor across the Southern Negev [i.e., Negev] joining the existing Transjordan territory to the Mediterranean and Gaza . . . [thereby] cutting the Jewish State, and therefore Communist influence, off from the Red Sea.⁵⁵

More important, on May 7, 1948, a week before the all-Arab attack on Israel, Burrows suggested to the Foreign Office intimate to King `Abdallah that "we could in practice presumably not object to Arab Legion occupation of the Nejev [i.e., Negev]."⁵⁶ In other words, not only was the Foreign Office not opposed to Transjordan's occupation of the Jewish State's territory but it encouraged `Abdallah to go in and occupy about half of it.

* Having grudgingly recognized their inability to prevent the partition of Palestine, British officialdom wished to see a far smaller and weaker Jewish state than that envisaged by the U.N. partition resolution and did its utmost to bring about such an eventuality. Limitations of space do not allow a presentation of the overwhelming documentary evidence of British efforts to cut Israel "down to size" and stunt its population growth through the prevention of future Jewish immigration.⁵⁷ Suffice to say that British policymakers sought to forestall an Israeli-Transjordanian peace agreement unless it detached the Negev from the Israeli state.

Conclusions

Recently declassified documents in Israeli and Western archives fail to confirm the picture of the origins of the Arab-Israeli conflict painted by the new historians. The self-styled new historiography is really a "distortography." It is anything but new: much of what it presents is old and much of the new is distortion. The "new historians" are neither new nor true historians but rather partisans seeking to give academic respectability to longstanding misconceptions and prejudice on the Arab-Israeli conflict. To borrow the words of the eminent British historian E.H. Carr, what the new historians are doing is to "write propaganda or historical fiction, and merely use facts of the past to embroider a kind of writing which has nothing to do with history."⁵⁸

Returning to political issues of today: the Palestinian claim to national self-determination stands on its own and does not need buttressing from historical falsification. Quite the contrary, fabricating an Israeli history to cater to interests of the moment does great disservice not only to historical truth but also to the Palestinians that the new historians seek to champion. Instead, they should heed Albert Hourani's advice. Securing the future means coming to terms with one's past, however painful that might be, not denying it.

[A lesson Zionists should learn...]

1 The Birth of Israel: Myths and Reality (New York: Pantheon, 1987), p. 4; see also pp. 10 and 233.

2 The new historians make much of their relatively young age: "Most of them, born around 1948, have matured in a more open, doubting, and self-critical Israel than the pre-1967, pre-1973, and pre-Lebanon War Israel of the old historians." Of course, biological age indicates little about outlook. The opponents of the new historians also matured "in a more open, doubting, and self-critical Israel," many of them belonging to the same age group and having lived in the same milieu as the new historians. Moreover, some new historians are older than the "old" historians, especially Flapan, who was born in 1911 and thus precisely a member of that generation that "had lived through 1948 as highly committed adult participants in the epic, glorious rebirth of the Jewish commonwealth" and that was consequently derided by the new historians as being "unable to separate their lives from the events they later recounted, unable to distance themselves from and regard impartially the facts and processes through which they had lived." Benny Morris, 1948 and After: Israel and the Palestinians (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), p. 7.

3 Avi Shlaim writes: "At the time of the Basle Congress, Palestine was under the control of the Ottoman Turks. It was inhabited by nearly half a million Arabs and some 50,000 Jews. . . . But, in keeping with the spirit of the age of European imperialism, the Jews did not allow these local realities to stand in the way of their own national aspirations." Avi Shlaim, Collusion Across the Jordan: King Abdullah, the Zionist Movement, and the Partition of Palestine (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988), p. 2. Ilan Pappé has been far more outspoken in articulating Zionism as a brand of Western colonialism that "gained control over a land that is not theirs at the end of the nineteenth century." See, for example, "Damning the Historical Forgery," Kol Ha-ir, Oct. 6, 1995, p. 61.

4 Itamar Rabinovich, The Road Not Taken: Early Arab-Israeli Negotiations (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991).

5 Avraham Sela, "Transjordan, Israel and the 1948 War: Myth, Historiography, and Reality," Middle Eastern Studies, vol. 28, No. 4 Oct. 1992, pp. 623-89.

6 Benny Morris, The Birth of the Palestinian Refugee Problem (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), p. 286; Shabtai Tevet, "The Palestine Arab Refugee Problem and its Origins," Middle Eastern Studies, Vol. 26, No. 2 Apr. 1990, pp. 214-49.

7 Robert Satloff's review of Morris's Israel's Border Wars, in Middle Eastern Studies, Vol. 31, Number 4 Oct. 1995, p. 954.

8 Benny Morris, "A Second Look at the 'Missed Peace,' or Smoothing Out History: A Review Essay," Journal of Palestine Studies, Autumn 1994, p. 86.

- 9 Avi Shlaim, "The Debate about 1948," *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, Aug. 1995, p. 289. See also Morris, *1948 and After*, p. 7.
- 10 Shlaim, *Collusion*, p. viii.
- 11 Shlaim, "The Debate about 1948," p. 296.
- 12 Jon Kimche and David Kimche, *Both Sides of the Hill* (London: Secker and Warburg, 1960), p. 60; Marie Syrkin, *Golda Meir: Woman with a Cause* (London: Victor Gollancz, 1964), pp. 195-202.
- 13 Dan Kurzman, *Genesis 1948: The First Arab-Israeli War* (New York: New American Library, 1972), pp. 42-44.
- 14 Sir John Bagot Glubb, *A Soldier with the Arabs* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1957), pp. 63-66.
- 15 For example, Kurzman, *Genesis 1948*, pp. 116-17; Zeev Sharef, *Three Days* (London: W.H. Allen, 1962), p. 77; and Kimche and Kimche, *Both Sides of the Hill*, p. 39. As we shall see (on p. XX), the newly released official British documents do shed fresh light on the Bevin-Abu'l-Huda meeting but completely in the opposite direction from that claimed by Shlaim.
- 16 Kimche and Kimche, *Both Sides of the Hill*, pp. 227-28; Rony Gabbay, *A Political Study of the Arab-Israeli Conflict: The Arab Refugee Problem (A Case Study)* (Geneva: Librairie E. Droz, 1959), pp. 108-11; and Nadav Safran, *From War to War: The Arab-Israeli Confrontation 1948-1967* (Indianapolis, Ind.: Pegasus, 1969), pp. 34-35.
- 17 Morris, *1948 and After*, pp. 13-16; Shlaim, "The Debate about 1948," pp. 294-95.
- 18 See, for example, Moshe Lissak, Yehuda Wallach, and Eviatar Nur, eds., *Atlas Karta Le-toldot Medinat Israel: Shanim Rishonot, Tashah-Tashak* (Karta Atlas of Israel: the First Years, 1948-61), (Jerusalem: Karta, 1978); Safran, *From War to War*, p. 30.
- 19 David Ben-Gurion, *Medinat Israel Ha'mehudeshet*, vol. 1 (Tel Aviv: Am Oved, 1969), pp. 70-71, 98, 102, 106, and 115; idem, *Israel: A Personal History* (London: New English Library, 1972), pp. 61, 90; G. Rivlin and E. Orren, eds., *Yoman Ha-milhama*, 3 vols. (Tel Aviv: Misrael Ha-bitahchom, Ha-hotsa'a La-or, 1983), particularly vol. 3, pp. 1013-19.
- 20 Ilan Pappé, *The Making of the Arab-Israeli Conflict, 1947-1951* (London: I.B. Tauris, 1992), p. 271.
- 21 See, for example, Martin Gilbert, *The Second World War* (London: Fontana, 1990), p. 746; National Register of the United Kingdom and the Isle of Man, *Statistics of Population on 29 September 1939* (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office (hereafter HMSO), 1939).
- 22 "Casualties in Palestine since the United Nations Decision, Period 30th November, 1947 to 3rd April, 1945," CO 733/483/5, p. 19.
- 23 Shlaim, "The Debate about 1948," p. 296. On the Jordanian side, Col. `Abdallah at-Tall, who served as a messenger between King `Abdallah and the Zionists during the armistice talks at the end of the 1947-49 war, then defected to Egypt and wrote about his experiences in *Karithat Filastin: Mudhakkirat `Abdallah at-Tall, Qa'id Ma`rakat al-Quds* (Cairo: Al-Qalam, 1959). On the Israeli side, Lt. Col. Israel Baer, an adviser to Ben-Gurion later convicted of spying for the Soviet Union, told about the negotiations in *Bithon Israel: Etmol, ha-Yom, Mahar* (Tel Aviv: Amikam, 1966).
- 24 Sela, "Transjordan, Israel and the 1948 War," pp. 623-24. See also his article "Arab Historiography of the 1948 War: The Quest for Legitimacy," in Laurence J. Silberstein, ed., *New Perspectives on Israeli History* (New York: New York University Press, 1991), pp. 124-54.
- 25 Shlaim, "The Debate about 1948," p. 297.
- 26 Morris, *Palestinian Refugee Problem*, p. 294.
- 27 Aharon Cohen, *Israel and the Arab World* (London: W.H. Allen, 1970), pp. 458-66; Gabbay, *A Political Study*, pp. 54, 85-98.
- 28 Joseph B. Schechtman, *The Arab Refugee Problem* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1952), p. 4.
- 29 Aharon Klieman, *Du Kium Le-lo Shalom (Unpeaceful Coexistence: Israel, Jordan, and the Palestinians)* (Tel Aviv: Ma`ariv, 1986), pp. 15-16.
- 30 Shlaim, "The Debate about 1948," p. 289. And, years earlier, Arnold Toynbee, Alfred Lillienthal, Noam Chomsky, and Edward Said all used these same arguments.
- 31 Morris, *1948 and After*, p. 17. "Yishuv" refers to the Zionist community in Palestine before the establishment of Israel.
- 32 Morris, *Palestinian Refugee Problem*, p. 24.
- 33 *Ibid.*, pp. 25-26.
- 34 *Protocols of the Jewish Agency Executive meetings of June 7, 9, and 12, 1938*, Central Zionist Archives, Jerusalem.
- 35 The Peel report suggested the partition of Mandatory Palestine into two states, Arab and Jewish; to reduce frictions between the two communities, the commission also suggested a land and population exchange, similar to that effected between Turkey and Greece after the First World War. See *Palestine Royal Commission, Report, Presented by the Secretary of State for the Colonies to Parliament by Command of His Majesty, July 1937*, Cmd. 5479 (London: HMSO, 1937), pp. 291-95. There being far more Arabs in the Jewish state-to-be than the other way around (225,000 vs. 1,250), Ben-Gurion and some other Zionist proponents of partition viewed this exchange (or transfer, as it came to be known) as a partial compensation for the confinement of the prospective Jewish state to a tiny fraction of the Land of Israel. Yet they quickly dismissed this idea, as shown by the fact that not one of the 30-odd submissions the JAE made to the Palestine Partition Commission (the Woodhead Commission, 1938) suggested population exchange and transfer.
- 36 Morris, *The Birth*, pp. 27-28.
- 37 *Ibid.*, p. 28.

- 38 Ibid. Morris traces the speech to Dec. 3, 1947, as is done in the secondary source from which he borrowed it. In the original source, however, the date given is Dec. 13, 1947.
- 39 Rivlin and Orren, eds., *Yoman Ha-milhama*, vol. I, p. 22.
- 40 Ben-Gurion, *Ba-ma'araha*, vol. IV, part 2 (Tel Aviv: Hotsa'at Miflegat Poalei Eretz Yisra'el, 1959), pp. 258-59 (emphasis added).
- 41 Ibid., p. 260.
- 42 Morris, *1948 and After*, p. 47.
- 43 Shlaim, *Collusion Across the Jordan*, p. 1; idem, *The Politics of Partition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), p. viii (this is an abridged and slightly revised edition of *Collusion*). Other new historians have taken up this thesis. Thus, Pappé: "The common ground for the agreement was a mutual objection to the creation of a Palestinian state. . . . The Jewish Agency in particular abhorred such a possibility, asserting that the creation of a Palestinian state would perpetuate the ideological conflict in Palestine" (*The Making of the Arab-Israeli Conflict*, p. 118).
- 44 Ezra Danin, "Siha in Abdallah, 17.11.47," *Central Zionist Archives*, S25/4004.
- 45 Sasson to Shertok, Nov. 20, 1947, *Central Zionist Archives*, S25/1699.
- 46 Danin, "Siha in Abdallah."
- 47 Ibid.
- 48 Golda Meir's verbal report to the Provisional State Council on May 12, 1948, *Israel State Archives*, *Provisional State Council: Protocols, 18 April - 13 May 1948*, Jerusalem, 1978, p. 40. [Eds: the collection had an English title. *Yeshivat Minhelet Ha-am*, 12/5/48.]
- 49 Ben-Gurion, *Yoman Ha-milhama*, vol. III, Dec. 18, 1948, p. 885.
- 50 Shlaim, "The Debate," p. 297.
- 51 Ibid., p. 293.
- 52 See, for example, Kirkbride's telegram to Bevin dated Nov. 17, 1947, displaying total ignorance of the Abdullah-Meir meeting, which was held that very day (FO 816/89). For further evidence of British ignorance of the alleged Hashemite-Jewish deal, see a personal and secret letter from H. Beeley, Eastern Department, Foreign Office, to T.E. Bromley, Jan. 20, 1948, FO 371/68403/E1877; and Michael Wright, "Brief for Conversation with Transjordan Prime on Palestine," Feb. 6, 1948, FO 371/6837/E1980G.
- 53 Glubb, *A Soldier with the Arabs*, p. 66.
- 54 Mr. Bevin to Sir Alec Kirkbride (Amman), "Conversation with the Transjordan Prime Minister," Feb. 9, 1948, FO 371/68366/E1916/G.
- 55 Memorandum by Bernard Burrows, Feb. 9, 1948, FO 371/68368/E296.
- 56 Bernard Burrows, "Palestine After May 14," May 7, 1948, FO 371/68854/E6778.
- 57 For a discussion of this issue, see Efraim Karsh, *Fabricating Israeli History: "The New Historians"* (London: Frank Cass, forthcoming).
- 58 E.H. Carr, *What is History?* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1984), p. 29.

Efraim Karsh is director of the Mediterranean Studies Programme at King's College, University of London, and editor of the quarterly journal *Israel Affairs*.
The Middle East Quarterly, June 1996, III, 2.
The Middle East Forum Promoting American Interests
<<http://www.meforum.org/article/302>>

NEWS YOU WON'T FIND ON CNN

Power, Propaganda and Conscience in The War On Terror

by John Pilger

I am a reporter, who values bearing witness. That is to say, I place paramount importance in the evidence of what I see, and hear, and sense to be the truth, or as close to the truth as possible. By comparing this evidence with the statements, and actions of those with power, I believe it's possible to assess fairly how our world is controlled and divided, and manipulated - and how language and debate are distorted and a false consciousness developed.

When we speak of this in regard to totalitarian societies and dictatorships, we call it brainwashing: the conquest of minds. It's a notion we almost never apply to our own societies. Let me give you an example. During the height of the cold war, a group of Soviet journalists were taken on an official tour of the United States. They watched TV; they read the newspapers; they listened to debates in Congress. To their astonishment, everything they heard was more or less the same. The news was the same. The opinions were the

same, more or less. "How do you do it?" they asked their hosts. "In our country, to achieve this, we throw people in prison; we tear out their fingernails. Here, there's none of that? What's your secret?"

The secret is that the question is almost never raised. Or if it is raised, it's more than likely dismissed as coming from the margins: from voices far outside the boundaries of what I would call our 'metropolitan conversation', whose terms of reference, and limits, are fixed by the media at one level, and by the discourse or silence of scholarship at another level. Behind both is a presiding corporate and political power.

A dozen years ago, I reported from East Timor, which was then occupied by the Indonesian dictatorship of General Suharto. I had to go there under cover, as reporters were not welcome - my informants were brave, ordinary people who confirmed, with their evidence and experience, that genocide had taken place in their country. I brought out meticulously hand-written documents, evidence that whole communities had been slaughtered - all of which we now know to be true.

We also know that vital material backing for a crime proportionally greater than the killing in Cambodia under Pol Pot had come from the West: principally the United States, Britain and Australia. On my return to London, and then to this country, I encountered a very different version. The media version was that General Suharto was a benign leader, who ran a sound economy and was a close ally. Indeed, prime minister Keating was said to regard him as a father figure.

He and Foreign Minister Gareth Evans made many laudatory speeches about Suharto, never mentioning - not once - that he had seized power as a result of what the CIA called "one of the worst massacres of the twentieth century." Nor did they mention that his special forces, known as Kopassus, were responsible for the terror and deaths of a quarter of the East Timorese population - 200,000 people, a figure confirmed in a study commissioned by the Foreign Affairs Committee of Federal Parliament.

Nor did they mention that these killers were trained by the Australian SAS not far from this auditorium, and that the Australian military establishment was integrated into Suharto's violent campaign against the people of East Timor.

The evidence of atrocities, which I reported in my film *Death of a Nation* was heard and accepted by the Human Rights Commission of the United Nations, but not by those with power in Australia. When I showed evidence of a second massacre near the Santa Cruz cemetery in November 1991, the foreign editor of the only national newspaper in this country, *The Australian*, mocked the eyewitnesses.

"The truth," wrote Greg Sheridan, "is that even genuine victims frequently concoct stories." The paper's Jakarta correspondent, Patrick Walters, wrote that "no one is arrested [by Suharto] without proper legal procedures". The editor-in-chief, Paul Kelly, declared Suharto a "moderate" and that there was no alternative to his benign rule.

Paul Kelly sat on the board of the Australia-Indonesia Institute, a body funded by the Australian government. Not long before Suharto was overthrown by his own people, Kelly was in Jakarta, standing at Suharto's side, introducing the mass murderer to a line of Australian editors. To his great credit, the then editor of the *West Australian*, Paul Murray, refused to join this obsequious group.

Not long ago, Paul Kelly was given a special award in the annual Walkley Awards for journalism - the kind they give to elder statesmen. And no one said anything about Indonesia and Suharto. Imagine a similar award going to Geoffrey Dawson, editor of the *London Times* in the 1930s. Like Kelly, he appeased a genocidal dictator, calling him a "moderate".

This episode is a metaphor for what I'd like to touch upon tonight.

For 15 years, a silence was maintained by the Australian government, the Australian media and Australian academics on the great crime and tragedy of East Timor. Moreover, this was an extension of the silence about the true circumstances of Suharto's bloody ascent to power in the mid-sixties. It was not unlike the official silence in the Soviet Union on the bloody invasion of Hungary and Czechoslovakia.

The media's silence I'll discuss in a while. Let's look now at the academic silence. One of the greatest acts of genocide in the second half of the twentieth century apparently did not warrant a single substantial academic case study, based on primary sources. Why? We have to go back to the years immediately after world war two when the study of post-war international politics, known as "liberal realism", was invented in the United States, largely with the sponsorship of those who designed American global economic power. They include the Ford, Carnegie and Rockefeller Foundations, the OSS, the forerunner of the CIA, and the Council on Foreign Relations.

Thus, in the great American universities, scholars generally served to justify the cold war - which, we now know from declassified files, not only brought us closer to nuclear war than we thought, but was itself largely bogus. As the British files now make clear, there was no Soviet threat to the world. The threat was to Russia's satellites, just as the United States threatened, invaded and controlled its satellites in Latin America.

"Liberal realism" - in America, Britain, Australia - meant taking the humanity out of the study of nations and viewing the world in terms of its usefulness to western power. This was presented in a self-serving jargon: a masonic-like language in thrall to the dominant power. Typical of the jargon were labels.

Of all the labels applied to me, the most interesting is that I am 'neo-idealist'. The 'neo' but has yet to be explained. I should add here that the most hilarious label is the creation of the foreign editor of The Australian who took a whole page in his newspaper to say that a subversive movement called Chomskyist-Pilgerism was inspiring would-be terrorists throughout the world.

During the 1990s, whole societies were laid out for autopsy and identified as "failed states" and "rogue states", requiring "humanitarian intervention". Other euphemisms became fashionable - "good governance" and "third way" were adopted by the liberal realist school, which handed out labels to its heroes. Bill Clinton, the president who destroyed the last of the Roosevelt reforms, was labelled "left of centre".

Noble words like democracy, freedom, independence, reform were emptied of their meaning and taken into the service of the World Bank, the IMF and that amorphous thing called "The West" - in other words, imperialism.

Of course, imperialism was the word the realists dared not write or speak, almost as if it had been struck from the dictionary. And yet imperialism was the ideology behind their euphemisms. And need I remind you of the fate of people under imperialism. Throughout 20th century imperialism, the authorities of Britain, Belgium and France gassed, bombed and massacred indigenous populations from Sudan to Iraq, Nigeria to Palestine, India to Malaya, Algeria to the Congo. And yet imperialism only got its bad name when Hitler decided he, too, was an imperialist.

So, after the war, new concepts had to be invented, indeed a whole lexicon and discourse created, as the new imperial superpower, the United States, didn't wish to be associated with the bad old days of European power. The American cult of anti-communism filled this void most effectively; however, when the Soviet Union suddenly collapsed and the cold war was over, a new threat had to be found.

At first, there was the "war on drugs" - and the Bogeyman Theory of History is still popular. But neither can compare with the "war on terror" which arrived with September 11, 2001. Last year, I reported the "war on terror" from Afghanistan. Like East Timor, events I witnessed bore almost no relation to the way they were represented in free societies, especially Australia.

The American attack on Afghanistan in 2001 was reported as a liberation. But the evidence on the ground is that, for 95 per cent of the people, there is no liberation. The Taliban have been merely exchanged for a group of American funded warlords, rapists, murderers and war criminals - terrorists by any measure: the very people whom President Carter secretly armed and the CIA trained for almost 20 years.

One of the most powerful warlords is General Rashid Dostum. General Dostum was visited by Donald Rumsfeld, the US Defence Secretary, who came to express his gratitude. He called the general a "thoughtful" man and congratulated him on his part in the war on terror. This is the same General Dostum in whose custody 4,000 prisoners died terrible deaths just over two years ago - the allegations are that wounded men were left to suffocate and bleed to death in containers. Mary Robinson, when she was the UN's senior humanitarian representative, called for an inquiry; but there was none for this kind of acceptable terrorism. The general is the face of the new Afghanistan you don't see in the media.

What you see is the urbane Harmid Karzai, whose writ barely extends beyond his 42 American bodyguards. Only the Taliban seem to excite the indignation of our political leaders and media. Yet under the new, approved regime, women still wear the burqua, largely because they fear to walk down the street. Girls are routinely abducted, raped, murdered.

Like the Suharto dictatorship, these warlords are our official friends, whereas the Taliban were our official enemies. The distinction is important, because the victims of our official friends are worthy of our care and concern, whereas the victims of our official enemies are not. That is the principle upon which totalitarian regimes run their domestic propaganda. And that, basically, is how western democracies, like Australia, run theirs.

The difference is that in totalitarian societies, people take for granted that their governments lie to them: that their journalists are mere functionaries, that their academics are quiet and complicit. So people in these countries adjust accordingly. They learn to read between the lines. They rely on a flourishing underground. Their writers and playwrights write coded works, as in Poland and Czechoslovakia during the cold war.

A Czech friend, a novelist, told me; "You in the West are disadvantaged. You have your myths about freedom of information, but you have yet to acquire the skill of deciphering: of reading between the lines. One day, you will need it."

That day has come. The so-called war on terror is the greatest threat to all of us since the most dangerous years of the cold war. Rapacious, imperial America has found its new "red scare". Every day now, officially manipulated fear and paranoia are exported to our shores - air marshals, finger printing, a directive on how many people can queue for the toilet on a Qantas jet flying to Los Angeles.

The totalitarian impulses that have long existed in America are now in full cry. Go back to the 1950s, the McCarthy years, and the echoes today are all too familiar - the hysteria; the assault on the Bill of Rights; a war based on lies and deception. Just as in the 1950s, the virus has spread to America's intellectual satellites, notably Australia.

Last week, the Howard government announced it would implement US-style immigration procedures, fingerprinting people when they arrived. The Sydney Morning Herald reported this as government measures to "tighten its anti-terrorism net". No challenge there; no scepticism. News as propaganda.

How convenient it all is. The White Australia Policy is back as "homeland security" - yet another American term that institutionalises both paranoia and its bed-fellow, racism. Put simply, we are being brainwashed to believe that Al-Qaida, or any such group, is the real threat. And it isn't. By a simple mathematical comparison of American terror and Al-Qaida terror, the latter is a lethal flea. In my lifetime, the United States has supported and trained and directed terrorists in Latin America, Africa, Asia. The toll of their victims is in the millions.

In the days before September 11, 2001, when America routinely attacked and terrorised weak states, and the victims were black and brown-skinned people in faraway places like Zaire and Guatemala, there were no headlines saying terrorism. But when the weak attacked the powerful, spectacularly on September 11, suddenly, there was terrorism.

This is not to say that the threat from al-Qaida is not real - It is very real now, thanks to American and British actions in Iraq, and the almost infantile support given by the Howard government. But the most pervasive, clear and present danger is that of which we are told nothing.

It is the danger posed by "our" governments - a danger suppressed by propaganda that casts "the West" as always benign: capable of misjudgment and blunder, yes, but never of high crime. The judgement at Nuremberg takes another view. This is what the judgement says; and remember, these words are the basis for almost 60 years of international law: "To initiate a war of aggression, it is not only an international crime; it is the supreme international crime differing only from other war crimes in that it contains within itself the accumulated evil of the whole"

In other words, there is no difference, in the principle of the law, between the action of the German regime in the late 1930s and the Americans in 2003. Fuelled by religious fanaticism, a corrupt Americanism and corporate greed, the Bush cabal is pursuing what the military historian Anatol Lieven calls "the classic modern strategy of an endangered right-wing oligarchy, which is to divert discontent into nationalism". Bush's America, he warns, "has become a menace to itself and to mankind."

Those are rare words. I know of no Australian historian or any other so-called expert to have uttered such a truth. I know of no Australian media organisation that would allow its journalists to speak or write such a truth. My friends in Australian journalism whisper it, always in private. They even encourage outsiders, like myself, to say it publicly, as I am doing now.

Why? Well, **a career, security - even fame and fortune - await those who propagate the crimes of official enemies. But a very different treatment awaits those who turn the mirror around.** I've often wondered if George Orwell, in his great prophetic work 1984, about thought control in totalitarian state ... I've often wondered what the reaction would have been had he addressed the more interesting question of thought control in relatively free societies. Would he have been appreciated and celebrated? Or would he have faced silence, even hostility?

Of all the western democracies, Australia is the most derivative and the most silent. Those who hold up a mirror are not welcome in the media. My work is syndicated and read

widely around the world, but not in Australia, where I come from. However, I am mentioned in the Australian press quite frequently. The official commentators, who dominate the press, will refer critically to an article of mine they may have read in the Guardian or New Statesman in London. But Australian readers are not allowed to read the original, which must be filtered through the official commentators. But I do appear regularly in one Australian paper: the Hinterland Voice - a tiny free sheet, whose address is Post Office Kin Kin in Queensland. It's a fine local paper. It has stories about garage sales and horses and the local scouts, and I'm proud to be part of it.

It's the only paper in Australia in which I've been able to report the evidence of the disaster in Iraq - for example, that the attack on Iraq was planned from September 11; that only a few months earlier, Colin Powell and Condoleezza Rice, had stated that Saddam Hussein was disarmed and no threat to anyone.

Today, the United States is currently training a gestapo of 10,000 agents, commanded by the most ruthless, senior elements of Saddam Hussein's secret police. The aim is to run the new puppet regime behind a pseudo-democratic façade - and to defeat the resistance. That information is vital to us, because the fate of the resistance in Iraq is vital to all our futures. For if the resistance fails, the Bush cabal will almost certainly attack another country - possibly North Korea, which is nuclear armed.

Just over a month ago, the United Nations General Assembly voted on a range of resolutions on disarmament of weapons of mass destruction. Remember the charade of Iraq's WMDs? Remember John Howard in Parliament last February, saying that Saddam Hussein, "will emerge with his arsenal of chemical and biological weapons intact", and that it was "a massive programme".

In a speech lasting 30 minutes, Howard referred more than 30 times to the threat posed by Saddam Hussein's weapons of mass destruction. And it was all a deception, wasn't it, a lie, a terrible joke on the public, and it was channelled and amplified by an obedient media. And who in the universities, our power-houses of knowledge and criticism and debate - who stood up and objected? I can think of just two.

Nor can I find any report in the media of the United Nations General Assembly resolutions on 8th December. The outcome was remarkable, if not surprising. The United States opposed all the most important resolutions, including those dealing with nuclear weapons. In its secret Nuclear Posture Review for 2002, the Bush administration outlines contingency plans to use nuclear weapons against North Korea, and Syria, and Iran and China.

Following suit, a British government has announced for the first time that Britain will attack non-nuclear states with nuclear weapons "if necessary". Who among you is aware of these ambitions, and yet American and British intelligence facilities in this country are crucial to their implementation.

Why is there no public discussion about this? The answer is that Australia has become a microcosm of the self-censored society. In its current index of press freedom, the international monitoring organisation Reporters Without Borders lists Australian press freedom in 50th place, ahead only of autocracies and dictatorships. How did this come about?

In the nineteenth century, Australia had a press more fiercely independent than most countries. In 1880, in New South Wales alone, there were 143 independent titles, many of them with a campaigning style and editors who believed it was their duty to be the voice of the people. Today, of twelve principal newspapers in the capital cities, one man, Rupert Murdoch, controls seven. Of the ten Sunday newspapers, Murdoch has seven. In Adelaide and Brisbane, he has effectively a complete monopoly. He controls almost 70 per cent of capital city circulation. Perth has only one newspaper.

Sydney, the largest city, is dominated by Murdoch and by the Sydney Morning Herald, whose current editor in chief Mark Scott told a marketing conference in 2002 that journalism no longer needed smart and clever people. "They are not the answer," he said. The answer is people who can execute corporate strategy. In other words, mediocre minds, obedient minds.

The great American journalist Martha Gellhorn once stood up at a press conference and said: "Listen, we're only real journalists when we're not doing as we're told. How else can we ever keep the record straight?" The late Alex Carey, the great Australian social scientist who pioneered the study of corporatism and propaganda, wrote that the three most significant political developments of the twentieth century were, "the growth of democracy, the growth of corporate power and the growth of corporate propaganda as a means of protecting corporate power against democracy".

Carey was describing the propaganda of 20th century imperialism, which is the propaganda of the corporate state. And contrary to myth, the state has not withered away; indeed, it has never been stronger. General Suharto was a corporate man - good for business. So his crimes were irrelevant, and the massacres of his own people and of the East Timorese were consigned to an Orwellian black hole. So effective is this historical censorship by omission that Suharto is currently being rehabilitated. In The Australian last October, Owen Harries described the Suharto period as a "golden era" and urged Australia to once again embrace the genocidal military of Indonesia.

Recently, Owen Harries gave the Boyer Lectures on the ABC. This is an extraordinary platform: in six episodes broadcast on Radio National, Harries asked whether the United States was benign or imperial. After some minor criticisms of American power, he described the foreign policy of the most dangerous administration in modern times as "utopian".

Who is Owen Harries? He was an adviser to the government of Malcolm Fraser. But in none of the publicity about his lectures have I read that Harries was also involved with an CIA-front propaganda organisation, the Congress for Cultural Freedom and its Australian offshoot. For years, Harries was an apologist for the cold war and the initial CIA-run attack on Vietnam. In Washington, he was editor of an extreme right wing journal called The National Interest.

No one would deny Owen Harries his voice in any democracy. But we should know who his former sponsors were. Moreover, it is his extreme view that is the one that dominates. That the ABC should provide him with such a platform tells us a great deal about the effects of the long-running political intimidation of our national broadcaster.

Consider, on the other hand, the ABC's treatment of Richard Flanagan, one of our finest novelists. Last year, Flanagan was asked to read a favourite piece of fiction on a Radio National programme and explain his reasons for the choice. He decided on one of his favourite writers of fiction: John Howard. He listed Howard's most famous fictions - that desperate refugees had wilfully thrown their children overboard, and that Australia was endangered by Saddam Hussein's weapons of mass destruction.

He followed this with Molly Bloom's soliloquy from Joyce's Ulysses, because, he explained, "in our time of lies and hate it seems appropriate to be reminded of the beauty of saying yes to the chaos of truth". Well, all of this was duly recorded. But when the programme was broadcast, all references to the prime minister had been cut out. Flanagan accused the ABC of rank censorship. No, was the response. They just didn't want "anything political". And this is the same ABC that has just given Owen Harries, the voice of George W Bush's utopia, six one hour broadcasts.

As for Richard Flanagan, that wasn't the end of it. The ABC producer who had censored him asked if he would be interested in coming on a programme to discuss, "disillusionment in contemporary Australia". In a society that once prided itself on its laconic sense of irony, there was not even a hint of irony, just an obedient, managerial silence. "All around me," wrote Flanagan, "I see avenues for expression closing, and odd collusion of an ever-more cowed media and the way in which the powerful seek to dictate what is and what is not read and heard."

I believe those words speak for many Australians. Half a million of them converged on the centre of Sydney on February 16 th, and this was repeated proportionally across the country. Ten Million marched across the world. People who had never protested before protested the fiction of Howard and of Bush and Blair.

If Australia is the microcosm, consider the destruction of free speech in the United States, which constitutionally has the freest press in the world. In 1983, the principal media in America was owned by fifty corporations. In 2002, this had fallen to just nine companies. Today, Murdoch's Fox Television and four other conglomerates are on the verge of controlling 90 per cent of the terrestrial and cable audience. Even on the Internet, the leading twenty websites are now owned by Fox, Disney, AOL, Time Warner, Viacom and other giants. Just fourteen companies attract 60 per cent of all the time Americans spend online. And these companies control, or influence most of the world's visual media, the principal source of information for most people.

"We are beginning to learn," wrote Edward Said in his book Culture and Imperialism, "that de-colonisation was not the termination of imperial relationships but merely the extending of a geo-political web that has been spinning since the Renaissance. The new media have the media to penetrate more deeply into a receiving culture than any previous manifestation of Western technology." Compared with a century ago, when "European culture was associated with a white man's presence, we now have in addition an international media presence that insinuates itself over a fantastically wide range."

He was referring not only to news. Right across the media, children are remorsefully targeted by big business propaganda, commonly known as advertising. In the United States, some 30,000 commercial messages are targeted at children every year. The chief executive of one leading advertising company explained: "They aren't children so much as evolving consumers." Public relations is the twin of advertising. In the last twenty years, the whole concept of PR has changed dramatically and is now an enormous propaganda industry. In the United Kingdom, it's estimated that pre-packaged PR now accounts for half of the content of some major newspapers. The idea of "embedding" journalists with the US military during the invasion of Iraq came from public relations experts in the Pentagon, whose current strategic-planning literature describes journalism as part of psychological operations, or "psyops". Journalism as psyops.

The aim, says the Pentagon, is to achieve "information dominance" - which, in turn, is part of "full spectrum dominance" - the stated policy of the United States to control land, sea, space and information. They make no secret of it. It's in the public domain.

Those journalists who go their own way, those like Martha Gellhorn and Robert Fisk, beware. The independent Arab TV organisation, Al-Jazeera, was bombed by the Americans in Afghanistan and Iraq. In the invasion of Iraq, more journalists were killed than ever before - by the Americans. The message could not be clearer. The aim, eventually, is that there'll be no distinction between information control and media. That's to say: you won't know the difference.

That alone is worthy of reflection by journalists: those who still believe, like Martha Gellhorn, that their duty is to keep the record straight. The choice is actually quite simple: they are truth-tellers, or, in the words of Edward Herman, they merely "normalise the unthinkable".

In Australia, so much of the unthinkable has already been normalised. Almost twelve years after Mabo, the basic rights of the first Australians, known as native title, have become ensnared in legal structures. The Aboriginal people now fight not just to survive. They face a constant war of legal attrition, fought by lawyers. The legal bill and associated costs in native title administration alone now runs into hundreds of millions of dollars. Puggy Hunter, a West Australian Aboriginal leader, told me: "Fighting the lawyers for our birthright, fighting them every inch of the way, will kill me." He died soon afterwards, in his forties.

The High Court of Australia, once regarded as the last hope for the First Australians, now refers to native title as having a "bundle of rights" - as if Aboriginal rights can be sorted and graded - and downgraded.

The unthinkable is the way we allow the government to treat refugees, against whom our brave military is dispatched. In camps so bad that the United Nations inspector said he had never seen anything like them, we allow what amounts to child abuse.

On October 19th 2001, a boat carrying 397 people sank on its way to Australia. 353 drowned, many of them children. Were it not for a single individual, Tony Kevin, a retired Australian diplomat, this tragedy would have been consigned to oblivion. Thanks to him, we now know the Australian and military intelligence knew the boat was in grave danger of sinking, and did nothing. Is that surprising when the prime minister of Australia and the responsible minister have created such an atmosphere of hostility towards these defenceless people - a hostility designed, I believe, to tap the seam of racism that runs right through our history.

Consider the culpable loss of those lives against the pompous statements of Australian defence experts about our "sphere of influence" in Asia and the Pacific - that allows the Australian military to invade the Solomon's, but not to save 353 lives.

Threats? Let's talk about threats from asylum-seekers in leaking boats, from Al-Qaida. In its annual report for 1990, the Australian Security and Intelligence Organisation, ASIO, stated: "The only discernible threat of politically motivated violence comes from the racist right." I believe, regardless of subsequent events, nothing has changed.

All these matters are connected. They represent, at the very least, an assault on our intellect and our morality, yet even in our cultural life, we seem to turn away, as if frightened. Last week, I attended the opening of a new play in Sydney called "Harbour". It's about the great struggle on the waterfront in 1998 which attracted extraordinary public support. The play is an act of neutering, its stereotypes and sentimentality make history acceptable. Those who can afford the \$60-odd for a ticket will not be disappointed. The sponsors, Jaguar and Fairfax and a huge law firm, will not be disappointed.

We must reclaim our history from corporatism; for our history is rich and painful and, yes, proud. We should reclaim it from the John Howards and the Keith Windshuttles, who

deny it, and from the polite people and their sponsors who neuter it. You will hear them say that Joe Blow doesn't care - that as a people, we are apathetic and indifferent.

It was the thousands of Australians who went into the streets in 1999, in city after city, town after town, who decisively helped the people of East Timor - not John Howard, not General Cosgrove. And those Australians were not indifferent. It was the thousands of Australians and New Zealanders who stopped the French exploding their nuclear bombs in the Pacific. And they were not indifferent. It was the young people who travelled to Woomera and forced the closure of that disgraceful camp. And they were not indifferent.

The tragedy for many Australians seeking pride in the achievements of our nation is the suppression or the neutering, in popular culture, of a politically distinctive past, of which we there is much to be proud. In the lead and silver mines of Broken Hill, the miners won the world's first 35-hour a week, half a century ahead of Europe and America. Long before most of the world, Australia had a minimum wage, child benefits, pensions and the vote for women. By the 1960s, Australia could boast the most equitable spread of income in the western world. In spite of Howard and Ruddock, in my lifetime, Australia has been transformed from a second-hand Anglo-Irish society to one of the most culturally diverse and attractive on earth, and almost all of it has happened peacefully. Indifference had nothing to do with it.

I can almost hear a few of you saying, "OK, then what should we do?"

As Noam Chomsky recently pointed out, you almost never hear that question in the so-called developing world, where most of humanity struggles to live day by day. There, they'll tell you what they are doing.

We have none of the life-and-death problems faced by, say, intellectuals in Turkey or campesinos in Brazil or Aboriginal people in our own third world. Perhaps too many of us believe that if we take action, then the solution will happen almost overnight. It will be easy and fast. Alas, it doesn't work that way.

If you want to take direct action - and I believe we don't have a choice now: such is the danger facing all of us - then it means hard work, dedication, commitment, just like those people in countries on the front line, who ought to be our inspiration. The people of Bolivia recently reclaimed their country from water and gas multinationals, and threw out the president who abused their trust. The people of Venezuela have, time and again, defended their democratically elected president against a ferocious campaign by an American-backed elite and the media it controls. In Brazil and Argentina, popular movements have made extraordinary progress - so much so that Latin America is no longer the vassal continent of Washington.

Even in Colombia, into which the United States has poured a fortune in order to shore up a vicious oligarchy, ordinary people - trade unionists, peasants, young people have fought back.

These are epic struggles you don't read much about here. Then there's what we call the anti-globalisation movement. Oh, I detest that word, because it's much more than that. It's a remarkable response to poverty and injustice and war. It's more diverse, more enterprising, more internationalist and more tolerant of difference than anything in the past, and it's growing faster than ever.

In fact, it is now the democratic opposition in many countries. That is the very good news. For in spite of the propaganda campaign I have outlined, never in my lifetime have people all over the world demonstrated greater awareness of the political forces ranged against them and the possibilities of countering them. The notion of a representative democracy controlled from below where the representatives are not only elected but can be called truly to account, is as relevant today as it was when first put into practice in the Paris Commune 133 years ago. As for voting, yes, that's a hard won gain. But the Chartists, who probably invented voting as we know it today, made clear that it was gain only when there was a clear, democratic choice. And there's no clear, democratic choice now. We live in a single-ideology state in which two almost identical factions compete for our attention while promoting the fiction of their difference.

The writer Arundhati Roy described the outpouring of anti-war anger last year as "the most spectacular display of public morality the world has ever seen". That was just a beginning and a cause for optimism.

Why? Because I think a great many people are beginning to listen to that quality of humanity that is the antidote to rampant power and its bedfellow: racism. It's called conscience. We all have it, and some are always moved to act upon it. Franz Kafka wrote: "You can hold back from the suffering of the world, you have free permission to do so and it is in accordance with your nature, but perhaps this very holding back is the one suffering that you could have avoided."

No doubt there are those who believe they can remain aloof - acclaimed writers who write only style, successful academics who remain quiet, respected jurists who retreat into arcane law and famous journalists who protest: "No one has ever told me what to say." George Orwell wrote: "Circus dogs jump when the trainer cracks the whip. But the really well-trained dog is the one that turns somersaults when there is no whip."

For those members of our small, privileged and powerful elite, I recommend the words of Flaubert. "I have always tried to live in an ivory tower," he said, "but a tide of shit is beating its walls, threatening to undermine it." For the rest of us, I offer these words of Mahatma Gandhi: "First, they ignore," he said. "Then they laugh at you. Then they fight you. Then you win."

UWA Extension Summer School Lecture by John Pilger, Winthrop Hall, The University of Western Australia, 12 Jan. 2004
<http://www.johnpilger.com/>

<www.dissidentvoice.org/Jan04/Pilger0122.htm>

NUTS AND BOLTS

BAD LUCK

"In this difficult time we must again reaffirm we are enlisted for the duration--and reaffirm our belief that the cause of Israel must be the cause of America--and the cause of people of conscience everywhere."

John Kerry is a Massachusetts Senator and a Democratic Candidate for the Presidency of the United States. See "The Cause of Israel is the Cause of America", By Sen. John Kerry.

OLD TERROR

How did Zionist terror make Britain's Palestinian mandate impossible to administer?

B. Wasserstein, The British in Palestine.

C. Sykes, Cross Roads to Israel.

M.J. Cohen, Palestine: Retreat from the Mandate.
N. Bethwell, The Palestine Triangle.
J. Bowyer Bell, Terror Out of Zion.
M. Begin, The Revolt.
Y. Porath, The Emergence of the Palestinian Arab National Movement, 1918-1929.
Y. Porath, The Palestinian Arab Nationalist Movement, 1929-1939.
R. Owendale, Britain, the United States and the End of the Palestine Mandate.
C. Smith, Palestine and the Arab-Israeli Conflict.
K. Stein, The Land Question in Palestine
J. Ruedy, "Dynamics of Land Alienation", in 1. Abu-Lughod (ed.), The Transformation of Palestine.

+++++

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

OTHER AAARGH MONTHLY PUBLICATIONS

El Paso del Ebro

<<http://elpasodelebro.100megas.com>>

Das kausale Nexusblatt

<<http://de.geocities.com/kausalenexusblatt>>

Il Resto del Siculo

<<http://ilrestodelsiclo.spaziofree.net>>

La Gazette du Golfe et des banlieues (multilingual)

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

Conseils de Révision

<<http://conseilsderevision.tripod.com>>

This flag of Israel is the symbol of a new nationalist state, with its own government, army, foreign policy, language, national anthem and oath of allegiance. And this new flag has brought every one of us five million American citizens of the ancient faith of Judah to a parting in the road. Judaism, I have felt, was a religious faith which knew no national boundaries, to which a loyal citizen of any country could adhere. [â€¦] who see support for Israel as divinely ordained. In 1949, however, when Lilienthal wrote "Israel's Flag is Not Mine" for Readers Digest, his critique of Zionist propaganda was shared by mainstream [â€¦] Putting Israel First: The War Party's Achilles' heel | My Catbird Seat. January 30, 2012 at 7:40 pm. Reply. [â€¦] who see support for Israel as divinely ordained.